Pennsylvania
Department of Education
Teacher and Principal Evaluation Information
Individual LEA Data
For the 2013-14 Rating Period

GENERAL INFORMATION

Name of LEQ or Charter School:
Apollo-Ridge SD

AUN Number:
128030603

Address of LEA or Charter School:
PO Box 219  Spring Church, PA 15686

Name Superintendent or Chief School Administrator:
Dr. Matthew Curci

For Information Contact:
Dr. Matthew Curci

Email:
curcim@apolloridge.com

Phone:
724-478-6000 - 6012

TEACHER INFORMATION

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?
   Teacher compensation is based on the Collective Bargaining Agreement schedule, with salary steps based on years of service, negotiated between the District and the Apollo-Ridge Education Association.

c. Teacher Advancement/Promotions?
d. Teacher Retention and Removal?

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:
Number Rated 89
Number Not Rated 0
Total Number Employed 89

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>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</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>Apollo-Ridge Elem Sch</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>37 94.9%</td>
<td>2 5.1%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>39 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Describe the LEA's system used to evaluate the performance of your Principals:

The Apollo-Ridge School District uses a self-developed Administrative Evaluation Form that evaluates principals according to performance in several domains. These domains include Relationship with Superintendent and Administration, Educational Leadership, Business and Finance, Staff and Personnel Relationships, Student Responsibilities, Community Relationships, Personal Qualities, and Goals. This multiple domain approach recognizes the current research and literature establishing that principals must employ a variety of strengths and skills in order to serve as effective leaders in their buildings, and that the current climate in education requires that principals are able to function both as educational leaders and building managers. In each of the established categories and on a final overall rating, principals are rated ranging from "Unsatisfactory" to "Exceeds Expectations." Principals perform a self-evaluation, then meet with the Superintendent to discuss how they were formally evaluated. Principals who are rated as "Needs Improvement" or "Unsatisfactory" are provided specific feedback and planning with regard to how their performance must improve, and provided opportunities for professional development for support. If at the end of the next evaluation period the principal has not improved, dismissal proceedings may follow. As a second component to the evaluation process, principals submit three goals to the Superintendent and Board of Education prior to the start of the upcoming school year. One goal has a district-wide focus, the second a building level focus, and the third a personal focus for growth as a professional. The principals provide a monthly update regarding goal progress, and at the end of the school year submit a portfolio documenting achievement of the goals. A committee of board members evaluate performance with regard to each goal, providing an additional merit-based component to the principal's evaluation.

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?

b. Student Growth Data?

How often does the LEA formally evaluate:

a. New Principals (Less than 3 Years)?

b. Experienced Principals (More than 3 Years)?
Does the LEA use weighting formula(e) and/or rubric(s) to guide principal evaluators?

Yes

The rubric is designed to assess the principal in a variety of domains, all of which are part of the varied aspects of the principal role. These domains include the following aspects of fulfilling the role of instructional leader and building manager: Relationship with Superintendent and Administration, Educational Leadership, Business and Finance, Staff and Personnel Relationships, Student Responsibilities, Community Relationships, Personal Qualities, and Goals. An overall rating is also given.

Does your LEA have at least one Principal position?  Yes

Does your LEA have at Standarized Principal Evaluation System?  Yes

LEA Principal Evaluations Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number Rated</th>
<th>Number Not Rated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Employed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEA Principal Evaluation Detail:

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