

Pennsylvania
Department of Education
Teacher and Principal Evaluation Information
Individual LEA Data
For the 2010-11 Rating Period

GENERAL INFORMATION

LEA Name:

Collegium CS

AUN Number:

124153320

Address:

535 James Hance Court Exton, PA 19341

Name Superintendent or Chief School Administrator:

William D. Winters

For Information Contact:

Beth Jones

Email:

bjones@ccs.us

Phone:

610-903-1300, ext. 612

TEACHER INFORMATION

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

Collegium uses an alternative evaluation form to evaluate our teachers. The Collegium-developed form is based on a variety of effective teaching methodologies and supporting research, including the work of: Harry Wong, Wiggins and McTighe's Understanding by Design/Backward Design and Madeline Hunter. We use the indicators on these forms to help our principals as they evaluate the teachers during semi-annual observations of those with at least one year of experience and during the three annual observations of new teachers and teachers new to Collegium. Teachers who are identified as needing improvement are observed with increased frequency and are provided with intense mentoring/coaching between observations. Additional individual professional development is available for teachers who are found to need improvement through the evaluation process. The evaluation form includes four sections: Methodology, Planning, Classroom Environment and Management, and Professional Responsibilities. Each line item in a section is rated at one of 4 levels: Level 1 = Unsatisfactory; Level 2 = Basic, needs some improvement; Level 3 = Proficient; and Level 4 = Distinguished, no improvement needed. Collegium uses the evaluation system to inform salary, bonus, retention and promotion decisions.

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

a. Teacher Development? Yes

Collegium's Principals, Director of Curriculum and Assessment, Director of Student Services and our Act 48 committee review teacher evaluations to collect information on areas of weakness. In-service programs are developed and implemented in response to these areas of concern.

b. Teacher Compensation? Yes

A teacher's individual scores on his/her annual evaluations directly relate to his/her compensation for the following year. The better the scores, the higher the salary increase and the greater the annual bonus amount.

c. Teacher Promotions? Yes

Teachers with superior scores on annual performance evaluations are given priority over those without when being considered for promotions. Teachers with "basic" or "unsatisfactory" ratings are not considered for advancement.

d. Teacher Retention and Removal? Yes

Teachers who are identified, through low scores as needing improvement, are observed with increased frequency along with being provided with intense mentoring/coaching between observations. Additional individual professional development is available for teachers who are found to need improvement through the evaluation process. Repeated unsatisfactory evaluations without evident improvement would lead to a teacher's removal from his/her position.

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)? Other

b. Experienced Teachers (More than 3 Years)? Twice a year

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

Does the LEA publicly report teacher evaluation data by school?

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

LEA Teacher Evaluations Summary:

| | |
|-----------------------|-----------|
| Number Rated | 141 |
| Number Not Rated | 1 |
| Total Number Employed | <hr/> 142 |

LEA Teacher Evaluations 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) % |
| Unsatisfactory/Satisfactory | | | Unsatisfactory | Unsatisfactory | NA | NA | Satisfactory | Satisfactory |
| Collegium CS | 142 | 1 0.7 % | 0 0 % | 2 1.4 % | 0 0 % | 0 0 % | 57 40.1 % | 82 57.7 % |
| Totals | 142 | 1 0.7 % | 0 0 % | 2 1.4 % | 0 0 % | 0 0 % | 57 40.1 % | 82 57.7 % |

Note: - All Building percentages are the result of dividing the number of ratings at each level (Numberator) by the building total (Denominator)

- All Total percentages are the result of dividing the total number of ratings at each level (Numberator) 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:

Collegium uses an internally developed form to evaluate our principals. The CEO evaluates the principals. Principals are evaluated three times during their first year and annually in subsequent years. Principals who are identified as needing improvement are observed with increased frequency and would be provided with intense mentoring/coaching between observations. Additional individual professional development is available for principals who are found to need improvement through the evaluation process. The evaluation form includes five sections: Curriculum/Academic Program; School Management; Organization/Decision-Making/Leadership; Human Relations; and, Professional Responsibilities. Each section is rated at one of 4 levels: Level 1 = Unsatisfactory; Level 2 = Basic, needs some improvement; Level 3 = Proficient; and Level 4 = Distinguished, no improvement needed. Collegium uses the evaluation system to inform salary, bonus, retention and promotion decisions. Additionally, as a component of the evaluation process, annual surveys are completed by faculty/staff where they assess the performance of the principals with whom they interact. The rating achieved on this survey is an additional component of the principals' raise/bonus calculation.

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

a. Principal Development? Yes

If a principal is lacking in an area that was evaluated, plans for professional development and improvement will be determined as a result of the evaluation.

b. Principal Compensation? Yes

A principal's individual scores on his/her annual evaluations directly relate to his/her compensation for the following year. The better the scores, the higher the salary increase and the greater the annual bonus amount.

c. Principal Promotions? Yes

Principals with superior scores on annual performance evaluations are given priority over those without when being considered for promotions or special project leadership roles. Principals with "basic" or "unsatisfactory" ratings would not be considered for advancement.

d. Principal Retention and Removal? Yes

Principals who are identified, through low scores as needing improvement, are observed with increased frequency along with being provided with intense mentoring/coaching between observations. Additional individual professional development is available for principals who are found to need improvement through the evaluation process. Repeated unsatisfactory evaluations without evident improvement would lead to a principal's removal from his/her position.

Does the LEA principal 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 Principals (Less than 3 Years)? More than twice a year
- 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. No

Does the LEA publicly report principal evaluation data by school?

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

Does your LEA have at least one Principal position? Yes

Does your LEA have at Standarized Principal Evaluation System? Yes

LEA Principal Evaluations Summary:

| | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| Number Rated | 3 |
| Number Not Rated | <u>0</u> |
| Total Number Employed | 3 |
| | <u><u> </u></u> |

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) % |
| Unsatisfactory/Satisfactory | | | Unsatisfactory | Unsatisfactory | | | 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