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

The Chester County Intermediate unit established the Professional Staff Evaluation based on Danielson’s (1996) Framework for Teaching. Teachers are rated on each component of the 4 Domains in the framework, mirrored in the PDE forms 428, 427 and 428: Planning and Preparation, Learning Environment, Instruction and Professional Responsibilities. The rubric for each component denotes a descriptor for Unsatisfactory, Basic, Proficient and Distinguished, describing the teacher’s level of accomplishment. A performance summary is determined to be Unsatisfactory – one or more domains evaluated as unsatisfactory; Satisfactory; or, Commendable – two or more domains evaluated as commendable, with no unsatisfactory or basic components and no unsatisfactory domains. Observations, completed documents and participation in professional activities are a few of the formative tools utilized by supervisors to conduct evaluations. Level I certified teachers are formally observed semi-annually and informally observed monthly by their supervisors. Level II certified teachers complete a Self-Directed Supervisory Practice Plan for three consecutive years, followed by intensive, clinical observations in the fourth year. This cycle continues during their employment with the Intermediate Unit. Teachers, in collaboration with their supervisors, review the annual evaluation to determine areas for improvement or continued growth. The plan involves setting a professional growth goal and determining a process for achieving the goal. Teachers are required to define evaluative benchmarks and products to complete the plan. Any Level I certified teacher who receives two 2 unsatisfactory ratings within one school year and any Level II certified teacher who receive an unsatisfactory annual evaluation does not receive a salary increase for the subsequent year. Any teacher who receives two consecutive unsatisfactory evaluations is terminated from employment with CCIU. Supervisors engage in training activities, at least annually to review the rubrics and increase consistency in evaluation practices.
Does the LEA use the results of the teacher evaluation system described above in decisions regarding:

a. Teacher Development? Yes
   
   In addition to the learning activities in the PDE approved Professional Development Plan, Professional Employees complete a Self-Directed Supervisory Practice Plan for three consecutive years, followed by intensive, clinical observations in the fourth year. The cycle continues during their employment with the Intermediate Unit. Teachers, in collaboration with their supervisors, review the evaluation to determine areas for improvement or continued growth. The plan involves setting a professional growth goal and determining a process for achieving the goal. Teachers are required to define evaluative benchmarks and products to complete the plan.

b. Teacher Compensation? Yes
   
   Any Level I certified teacher who receives two 2 unsatisfactory ratings within one school year and any Level II certified teacher who receives an unsatisfactory annual evaluation does not receive a salary increase for the subsequent year.

c. Teacher Promotions? Yes
   
   Teachers who perform at the Commandable level are encouraged to apply for open supervisory or administrative positions if they have the proper certification.

d. Teacher Retention and Removal? Yes
   
   Any teacher who receives two consecutive unsatisfactory evaluations is terminated from employment with CCIU.

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. Yes

   The Chester County Intermediate unit established the Professional Staff Evaluation based on Danielson’s (1996) Framework for Teaching. Teachers are rated on each component of the 4 Domains in the framework: Planning and Preparation, Learning Environment, Instruction and Professional Responsibilities. The rubric for each component denotes a descriptor of Unsatisfactory, Basic, Proficient or Distinguished, describing the teacher’s level of accomplishment. A performance summary is determined to be Unsatisfactory – one or more domains evaluated as unsatisfactory; Satisfactory; or, Commandable – two or more domains evaluated as commendable, with no unsatisfactory or basic components and no unsatisfactory domains.

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 353
Number Not Rated 0
Total Number Employed 353

LEA Teacher Evaluations 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>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester County IU 24</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>2 0.6 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>172 48.7 %</td>
<td>179 50.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>2 0.6 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>172 48.7 %</td>
<td>179 50.7 %</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 Chester County Intermediate Unit Administrator Evaluation is the product of a comprehensive study of several models of evaluation. The criteria selected for the CCIIU tool were carefully matched to the organization’s mission to provide quality, innovative and cost-effective programs to enhance the lives of students and members of our communities. The evaluation is comprised of four core job responsibilities and seven areas of performance. The principal and his/her supervisor select the specific job responsibilities to include on the evaluation form based on individual and building needs. These account for thirty-five per cent of the final score. Performance areas, sixty-five per cent of the final score, include Communication, Supervision, Problem-Solving, Accountability and Responsibility, Collaboration and Teamwork, Continuing Professional Development and Initiative. A descriptive rubric accompanies each performance area to clarify expectations. The summative evaluation score is converted to Unsatisfactory, Needs Improvement, Meets Expectations, Exceeds Expectations or Distinguished. The Administrator Evaluation is used to determine merit based bonuses and to identify individuals for career advancement.

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

a. Principal Development?
   Yes
   Each principal's evaluation is reviewed to determine areas for improvement or professional growth. Based on this review, annual goals are determined for the subsequent year in collaboration with the principal. Goals are performance based, observable and measurable within an agreed upon timeline.

b. Principal Compensation?
   Yes
The Chester County IU has a merit system for annual bonuses based on the evaluation score. The average of mid and final evaluation scores are added to scores derived from successful completion of goals. This sum is used to determine bonus increases.

c. Principal Promotions? Yes

Principals who demonstrate consistent and consecutive high evaluation scores are encouraged to apply for advanced positions within the IU organization.

d. Principal Retention and Removal? Yes

The CCIU is committed to ensuring the success of every employee. Principals who receive a Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory are provided with support through professional development and mentoring. A second Unsatisfactory rating results in termination.

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

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 CCIU uses a weighted system to evaluate administrators. The seven components of Performance Assessment are equally weighted and comprise sixty-five per cent of the final score. The four areas of job responsibility comprise thirty-five per cent of the final score.

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rated</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Rated</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number</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>Satisfactory</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Satisfactory</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*