TEACHER INFORMATION

Describe the LEA's system used to evaluate the performance of your teachers:
The Delaware County Intermediate Unit (DCIU) mission statement is clear about its primary focus. It is about creating leadership and providing leadership in the development and delivery of quality cost effective programs and services to school communities. Our three primary beliefs are: (1) A commitment to providing diverse and flexible educational programs in a safe environment; (2) Promoting forward thinking, creativity, partnerships, and encouragement of positive change; (3) To maintain an entrepreneurial spirit of developing meaningful goals that indicates the success of our mission. These three primary beliefs and particularly the third belief regarding meaningful goals that indicate the success of our mission is a key component of the development and implementation of a supervision and evaluation plan for the Delaware County Intermediate Unit. The overarching purpose and focus of the LEA's 3rd component are to identify specific training and professional development opportunities essential to the success of the implementation of a plan and (2) develop specific mechanisms to ensure the institutionalization of the model including annual reviews of processes and procedures so it can be effectively implemented and utilized as part of the organization's planning and thinking. It is recognized by the entire administration of the DCIU that development of this plan is a top priority. Throughout the history of education, supervision and evaluation of staff has been a critical component...not because of the focus on teacher performance, but because of the importance of that teacher's actions on student learning. Unless teacher performance is directly impacting on student learning, no change and therefore no improvement may be occurring. It is the belief of the supervision and evaluation planning team that a comprehensive plan focused primarily on teaching and learning activities will have the greatest opportunity to impact on student learning. Therefore this model is to be designed to incorporate the best research and thinking regarding supervision and evaluation. This model will include four major components: (1) Goal setting for both the organization and individual; (2) Differentiated supervision model using three primary subparts; (3) The Frameworks Observation Program Model developed by Charlotte Danielson, and published in 1996 in her book, Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching. We have also borrowed from her latest book, Enhancing Student Achievement: A Framework for School Improvement. A Third primary resource utilized was Teacher Evaluation, by Charlotte Danielson and Thomas McGrew. All three of these books link closely to the belief system of the DCIU and to the best practices that we see in supervision and evaluation. In addition we will be looking to incorporate the use of the Pennsylvania Department of Education's new evaluation models currently referred to as 426, 427, and 428 for use with our staff in the development of this new model. As a result of working with our staff we believe that the use of form 426 and 427 for teachers who have Instructional I certificates, and 428 forms for those who have achieved Instructional II status, will facilitate our goals. DCIU began using PDE forms 426, 427, and 428 in place of forms 3501 and 3503 from the fall of 2003. It is the belief of the committee that the use of a comprehensive model will both enhance the quality of teaching and learning in a classroom but will also provide great learning opportunities for the teacher. Everyone will benefit from the staff development opportunities created by the frameworks. Training and providing ongoing support for professional development are, can and will be developed and implemented at the DCIU. Differentiated Supervision Overview - An Action Plan provides the focus for the three models in the Differentiated Supervision/Evaluation staff development project. These models include: (1) Focused Supervision; (2) Collegial Supervision; and (3) Self-Directed Supervision. A Differentiated Supervision model allows professional staff and administrators optimal options and some moderation for their professional development needs. From year to year, staff members may be involved in the different models. There is one model (#1) that is required for specific staff --Focused Supervision. This model is required for (1) All non-tenured employees; (2) All tenured, but new employees; and (3) Employees who have been identified as being "at-risk." All non-tenured staff stays in the Focused Supervision mode until attaining tenure status. All tenured, but new, staff stays in Focused Supervision for a minimum of one year. All "at-risk" staff stays in Focused Supervision until they have attained the necessary skills. After successful Focused Supervision, a staff member automatically moves to Collegial Supervision. Each of these modes are defined and explained in detail in the following sections. Focused Supervision/Definition - Focused Supervision is a process of supervision that allows staff and administrators numerous opportunities for consultation and support regarding the skills described in the IU Supervision/Evaluation rubrics (see Part D). Staff members are placed in this model if they: (1) Non-tenured Staff: a staff member who has fewer than three years of service in Pennsylvania and has not yet received six satisfactory approved PDE (IU) ratings; (2) New Staff: a tenured, but new, staff member with less than one year of employment with the Intermediate Unit; and (3) "At-Risk" Staff: a staff member whose supervisor has identified and noted one or more significant need(s) on their most recent observation/evaluation. They have a rating of Basic or Unsatisfactory in at least one category on the approved PDE (IU) rating form.Components/Action Plan: The Plan will address goals for the non-tenured or new staff member. The Plan will have sufficient detail and clarity for each goal including methods of meeting the goals, support available, and ways to measure the progress.Improvement Plan: The Plan will offer the "at-risk" staff member a detailed plan of correction and support. The Plan will detail the expectations and timeline.Observation: The Plan will offer regular and frequent opportunities for the supervisors to observe a lesson, and/or activities of the staff member and meet with staff member concerning these observations.Supervision: The Plan will offer administrative support using the IU rubrics as the foundation for successful professional growth and development. Collegial/Definition - Collegial Supervisor. The Plan is a method of supervision that enables staff members to work collaboratively to examine, refine, and enhance positive student and professional performance in their assignment. Eligibility - Staff members may participate in this model if they: (1) Tenured and permanently certified; (2) At the request and with the approval of the supervisors to observe a lesson, and/or activity of the staff member and meet with staff member concerning these observations; and (3) Have received Proficient or distinguished ratings on the approved PDE (IU) rating form for at least three years prior to participation and have been employed at least one year at the Intermediate Unit.Components/Action Plan: The Plan will include a team goal, a detailed action plan to achieve the goal, and a measurement plan to evaluate the achievement of the goal. The following combination of the approved PDE (IU) rating form for at least three years prior to participation and at least one year at the Intermediate Unit; and (4) With the understanding that they will be asked to share their project with others and the IU for their efforts will recognize them.Components/Action Plan: The Plan will be for a quality action project that is of value to students, parents, staff, or the organization, and which maximizes the use of the professional development resources. The Plan will have sustained consultation and consultation and the team will meet individually to review and approve the project and consult on the progress. The individual would be responsible to keep data that supports the successful progress and completion of the project. Supervision: The Supervision will meet with the individual to review the data collected and the progress on the project. Suggestions will be given as needed or requested. Evaluation: The Supervision will meet with the individual to review the self-assessment and to evaluate the progress and results of the project. Does the LEA use the results of the teacher evaluation system described above in decisions regarding: a. Teacher Development? Yes Only if used there is a need for professional growth to support someone from not getting an unsatisfactory rating b. Teacher Compensation? No
c. Teacher Promotions? No

d. Teacher Retention and Removal? Yes

If a person is unsatisfactory, an improvement plan is developed.

**Does the LEA teacher evaluation system described above include the following as evaluation criterion:**

a. Student Achievement Outcomes? No

b. Student Growth Data? No

**How often does the LEA formally evaluate:**

a. New Teachers (Less than 3 Years)? Twice a year

b. Experienced Teachers (More than 3 Years)? Annually

**Does the LEA use weighting formula(e) and/or rubric(s) to guide teacher evaluators?**

a. Yes or No? If Yes, describe background and process. Yes

Rubric based on work of Charlotte Danielson

**Does the LEA publicly report teacher evaluation data by school?**

a. Yes or No? (Web link provided if applicable.) No

**LEA Teacher Evaluations Summary:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Rated</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Not Rated</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Employed</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEA Teacher Evaluations Detail:**

Standard Evaluation System:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Total Employed (Denominator)</th>
<th>Not Rated (Numerator)</th>
<th>Satisfactory (Numerator)</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory (Numerator)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delaware County IU 25</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>235</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>224</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: - All Building percentages are the result of dividing the number of ratings at each level (Numerator) by the building total (Denominator).
- All Total percentages are the result of dividing the total number of ratings at each level (Numerator) by the overall total (Denominator).
*In order to ensure that individual ratings cannot be deduced, we have not reported any Teacher or Principal information if building level or LEA level data is less than or equal to 5.

---

**PRINCIPAL INFORMATION**

Describe the LEA’s system used to evaluate the performance of your Principals:

NA

Does the LEA use the results of the principal evaluation system described above in decisions regarding:

a. Principal Development? NA

b. Principal Compensation? NA

c. Principal Promotions? NA

d. Principal Retention and Removal? NA

Does the LEA principal evaluation system described above include the following as evaluation criterion:

a. Student Achievement Outcomes? NA

b. Student Growth Data? NA

NA

How often does the LEA formally evaluate:
a. New Principals (Less than 3 Years)?
b. Experienced Principals (More than 3 Years)?

Does the LEA use weighting formula(e) and/or rubric(s) to guide principal evaluators?

a. Yes or No?  If Yes, describe background and process.  NA

NA

Does the LEA publicly report principal evaluation data by school?

a. Yes or No?  (Web link provided if applicable.)  NA

NA

LEA Principal Evaluations Summary:

Rating System
Number Rated
Number Not Rated
Total Number Employed
### LEA Principal Evaluation Detail:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Title</th>
<th>Total Employed (Denominator)</th>
<th>Not Rated (Numerator) %</th>
<th>Level 1 (Numerator) %</th>
<th>Level 2 (Numerator) %</th>
<th>Level 3 (Numerator) %</th>
<th>Level 4 (Numerator) %</th>
<th>Level 5 (Numerator) %</th>
<th>Level 6 (Numerator) %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory/Satisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*%</td>
<td>*%</td>
<td>*%</td>
<td>*%</td>
<td>*%</td>
<td>*%</td>
<td>*%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: - All Total percentages are the result of dividing the total number of ratings at each level (Numerator) by the overall total (Denominator)

*In order to ensure that individual ratings can not be deduced, we have not reported any Teacher or Principal information if building level or LEA level data is less than or equal to 5*