Pennsylvania
Department of Education
Teacher and Principal Evaluation Information
Individual LEA Data
For the 2011-12 Rating Period

GENERAL INFORMATION

LEA Name:
Bucks County Technical High School

AUN Number:
122091457

Address:
610 Wistar Road  Fairless Hills, PA, 19030-4106

Name Superintendent or Chief School Administrator:
Leon Poeske

For Information Contact:
Leon Poeske

Email:
lpoeske@bcths.com

Phone:
215-949-1700

TEACHER INFORMATION

Describe the LEA's system used to evaluate the performance of your teachers:
Bucks County Technical High School uses PDE forms 426, 427, and 428 to evaluate teachers. The PDE forms are based on the Danielson model of effective teaching and supporting research. The school uses the indicators on these forms to help administrators as they evaluate the teachers during annual observations of Instructional II teachers and semi-annual observations of Instructional I teachers. Teachers who are identified as needing improvement are observed regularly with time spent with the teacher to discuss any issues between observations. Attention is focused on those indicators that have been documented as needs improvement or unsatisfactory. Individual professional development is available for teachers who are found to need improvement through the observation process. This training emphasizes how teachers can improve their skills to become better instructors. The school does not use the evaluation system for merit pay; however, unsatisfactory evaluations can lead to a freeze in step and column movement and possible dismissal, per the teacher's contract.

Does the LEA use the results of the teacher evaluation system described above in decisions regarding:
a. Teacher Development? Yes
   During the evaluation, administrators address areas of growth for a teacher and that can be used as part of a personal professional development plan for the following year.

b. Teacher Compensation? Yes
   Unsatisfactory ratings result in a pay freeze. This is in the Teacher Collective Bargaining Unit Agreement. This is implemented when/if an unsatisfactory rating is given.

c. Teacher Promotions? Yes
   Teachers with poor ratings would not be promoted into an administrative position.

d. Teacher Retention and Removal? Yes
   Per state guidelines, two unsatisfactory ratings would be grounds for dismissal.

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:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Rated</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Not Rated</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Employed</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### LEA Teacher Evaluations Detail:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unsatisfactory/Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Numerator)</td>
<td>(Numerator)</td>
<td>(Numerator)</td>
<td>(Numerator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1%</td>
<td>Level 2%</td>
<td>Level 3%</td>
<td>Level 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5%</td>
<td>Level 6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucks County Technical High S</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>2 1.7%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>2 1.7%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98.3%</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 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 school uses a rubric that encompasses five (5) areas of school leadership, along with subcategories for each domain. They are: 1. Planning and Administration 2. Leadership and Motivation 3. Problem Solving and Decision Making 4. Communication and Interpersonal Relations 5. Supervision and Staff Development. In addition, there is a section for overall comments (open-ended). The process for this assessment tool is as follows:

It is the responsibility of the chief school administrator (Administrative Director) to complete and discuss the evaluation with the Principal on an annual basis. The Principal completes a self-evaluation using the same instrument before meeting with the Administrative Director. The Principal submits the self-evaluation to the Administrative Director and the Administrative Director uses this information, along with other data collected throughout the year, to create a final evaluation. After meeting and discussing this final evaluation, both parties (the Principal and Administrative Director). This assessment tool has been adopted from other area schools.

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

a. Principal Development? Yes
   During the evaluation, the supervisor addresses areas of growth for the principal and that can be used as part of a personal professional development plan for the following year.

b. Principal Compensation? Yes
   Per the Act 93 Agreement, principals must receive at least a "satisfactory" rating in order to receive any potential pay increase.

c. Principal Promotions? Yes
   Principals would not be considered for advancement if they did not receive a positive evaluation.

d. Principal Retention and Removal? Yes
   Principals receiving consecutive poor appraisals would be considered for dismissal.
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. No

NA

Does the LEA publicly report principal evaluation data by school?

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

NA

Does your LEA have at least one Principal position? Yes

Does your LEA have at Standardized Principal Evaluation System? Yes

LEA Principal Evaluations Summary:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Rated</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Not Rated</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Employed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LEA Principal Evaluation Detail:

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