## PLUM BOROUG표

 SCHOOL DISTRICT
## Educator Effectiveness

Act 82 of 2012

## Teacher Effectiveness System in Act 82 of 2012

Observation/Evidence
Effective 2013-2014 SY
Danielson Framework Domains

1. Planning and Preparation
2. Classroom Environment
3. Instruction
4. Professional Responsibilities

School Building Data
Effective 2013-2014 SY
Indicators of Academic Achievement
Indicators of Closing the Achievement Gap, All Students Indicators of Closing the Achievement Gap, Subgroups Academic Growth PVAAS
Other Academic Indicators
Credit for Advanced Achievement


Fall 2013

Teacher Specific Data Effective 2016-2017 SY
PVAAS / Growth 3 Year Rolling Average 1. 2013-2014 SY
2. 2014-2015 SY
3. 2015-2016 SY

Other data as provided in Act 82

Elective Data/SLOs Optional 2013-2014 SY Effective 2014-2015 SY
District Designed Measures and Examinations Nationally Recognized Standardized Tests Industry Certification Examinations
Student Projects Pursuant to Local Requirements Student Portfolios Pursuant to Local Requirements

## Teacher Effectiveness System in Act 82 of 2012

Observation/Evidence<br>Effective 2013-2014 SY<br>Danielson Framework Domains<br>1. Planning and Preparation<br>2. Classroom Environment<br>3. Instruction<br>4. Professional Responsibilities



## Teacher Effectiveness System in Act 82 of 2012

```
School Building Data
Indicators of Academic Achievement
Indicators of Closing the Achievement Gap, All Students
Indicators of Closing the Achievement Gap, Subgroups
Academic Growth PVAAS
Other Academic Indicators
Credit for Advanced Achievemer
```

School Building
Data, 15\%
Teacher Specific
Data, 15\%
Evidence,
50\%
Elective
Data,
20\%

## Teacher Effectiveness System in Act 872012

## School Building Data

Indicators of Academ. He Penms yvania Schol
Indicators of a fined via the so when applial
Inclic. the academic score determine from the following,

A Atradacresala

- Sat Peformance
- PASTPration mance
- Plan Paritiontion

PVAAS Statewide Team for PDE

## Pennsylvania School Performance Profile: At a Glance

The building level data being used in Pennsylvania per Act 82 of 2012 is the School Performance Profile. The building data score comprises $15 \%$ of each teacher and principal's evaluation and will be a part of the educator effectiveness system starting with the 2013-2014 school year. The score for a school is based upon indicators that define a high performing school. Many data elements contribute to the SPP score. Data elements will only be included in a score if they are attributable to that building. Please note that the $N$ is 11 for all elements.

## Indicators of Academic Achievement -- 40\% of Total Score (44\% for Comprehensive CTCs)

- Percent Proficient or Advanced on PSSA

Mathematics, Reading, Science, and Writing tests and Keystone Exams Algebra I, Biology, and Literature

- Percent Competent or Advanced on Industry

Standards-Based Competency Assessments NOCTI and/or NIMS

- Percent Proficient or Advanced on 3rd Grade Reading PSSA
- SAT/ACT college ready benchmark
$\rightarrow$ Percentage calculation, at a high school the $11^{\text {th }}$ grade cohort will be used. Feeder schools that do not have tested grades use the current attributions.
$\rightarrow$ Percentage calculation, comprehensive CTCs and secondary schools (schools with a grade 11).
$\rightarrow$ Percentage calculation, only applies to buildings that have a $3^{\text {rd }}$ grade.
$\rightarrow$ Scaled calculation based on the percent of the $12^{\text {th }}$ grade cohort that obtains at least a 1550 on the SAT or 22 on ACT. The benchmark is $40 \%$. Note: Percent of cohort, not takers.

Indicators of Closing the Achievement Gap -- 10\% of Total Score (6\% for Comprehensive CTCs)
Percent of gap closure met in PSSA Math, Reading, Science, and Writing / Keystone Exams Algebra I, Biology, and Literature

| - All Students (5\%) (CTCs 3\%) | $\rightarrow$Expectation is that $1 / 2$ gap between performance in base year (2013) and $100 \%$ is <br> closed over 6 years |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| - Historically Underperforming <br> Students (5\%)(CTCs 3\%) | $\rightarrow$Same as 'all student' calculation but includes an unduplicated count of students <br> that are identified with any of the following: ED, ELL, and/or IEP |

Indicators of Academic Growth / PVAAS -- 40\% of Total Score
Split across PSSA Math, Reading, Science, and Writing / Keystone Exams Algebra I, Biology, and Literature

- The PVAAS Average Growth $\quad \rightarrow \begin{aligned} & \text { Scaled calculation, lowest a school can get is } 1 / 2 \text { of the possible points for any } \\ & \text { subject area }\end{aligned}$ Index subject area

Other Academic Indicators $\mathbf{- - 1 0 \%}$ of Total Score

- Cohort graduation rate
- Promotion rate
- Attendance rate
- Advanced Placement,

International Baccalaureate, or
College Credit

- PSAT/PLAN participation
$\rightarrow$ Percentage based on previous year's data. Not applicable for schools without a graduating class
$\rightarrow$ Percentage based on previous year's data. Used if graduation rate does not apply.
$\rightarrow$ Percentage based on previous year's data. Applies to all schools.
$\rightarrow$ Scaled calculation based on course offerings.
$\rightarrow$ Scaled calculation based on the percent of the $12^{\text {th }}$ grade cohort that took the Scaled calculation based on the percent of the $12^{\text {th }}$ grade cohort that took the
PSAT/PLAN at some point. The benchmark is $60 \%$. Note: Percent of cohort, not takers.
Extra Credit for Advanced Achievement --Maximum of 7 points added to total
- Percent Advanced on (PSSA/ KE) Mathematics,

Reading, Science, and Writing/ Algebra I, Biology, and Literature
$\rightarrow$ Percentage (up to 4 points)

- Percent Advanced on Industry Standards-Based Competency Assessments NOCTI and/or NIMS
- Percent scoring 3 or higher on Advanced Placement Exams at some point
$\rightarrow$ Percentage (up to 1 point)
$\rightarrow$ An unduplicated percentage of the total $12^{\text {th }}$ grade cohort.

8/19/2013 AIU/Bonnie Dyer
(up to 2 points)
OUU?

## Teacher Effectiveness System in Act 82 of 2012

## TEACHER SPECIFIC DATA



Teacher Specific Data
Gffective 2016-2017 SY
PVAAS / Growth 3 Year Rolling Average

1. 2013-2014 SY
2. 2014-2015 SY
Other data as provided in Act 82
O2015-2016 SY PVAAS Statewide Team for PDE

## Teacher Effectiveness System in Act 82 of 2012

## TEACHER SPECIFIC <br> D $\triangle 5$

## Teacher Effectiveness System in Act 82 of 2012



## Teacher Effectiveness System in Act 82 of 2012



| Commonwealth of Pennsylvania | DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION | 333 Market St., Harrisburg, PA 17126-0333 |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |

## CLASSROOM TEACHER RATING FORM

| Last Name |  | First |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District/LEA | 0 | School |  | 0 |
| Rating Date | 1/0/00 | Evaluation (Check One) |  |  |
| (a) Peacmer unservanon anuriactee |  |  |  |  |
| Domain | Title | (A) Factor (B) | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Earned Points } \\ (\mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{B}) \end{array}$ | Max <br> Points |
| I. | Planning \& Preparation | 0 20\% | 0.00 | 0.60 |
| II. | Classroom Environment | 0 30\% | 0.00 | 0.90 |
| III. | Instruction | 0 30\% | 0.00 | 0.90 |
| IV. | Professional <br> Responsibilities | 0 $20 \%$ | 0.00 | 0.60 |
| (1) Teacher Observation \& Practice Rating |  |  | 0.00 | 3.00 |

(B) Student Performance - Building Level Data, Teacher Specific Data, and Elective Data

| Building Level Score (0-107) | NA |
| :--- | :---: |
| (2) Building Level Score Converted to 3 Point Rating | 0.00 |


| (3) Teacher Specific Rating | 0.00 |
| :--- | :--- |
| (4) Elective Rating | 0.00 |



I certify that the above-named employee for the period beginning

$$
\frac{1 / 0 / 00}{(\text { month } / \text { day } / \text { year })} \text { and ending } \frac{1 / 0 / 00}{(\text { month/day/year) }} \text { ha }
$$

$\square$ Needs Improvement $\quad \mathbf{X}$ Failing
$\square$ Distinguished $\square$ Proficient
resulting in a final rating of:

## $\square$ Satisfactory $\square$ Unsatisfactory

A performance rating of Distinguished, Proficient or Needs Improvement shall be considered satisfactory, except that the second Needs Improvement rating issued by the same employer within 10 years of the first final rating of Need

$\overline{\text { Date }} \overline{\text { Designated Rater / Position: } \quad \overline{\text { Date }} \quad \text { Chief School Administrator }}$

I acknowledge that I have read the report and that I have been given an opportunity to discuss it with the rater.
My signature does not necessarily mean that I agree with the performance evaluation.

1. Building Level Score: Convert SPP to a 0-3 Scale

- $90-107=2.50-3$
- $70-89.9=1.50-2.49$
- $60-69.9=.50-1.49$
- 0-59.9 = 0-. 49

2. Teacher Specific Rating: Student performance on assessments; Value Added data;
3. Elective Rating: SLO's; District designed measures, student portfolios, etc.

## Section 2

| (B) Student Performance - Building Level Data, Teacher Specific Data, and Elective Data |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Building Level Score (0-107) |  |  | NA |  |
| (2) Building Level Score Converted to 3 Point Rating |  |  | 0.00 |  |
| (C) Final Teacher Effectiveness Rating - All Measures |  |  |  |  |
| Measure | Rating (C) | Factor <br> (D) | (tarier | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Max } \\ \text { Points } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| (1) Teacher Observation \& Practice Rating | 0.00 | 50\% | 0.00 | 1.50 |
| (2) Building Level Rating | 0.00 | 15\% | 0.00 | 0.45 |
| (3) Teacher Specific Rating | 0.00 | 15\% | 0.00 | 0.45 |
| (4) Elective Rating | 0.00 | 20\% | 0.00 | 0.60 |
|  | Total | ned Points | 0.00 | 3.00 |


| (3) Teacher Specific Rating | 0.00 |
| :--- | :---: |
| (4) Elective Rating | 0.00 |


| Conversion to Performance Rating |  |
| :---: | :---: |$|$| Total Earned Points | Rating |
| :---: | :---: |
| $0.00-0.49$ | Failing |
| $0.50-1.49$ | Needs <br> Improvement |
| $1.50-2.49$ | Proficient |
| $2.50-3.00$ | Distinguished |
| Performance Rating | Failing |

$\square$ Rating: Professional Employee, OR
I certify that the above-named employee for the period beginning
$\square_{\text {resulting in a final rating of: }}^{\square} \quad \square$ Proficient
resulting in a final rating of:

## $\square$ Satisfactory $\square$ Unsatisfactory

A performance rating of Distinguished, Proficient or Needs Improvement shall be considered satisfactory, except that the second Needs Improvement rating issued by the same employer within 10 years of the first final rating of Needs
A performance rating of Distinguished, Proficient or Needs Improvement shall be considered satisfactory, except that the second Needs Improvement ratin
Improvement where the employece is in the same certififcation shall be considered unsatisfactory. A rating of failing shall be considered unsatisfactory.
$\overline{\text { Date }} \quad \overline{\text { Designated Rater / Position: }}$

I acknowledge that I have read the report and that I have been given an opportunity to discuss it with the rater.
My signature does not necessarily mean that I agree with the performance evaluation.

CLASSROOM TEACHER RATING FORM

| Last Name |  |  | First |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District/LEA | 0 |  | School 0 |  |  |
| Rating Date | 1/0/00 |  | Evaluation (Check One) |  |  |
| (A) Teacher Observation and Practice |  |  |  |  |  |
| Domain | Title | $\begin{gathered} \text { *Rating* } \\ \text { (A) } \end{gathered}$ | Factor (B) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Earned Points } \\ \left(\begin{array}{l} \text { A x B } \end{array}\right) \end{gathered}$ | Max <br> Points |
| I. | Planning \& Preparation | 0 | 20\% | 0.00 | 0.60 |
| II. | Classroom Environment | 0 | 30\% | 0.00 | 0.90 |
| III. | Instruction | 0 | 30\% | 0.00 | 0.90 |
| IV. | Responsibilities | 0 | 20\% | 0.00 | 0.60 |
| (1) Teacher Observation \& Practice Rating |  |  |  | ${ }^{0.00}$ | 3.00 |


$\square$ Rating: Professional Employee,
I certify that the above-named employee for the period beginning$\square$ Distinguished $\square$ Proficient
resulting in a final rating of
$\square$ Satisfactory $\quad \square$ Unsatisfactory
A performance rating of Distinguished, Proficient or Needs Improvement shall be considered satisfactory, except that the second Needs Improvement rating issued by the same employer within 10 years of the first final rating of Needs
Improvement where the employee is in the same certification shall be considered unsaistactory. A rating of Failing shall be considered unsatisfactory.

Designated Rater / Position:

I acknowledge that I have read the report and that I have been given an opportunity to discuss it with the rater.
My signature does not necessarily mean that I agree with the performance evaluation.

CLASSROOM TEACHER RATING FORM


| (B) Student Performance - Building Level Data, Teacher Specific Data, and Elective Data |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Building Level Score (0-107) | NA |
| (2) Building Level Score Converted to 3 Point Rating | 0.00 |


| (3) Teacher Specific Rating | 0.00 |
| :--- | :--- |
| (4) Elective Rating | 0.00 |

(C) Final Teacher Effectiveness Rating - All Measures

| Measure | Rating (C) | Factor <br> (D) | carnexu <br> Points | Max <br> Points |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (1) Teacher Observation \& Practice Rating | 0.00 | $50 \%$ | 0.00 | 1.50 |
| (2) Building Level Rating | 0.00 | $15 \%$ | 0.00 | 0.45 |
| (3) Teacher Specific Rating | 0.00 | $15 \%$ | 0.00 | 0.45 |
| (4) Elective Rating | 0.00 | $20 \%$ | 0 | 0.6 |
|  |  | 0.00 | 3.00 |  |

$\square$ Rating: Professional Employee,
OR
$\square$ Rating: Temporary Professional


I certify that the above-named employee for the period beginning $\qquad$ has received a performance rating of:
$\square$ Distinguished $\quad \square$ Proficient
resulting in a final rating of:
$\square$ Satisfactory $\quad \square$ Unsatisfactory
$\square$ Needs Improvement $\quad \square$ Failing
$\square$ Satisfactory $\quad \square$ Unsatisfactory
Improvement where the employee is in the same certification shall be considered unsatisfactory. A rating of Failing shall be considered unsatisfactory
Date

I acknowledge that I have read the report and that I have been given an opportunity to discuss it with the rater.
My signature does not necessarily mean that I agree with the performance evaluation.

PRINCIPAL PROCESS


# PSSA / Keystones <br> PVAAS 

## Graduation Rate

Attendance Rate
SAT
PSAT

## AP (extra credit only)

## **Converted to a three point scale

## Section 2 <br> Building Level <br> Data



## Section 3

Final "All
Measures"


## Observation and Building Level data complete

## Correlation and

 Elective Ratings

