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

GENERAL INFORMATION

LEA Name:
Luzerne IU 18

AUN Number:
118000000

Address:
368 Tioga Avenue Kingston, PA 18704

Name Superintendent or Chief School Administrator:
Dr. Anthony P. Grieco

For Information Contact:
Gregory Koons

Email:
gkoons@liu18.org

Phone:
570-287-9681

TEACHER INFORMATION

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

Evaluation is a continuing process in which the professional employee and supervisor cooperatively identify strengths and weaknesses in the individual's effectiveness as a professional educator. The objectives of evaluation are to assess and improve performance, encourage professional growth, promote positive behavior, and facilitate attainment of intermediate unit goals and objectives in order to benefit the students. The forms used at the Luzerne Intermediate Unit include the Temporary Professional Employee/Professional Employee Rating Form (PDE-5501), the Instructional I to Instructional II Assessment Form (PDE 427), the Semi-Annual Employee Evaluation Form for Instructional I Teachers (PDE 426), and the Annual Employee Evaluation Form for Instructional II Teachers (PDE428). The PDE 426 and 427 look at four categories and aspects of teaching: I. Planning and Preparation, II. Classroom Environment, III. Instructional Delivery, and IV. Professionalism. The evaluation forms are based off of Charlotte Danielson's framework for teaching. Evaluations are completed by special education supervisors, director of special education, and director of federal and nonpublic services. In the event of an unsatisfactory teacher evaluation, an improvement plan is established to identify areas of needed improvement, provide professional development, and set completion deadlines.
Does the LEA use the results of the teacher evaluation system described above in decisions regarding:

- Teacher Development? Yes
  Based on observations made through classroom visitations and feedback from post-observation conferences professional development plans are developed for the coming school year. If a teacher is found to be in need of improvement or unsatisfactory a personal professional improvement plan is developed in collaboration with the teacher and implemented immediately.

- Teacher Compensation? No

- Teacher Promotions? No

- Teacher Retention and Removal? Yes
  Teachers that are continuously found to be unsatisfactory or unsuccessful in completing their professional improvement plan they may be removed from their position at the discretion of the Board of Directors.

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

- Student Achievement Outcomes? No

- Student Growth Data? No

How often does the LEA formally evaluate:

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

- Experienced Teachers (More than 3 Years)? Annually

Does the LEA use weighting formula(e) and/or rubric(s) to guide teacher evaluators? No

Does the LEA publicly report teacher evaluation data by school? No

LEA Teacher Evaluations Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Rated</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Not Rated</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Employed</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEA Teacher Evaluations Detail:
<table>
  <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>
  <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>Satisfactory</td>
    <td>Satisfactory</td>
    <td>Satisfactory</td>
    <td>Satisfactory</td>
  </tr>
  <tr>
    <td>Luzerne IU 18</td>
    <td>175</td>
    <td>0 0 %</td>
    <td>2 1.1 %</td>
    <td>0 0 %</td>
    <td>0 0 %</td>
    <td>0 0 %</td>
    <td>173 98.9 %</td>
  </tr>
  <tr>
    <td>Totals</td>
    <td>175</td>
    <td>0 0 %</td>
    <td>2 1.1 %</td>
    <td>0 0 %</td>
    <td>0 0 %</td>
    <td>0 0 %</td>
    <td>173 98.9 %</td>
  </tr>
</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

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

The LIU Administrative Staff Performance Evaluation is comprised of three parts: I. Job Performance; II. Equity within Classification and III. Merit. Job Performance is rated in one of four rankings based upon the annual review of their performance on three professional goals the administrator submits to the Executive Office prior to the start of the school year. Equity within Classification is purely a mathematical computation whereby the highest salaried administrator within a given classification receives the lowest percentage while the lowest administrative salaried administrator receives the highest. There are three additional percentages; median high; median and median low which administrators maybe placed based upon their respective salary. The final and most important part of the evaluation is the Merit. A Rubric for Merit is used to rank what the respective administrator has done above and beyond the scope of their responsibilities to enhance both their respective assignment and the organization as a whole. There are five categories within this rubric and each warrants a given percentage. Administrators are required to submit artifacts compiled throughout the school year to support their meritorious service. The ranking chosen is based upon a review of these artifacts and a discussion as to how they relate to the rubric. All three components of the evaluation are completed with a series of meetings at the end of the school year. At the final meeting the administrator is given their respective evaluation and professional goals are reviewed for the upcoming school year. The evaluation process then repeats itself.

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

a. Principal Development? Yes
   Results are used to evaluate both organizational and personal professional goals to assess progress and collaboratively design future organizational and personal goals.

b. Principal Compensation? Yes
   There is a merit based component to the evaluation system that allows administrators to earn an increased percentage to their compensation based on their level of success in achieving their goals. Evidence of achievement must be produced during their evaluation.

c. Principal Promotions? No

d. Principal Retention and Removal? No

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)? 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

The LIU Administrative Staff Performance Evaluation is comprised of three parts: I. Job Performance; II. Equity within Classification and III. Merit. Job Performance is rated in one of four rankings based upon the annual review of their performance on three professional goals the administrator submits to the Executive Office prior to the start of the school year. Equity within Classification is purely a mathematical computation whereby the highest salaried administrator within a given classification receives the lowest percentage while the lowest administrative salaried administrator receives the highest. There are three additional percentages: median high; median and median low in which administrators maybe placed based upon their respective salary. The final and most important part of the evaluation is the Merit. A Rubric for Merit is used to rank what the respective administrator has done above and beyond the scope of their responsibilities to enhance both their respective assignment and the organization as a whole. There are five categories within this rubric and each warrants a given percentage. Administrators are required to submit artifacts compiled throughout the school year to support their meritorious service. The ranking chosen is based upon a review of these artifacts and a discussion as to how they relate to the rubric. All three components of the evaluation are completed with a series of meetings at the end of the school year. At the final meeting the administrator is given their respective evaluation and professional goals are reviewed for the upcoming school year. The evaluation process then repeats itself.

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 a 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>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Not Rated</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Employed</td>
<td>1</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>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</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 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.