

Pennsylvania
Department of Education
Teacher and Principal Evaluation Information
Individual LEA Data
For the 2012-13 Rating Period

GENERAL INFORMATION

LEA Name:

Beaver Area Academic CS

AUN Number:

127040001

Address:

Gypsy Glen Rd Beaver, PA 15009

Name Superintendent or Chief School Administrator:

Ms. Carrie Rowe

For Information Contact:

Ms. Carrie Rowe

Email:

rowec@basd.k12.pa.us

Phone:

724-774-4021

TEACHER INFORMATION

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

In our Charter School teacher evaluation is differentiated according to service level. Level I teachers are evaluated twice yearly (January and June) using the PDE 426 form. This type of summative evaluation was based on the work of Carol Ann Tomlinson, who has written extensively about evaluation practices. The evaluation is qualitative in nature, calling for extended narrative responses, and focuses on four key categories: I. Planning and Preparation, II. Classroom Environment, III. Instructional Delivery, and IV. Professionalism. In addition to an extended narrative response for each of the four above named categories, sources of data are also noted. These sources vary based on category, but include evidence that justifies the rating, such as: student records, artifacts from professional development, student work, lesson/unit plans, and assessment materials (not an exhaustive list). Evaluators then use the four narrative pieces to write a single justification for evaluation, commendations, and areas for professional development focus (or professional goals). The teacher is also assigned an overall rating of "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory." Level I teachers are evaluated in this way until they earn level two certification or are no longer employed with the district. If a Level I teacher's performance is deemed "unsatisfactory" in light of the evidence provided during supervision and conferences, then an improvement plan is drafted to help the teacher achieve and display greater competency. The improvement plan focuses on the areas in the evaluation where problems have been noted. The plan indicates what action the teacher is required to take, what support the administration will provide, timelines, and teacher input. . Participation in and successful completion of improvement plans are used to inform decisions about continued employment. Level II teachers are evaluated annually (June) using the PDE 5501 form. This form resembles the PDE 426 and PDE 428 forms in an abbreviated format. This form uses four categories (I. Personality, II. Preparation, III. Technique, IV. Pupil Reaction) and asks the evaluator to score teachers in each category out of 20 points; the aggregate numerical value

earned by a teacher does not exceed 80 points when adding the four categories. If a teacher is given less than 20 points in one of the four categories, then an addendum is attached to the evaluation to substantiate the numerical score with anecdotal records using the descriptors as guidelines. While the categories generally factor equally into the overall rating, a gross deficiency in a single category may be sufficiently serious to warrant a total rating of unsatisfactory. In the case of an unsatisfactory rating, a teacher is issued an improvement plan as detailed above. Failure to comply with or successfully complete the improvement plan or issuance of two consecutive unsatisfactory ratings is sufficient evidence to support dismissal on the grounds of incompetency. Teachers may be evaluated by the CAO or her designee. Training for the evaluators is given during the certification process and is informed by local, state, and national professional development experiences.

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

a. Teacher Development? Yes

The performance evaluations of teachers plays a part in the professional development plans for the following school year. Administrators keep up-to-date on best practices and trends in public education and teacher year-end goals often reflect said best practices. Where teachers' goals indicate new areas of concern, professional development will be developed to address said needs.

b. Teacher Compensation? No

c. Teacher Promotions? Yes

A teacher with an unsatisfactory rating or one who fails to comply with the requirements outlined in an improvement plan may be dismissed on the grounds of incompetency. Teachers with satisfactory ratings are permitted to continue up the district's "career ladder." All teachers with satisfactory ratings progress on the district's "career ladder" at the same rate; the district does not use merit pay to advance some teachers with satisfactory ratings more quickly than others with the same rating.

d. Teacher Retention and Removal? Yes

A teacher with an unsatisfactory rating or one who fails to comply with the requirements outlined in an improvement plan may have their contract terminated for incompetency. Teachers with satisfactory ratings are permitted to continue their employment.

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. 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

Number Not Rated	0
Total Number Employed	6

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					Satisfactory
Beaver Area Academic CS	6	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	6 100%
Totals	6	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	6 100%

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:

The Chief School Administrator, or her designee, annually evaluates the performance of principals in the district using a form whose research is based on the Interstate School Leadership Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards. These five broad categories and their corresponding ISLLC standards are listed below:1.) Leadership – Standard: Facilitates the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.2.) School Culture – Standard: Advocates, nurtures, and sustains a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional development.3.) Building Management & Operations – Standard: Ensures management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.4.) School-Community Relations – Standard: Collaborates with families and community members, responds to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizes community resources.5.) District-Community Relations – Standard: Understands, responds to, and influences the larger political, social, economic legal, and cultural context.A principal may earn one of the following three ratings in each above named category: Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, or Needs Improvement. At the end of each school year, the Chief School Administrator or her designee meets with the principal to discuss her impression of the principal's performance throughout the school year, to detail objective data/observations for each broad category, to review a summative evaluation report, and to determine professional goals and levels of support for the following school year. The summative evaluation report also includes an overall rating, which takes into account the ratings in each of the five categories named above. A qualitative approach to the overall rating is used in lieu of a strict rubric or weighting scale. The qualitative approach permits the evaluator to assume multiple constructions or interpretations of performance, which can change based on changes in context.A gross deficiency in a single category or significant deficiencies in several categories may be sufficiently serious to warrant a total rating of "Needs Improvement." In the case of an unsatisfactory rating, a principal is issued an improvement plan. Failure to comply with or successfully complete the improvement plan or issuance of two consecutive unsatisfactory ratings is sufficient evidence to support dismissal on the grounds of incompetency.

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

a. Principal Development? Yes

The performance evaluations of a principal plays a part in the administrator's professional development plans for the following school year. The administrator is expected to remain up-to-date on best practices and trends in public education and principal year-end goals often reflect said best practices. Where a principals' goals indicate new areas of concern, professional development will be developed to address said needs.

b. Principal Compensation? Yes

Principal performance evaluations are used to inform compensation decisions for the principal. A principal with an unsatisfactory evaluation rating may not receive a salary increase previously anticipated.

c. Principal Promotions? No

d. Principal Retention and Removal? Yes

The principal may be dismissed for incompetence based on annual employment evaluations. Principals may be considered for promotions, as they become available, where their education, certification, and annual performance evaluations permit.

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. 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 Standardized Principal Evaluation System? Yes

LEA Principal Evaluations Summary:

Number Rated	1
Number Not Rated	<u>0</u>
Total Number Employed	<u><u>1</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	Satisfactory				Satisfactory
Totals	*	* %	* %	* %	* %	* %	* %	* %

Note: - 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