Name of LEQ or Charter School: Schuylkill IU 29

AUN Number: 129000000

Address of LEA or Charter School:
17 Maple Avenue Mar Lin, PA 17951

Name Superintendent or Chief School Administrator:
Dr. Diane M. Niederriter

For Information Contact:
Dr. Diane M. Niederriter

Email:
niedd@iu29.org

Phone:
570-544-9131 - 1209

If the LEA does not use their teacher evaluation system as a basis for the following, their decision criteria is provided:

a. Professional Development?

b. Teacher Compensation?

c. Teacher Advancement/Promotions?
**Does the LEA use weighting formula(e) and/or rubric(s) to guide teacher evaluators? (Charter Schools Only)**

- **a.** Yes or No? If Yes, describe background and process.

**Does the LEA teacher evaluation system described above include the following as evaluation criterion: (Charter Schools Only)**

- **a.** Student Achievement Outcomes?
- **b.** Student Growth Data?

**How often does the LEA formally evaluate:**

- **a.** Temporary Professionals (Less than 3 Years)? Twice a year
- **b.** Professionals (More than 3 Years)? Annually

**LEA Teacher Evaluations Summary:**

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Rated</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Not Rated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Employed</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEA Teacher Evaluations Detail:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<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>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schuylkill IU 29</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1 1.5%</td>
<td>2 3%</td>
<td>47 70.1%</td>
<td>17 25.4%</td>
<td>1 1.5%</td>
<td>66 98.5%</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 Schuylkill Intermediate Unit Board of Directors charged the administration with developing a formal evaluation system for employees in the Compensation Plan beginning with the 2003-2004 fiscal year. There was never a comprehensive system of evaluating Compensation Plan employees in the Schuylkill Intermediate Unit prior to 2003-2004. The evaluation system that was put in place for 2003-2004 was, in some respects, a pilot project. That evaluation system continues. We believe that an evaluation system serves multiple purposes. Ultimately, an evaluation system serves as a means for the Schuylkill Intermediate Unit to improve and expand its base of knowledge. For the individual employee, your evaluation will confirm, in writing, the success that you have achieved. Your strengths will be acknowledged. Focus areas for growth will be identified. Finally, if an employee is not contributing in a manner consistent with his fellow employees, issues affecting that employee's performance will be addressed. End-of-year evaluations must be completed prior to the Board considering and approving annual salary increases and other benefits. An employee's evaluation will be a factor in determining his/her compensation (salary and benefits).

The evaluation system is divided into two sections. Section I addresses performance areas that are expected of all Compensation Plan employees. In other words, all employees in the Compensation plan will be evaluated based on Section I. Section II addresses areas that are targeted to an employee's respective position. For example, the Director of Educational Services, a micro-repair technician and a special education supervisor are evaluated using the exact form – Section I. However, there is a unique Section II form for the Director of Educational Services and a unique Section II form for a micro-repair technician and a unique Section II form for a special education supervisor. Because the evaluation system will serve as a useful tool in enhancing employee and organizational expertise, we encourage a collaborative relationship between evaluators and staff during the evaluation process.

If the LEA does not use their principal evaluation system as a basis for the following, their decision criteria is provided:

a. Principal Development?
   b. Principal Compensation?
   c. Principal Promotions?
   d. Principal Retention and Removal?

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)? 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 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 1
Number Not Rated 0
Total Number Employed 1

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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 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