

Pennsylvania
Department of Education
Teacher and Principal Evaluation Information
Individual LEA Data
For the 2009-10 Rating Period

GENERAL INFORMATION

LEA Name:

Bald Eagle Area SD

AUN Number:

110141003

Address:

751 S Eagle Valley Rd Wingate, PA 16823-4740

Name Superintendent or Chief School Administrator:

Daniel F. Fisher, Superintendent

For Information Contact:

Gary J. Massaglia

Email:

751 S. Eagle Valley Road, Wingate, PA 16823

Phone:

814-353-1413

TEACHER INFORMATION

Describe the LEA's system used to evaluate the performance of your teachers:

The Supervision, Evaluation and Professional Growth Plan of the Bald Eagle Area School district is the result of collaboration and cooperation of the District's teachers, administrators, school board and nationally recognized authorities in the field of effective teaching research. The plan is based upon the exemplary practices identified by the Pennsylvania Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development and the research of Danielson and Mc Greal (2000). The goal of the plan is to provide the District's diverse professional employees with continuous and career-long growth opportunities which enable the employees to enhance student learning in an environment that prepares all learners to meet life's challenges. This Supervision/Evaluation Plan provides a framework for professional growth in the areas of curricular knowledge and instructional practices as well as encouraging goal setting, risk-taking and experimentation that promote both individual and organizational growth. These processes provide the professional employees with the resources and opportunities to approach their work in a reflective, inquiring manner. Another goal of the plan is to provide increased teacher-to-teacher, and teacher-to-administrator communications about the art of teaching. The Supervision/Evaluation Plan provides opportunities for professional growth through participation in a three-year differentiated supervision cycle that can be tailored to meet the unique needs of each professional staff member. All teachers are required to develop a Professional growth Plan each year. All staff will participate in goal setting, a mid-year conference and a year-end, summative, conference. Non-tenured Staff are in a Focused Assistance Mode (Mode I) for three years. This mode will require formal observations two times per year, informal observations and portfolio requirements. The Tenured Staff will have a three-year cycle (Mode II) which includes Administrative Monitoring for one year and two years of Goal Directed supervision. In the Administrative Monitoring Mode the staff works with an administrator to examine, refine and enhance instructional practices through formal observations. The Goal Directed Mode provides the staff with the flexibility to choose Self-directed or Action Research goals and projects. Mode III, Corrective Assistance, is for Tenured or Non-Tenured Staff that have received an evaluation determined to be at an unsatisfactory level. There are three phases including Awareness, Assistance and Disciplinary Phases. All staff will participate in a Summative Conference with an administrator at the end of each year. Peer Coaching and Professional Learning Communities, and Book Study Groups will also be included as options for the Goal-Directed Mode. The district utilizes the PDE 5501, 426, and 427 forms for evaluation purposes. The Supervision./Evaluation Plan uses Charlotte Danielson's Teacher Standards for Effective Teaching as its rubric. The rubric includes the areas of Planning and Preparation, Classroom Environment, Instructional Delivery and Professionalism with four performance levels including Unsatisfactory, Basic, Proficient and Commendable. The administrators will participate in a summer PLC on staff evaluation practices and fidelity.

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

- a. Teacher Development? No
NA
- b. Teacher Compensation? No
NA
- c. Teacher Promotions? No
NA
- d. Teacher Retention and Removal? Yes

Our District follows the PA code and dismisses teaches that have accumulate two consecutive unsatisfactory evaluations.

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

- a. Student Achievement Outcomes? No
- b. Student Growth Data? No
NA

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. No

NA

Does the LEA publicly report teacher evaluation data by school?

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

NA

LEA Teacher Evaluations Summary:

Number Rated	149
Number Not Rated	5
Total Number Employed	<u>154</u>

LEA Teacher Evaluations Detail:

Standard Evaluation System:

Building	Total Employed	Not Rated		Satisfactory		Unsatisfactory	
	(Denominator)	(Numerator)	%	(Numerator)	%	(Numerator)	%
Wingate El Sch	44	1	2.3 %	43	97.7 %	0	0 %
Port Matilda El Sch	15	3	20 %	12	80 %	0	0 %
Howard El Sch	8	0	0 %	8	100 %	0	0 %
Mountaintop Area El Sch	17	1	5.9 %	16	94.1 %	0	0 %
Bald Eagle Area JSHS	65	0	0 %	65	100 %	0	0 %
Totals	149	5	3.4 %	144	96.6 %	0	0 %

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 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**

LEA Teacher Evaluations Detail:

Alternate Approved Evaluation System:

	Total Employed	Not Rated	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6
	(Denominator)	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %
RatingTitle								
Unsatisfactory/Satisfactory			Unsatisfactory					Satisfactory
Wingate El Sch	44	1 2.3 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	43 97.7 %
Port Matilda El Sch	15	3 20 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	12 80 %
Howard El Sch	8	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	8 100 %
Mountaintop Area El Sch	17	1 5.9 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	16 94.1 %
Bald Eagle Area JSHS	65	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	65 100 %
Totals	149	5 3.4 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	144 96.6 %

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 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**

PRINCIPAL INFORMATION

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

The district utilizes a district created evaluation form. The "Evaluation Form for Administrative and Supervisory Personnel" will be utilized as the primary evaluation instrument. The evaluations will span two years as the administrative year runs March 1 of one calendar year through the last day of February of the following calendar year. Evaluation forms will be passed out four weeks prior to August 31. The evaluation forms will be collected the first working day in September. The "Individual Administrative Goals" will be completed and turned in to the Superintendent by the third week of May. On January 31, all evaluation forms will again be passed out, completed and returned to the Superintendent three weeks prior to the March School Board meeting. Resultant monetary increases will be acted on at the March meeting of the Board of Education. The Evaluation is based on assigned duties in accordance with the position job descriptions an on overall commitment and contributions to organizational goals and objectives. Meetings will be conducted by the Superintendent individually with the principals to review their Evaluation form and to provide feedback.

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

a. Principal Development? No

NA

bPrincipal Compensation? Yes

The district Act 93 agreement for the present term describes mandated salary adjustments based on principal evaluation scores and then recommended the the board of education. Act 93 Agreement is attached.

c. Principal Promotions? Yes

Principal evaluations have been used to reallign administrative assignments. Some have resulted in increased responsibilities and salaries and some have done so in the other direction.

d. Principal Retention and Removal? Yes

Principals have left the district in the past few years or been reassigned based on performance evaluations or anticipated evaluations.

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

a. Student Achievement Outcomes? No

b. Student Growth Data? No

NA

How often does the LEA formally evaluate:

a. New Principals (Less than 3 Years)? Annually

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

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. Yes

No rubric or weighting system is used. We use a Lykert scale of 0-4 with 4 indicating Commendable to 0 indicating Unsatisfactory

Does the LEA publicly report principal evaluation data by school?

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

NA

LEA Principal Evaluations Summary:

Rating System	Standard
Number Rated	5
Number Not Rated	_____
Total Number Employed	5

LEA Principal Evaluation Detail:

	Total Employed	Not Rated	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6
	(Denominator)	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %
RatingTitle			Unsatisfactory - O - 1.0 on the combined rating scale	Needs Improvement - 1.0 to 2.0 on the combined rating scale.	Average - 2.0 to 3.0 on the combined rating scale.	Above Average - 3.0 to 4.0 on the combined rating scale.	Commendable - 4.0 on the combined rating scale.	NA
Unsatisfactory/Satisfactory			Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Totals	*	* %	* %	* %	* %	* %	* %	* %

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**