

CHAPTER 19. EDUCATOR EFFECTIVENESS RATING TOOL

- Sec.
19.1. Classroom teacher effectiveness rating tool.
19.2. Principal/school leader effectiveness rating tool.
19.3. Nonteaching professional employee effectiveness rating tool.

Authority

The provisions of this Chapter 19 issued under section 1123(a), (b)(2), (e) and (j) of the Public School Code of 1949 (24 P. S. § 11-1123(a), (b)(2), (e) and (j)); and sections 201 and 506 of The Administrative Code of 1929 (71 P. S. §§ 61 and 186), unless otherwise noted.

Source

The provisions of this Chapter 19 adopted June 21, 2013, effective July 1, 2013, 43 Pa.B. 3337, unless otherwise noted.

§ 19.1. Classroom teacher effectiveness rating tool.

The rating tool functions as a framework for the evaluation and summative process for classroom teachers, and is designed for local education agencies providing early childhood, elementary or secondary education across this Commonwealth. The tool is comprised of the form and instructions. The following rating form shall be used to record the results of the data collection process.

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

CLASSROOM TEACHER RATING FORM

PDE 82-1 (4/13)

Last Name	First	Middle
District/LEA	School	
Rating Date: _____ Evaluation: (Check one) <input type="checkbox"/> Semi-annual <input type="checkbox"/> Annual		

(A) Teacher Observation and Practice

Domain	Title	*Rating* (A)	Factor (B)	Earned Points (A x B)	Max Points
I.	Planning & Preparation		20%		0.60
II.	Classroom Environment		30%		0.90
III.	Instruction		30%		0.90
IV.	Professional Responsibilities		20%		0.60
(1) Teacher Observation & Practice Rating					3.00

Rating	Value
Failing	0
Needs Improvement	1
Proficient	2
Distinguished	3

Domain Rating Assignment
0 to 3 Point Scale (A)

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

Building Level Score (0—107)	(3) Teacher Specific Rating
(2) Building Level Score Converted to 3 Point Rating	(4) Elective Rating

(C) Final Teacher Effectiveness Rating—All Measures

Measure	Rating (C)	Factor (D)	Earned Points (C x D)	Max Points
(1) Teacher Observation & Practice Rating		50%		1.50
(2) Building Level Rating		15%		0.45
(3) Teacher Specific Rating		15%		0.45
(4) Elective Rating		20%		0.60
<i>Total Earned Points</i>				3.00

<i>Conversion to Performance Rating</i>	
<i>Total Earned Points</i>	<i>Rating</i>
0.00-0.49	Failing
0.50-1.49	Needs Improvement
1.50-2.49	Proficient
2.50-3.00	Distinquished
<i>Performance Rating</i>	

Rating: Professional Employee, **OR** Rating: Temporary Professional Employee
 I certify that the above-named employee for the period beginning _____ and ending _____ has received a performance rating of:
 DISTINGUISHED PROFICIENT NEEDS IMPROVEMENT FAILING
 SATISFACTORY 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 unsatisfactory. A rating of Failing shall be considered unsatisfactory.

Date _____ Designated Rater / Position: _____ 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.

 Date _____ Signature of Employee _____

Descriptions of the four domains in Part (A) Teacher Observation and Practice are summarized in Table A.

Table A: Descriptions of Four Domains	
Domain	Description
I. Planning & Preparation 20%	Effective teachers plan and prepare for lessons using their extensive knowledge of the content area, the relationships among different strands within the content and between the subject and other disciplines, and their students' prior understanding of the subject. Instructional outcomes are clear, represent important learning in the subject, and are aligned to the curriculum. The instructional design includes learning activities that are well sequenced and require all students to think, problem solve, inquire, and defend conjectures and opinions. Effective teachers design formative assessments to monitor learning, and they provide the information needed to differentiate instruction. Measures of student learning align with the curriculum, enabling students to demonstrate their understanding in more than one way.
II. Classroom Environment 30%	Effective teachers organize their classrooms so that all students can learn. They maximize instructional time and foster respectful interactions with and among students, ensuring that students find the classroom a safe place to take intellectual risks. Students themselves make a substantive contribution to the effective functioning of the class by assisting with classroom procedures, ensuring effective use of physical space, and supporting the learning of classmates. Students and teachers work in ways that demonstrate their belief that hard work will result in higher levels of learning. Student behavior is consistently appropriate, and the teacher's handling of infractions is subtle, preventive, and respectful of students' dignity.

Table A: Descriptions of Four Domains

Domain	Description
III. Instruction 30%	In the classrooms of accomplished teachers, all students are highly engaged in learning. They make significant contributions to the success of the class through participation in high-level discussions and active involvement in their learning and the learning of others. Teacher explanations are clear and invite student intellectual engagement. The teacher's feedback is specific to learning goals and rubrics and offers concrete suggestions for improvement. As a result, students understand their progress in learning the content and can explain the learning goals and what they need to do in order to improve. Effective teachers recognize their responsibility for student learning and make adjustments, as needed, to ensure student success.
IV. Professional Responsibilities 20%	Accomplished teachers have high ethical standards and a deep sense of professionalism, focused on improving their own teaching and supporting the ongoing learning of colleagues. Their record-keeping systems are efficient and effective, and they communicate with families clearly, frequently, and with cultural sensitivity. Accomplished teachers assume leadership roles in both school and LEA projects, and they engage in a wide range of professional development activities to strengthen their practice. Reflection on their own teaching results in ideas for improvement that are shared across professional learning communities and contribute to improving the practice of all.

Copyright © Charlotte Danielson, 2013.

Table B summarizes teacher performance levels for each of the Domain Rating Assignments and for the ratings to be assigned for each domain in the Rating (A) column.

Table B: Four Levels of Performance in Four Domains				
Domain	Failing	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Distinguished
I. Planning & Preparation 20%	Teacher's plans reflect little understanding of the content, the students, and available resources. Instructional outcomes are either lacking or inappropriate; assessment methodologies are inadequate.	Teacher's plans reflect moderate understanding of the content, the students, and available resources. Some instructional outcomes are suitable to the students as a group, and the approaches to assessment are partially aligned with the goals.	Teacher's plans reflect solid understanding of the content, the students, and available resources. Instructional outcomes represent important learning suitable to most students. Most elements of the instructional design, including the assessments, are aligned to the goals.	Teacher's plans, based on extensive content knowledge and understanding of students, are designed to engage students in significant learning. All aspects of the teacher's plans—instructional outcomes, learning activities, materials, resources, and assessments—are in complete alignment and are adapted as needed for individual students.

Table B: Four Levels of Performance in Four Domains

Domain	Failing	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Distinguished
<p>II. Classroom Environment 30%</p>	<p>Classroom environment is characterized by chaos and conflict, with low expectations for learning, no clear standards of student conduct, poor use of physical space, and negative interactions between individuals.</p>	<p>Classroom environment functions somewhat effectively, with modest expectations for student learning and conduct, and classroom routines and use of space that partially support student learning. Students and the teacher rarely treat one another with disrespect.</p>	<p>Classroom environment functions smoothly, with little or no loss of instructional time. Expectations for student learning are high, and interactions among individuals are respectful. Standards for student conduct are clear, and the physical environment supports learning.</p>	<p>Students themselves make a substantive contribution to the smooth functioning of the classroom, with highly positive personal interactions, high expectations and student pride in work, seamless routines, clear standards of conduct, and a physical environment conducive to high-level learning.</p>

Table B: Four Levels of Performance in Four Domains

Domain	Failing	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Distinguished
III. Instruction 30%	Instruction is characterized by poor communication, low-level questions, little student engagement or participation in discussion, little or no use of assessment in learning, and rigid adherence to an instructional plan despite evidence that it should be revised or modified.	Only some students are engaged in learning because of only partially clear communication, uneven use of discussion strategies, and only some suitable instructional activities and materials. The teacher displays some use of assessment in instruction and is moderately flexible in adjusting the instructional plan and in response to students' interests and their success in learning.	All students are engaged in learning as a result of clear communication and successful use of questioning and discussion techniques. Activities and assignments are of high quality, and teacher and students make productive use of assessment. The teacher demonstrates flexibility in contributing to the success of the lesson and of each student.	All students are highly engaged in learning and make material contributions to the success of the class through their participation in discussions, active involvement in learning activities, and use of assessment information in their learning. The teacher persists in the search for approaches to meet the needs of every student.

Table B: Four Levels of Performance in Four Domains

Domain	Failing	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Distinguished
IV. Professional Responsibilities 20%	The teacher demonstrates low ethical standards and levels of professionalism, with poor recordkeeping systems and skill in reflection, little or no communication with families or colleagues, and avoidance of school and LEA responsibilities and participation in activities for professional growth.	The teacher demonstrates moderate ethical standards and levels of professionalism, with rudimentary recordkeeping systems and skills in reflection, modest communication with families or colleagues, and compliance with expectations regarding participation in school and LEA projects and activities for professional growth.	The teacher demonstrates high ethical standards and a genuine sense of professionalism by engaging in accurate reflection on instruction, maintaining accurate records, communicating frequently with families, actively participating in school and LEA events, and engaging in activities for professional development.	The teacher's ethical standards and sense of professionalism are highly developed, showing perceptive use of reflection, effective systems for recordkeeping and communication with families, leadership roles in both school and LEA projects, and extensive professional development activities. Where appropriate, students contribute to the systems for recordkeeping and family communication.

From *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teachers, 2nd Edition* (pp. 41–42), by Charlotte Danielson, Alexandria, VA: ASCD. © 2007 by ASCD. Adapted and reproduced with permission.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR RATING TOOL—STANDARDS OF USE

The rating form and related documents are available at the Department's website in electronic versions and Excel worksheet format for scoring and rating tabulation.

(I.) Definitions.

The following words and terms, when used in this section, shall have the following meanings, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise:

Assessment—The term shall mean the Pennsylvania System of School Assessment test, the Keystone Exam, an equivalent local assessment or another test established by the State Board of Education to meet the requirements of section 2603-B(d)(10)(i) and required under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (Public Law 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425) or its successor statute or required to achieve other standards established by the Department for the school or school district under 22 Pa. Code § 403.3 (relating to single accountability system).

Chief School Administrator—An individual who is employed as a school district superintendent, an executive director of an intermediate unit or a chief school administrator of an area vocational-technical school or career technology centers.

Classroom Teacher—A professional or temporary professional employee who provides direct instruction to students related to a specific subject or grade level and usually holds one of the following:

- Instructional I Certificate (see § 49.82),
- Instructional II Certificate (see § 49.83),
- Vocational Instructional I Certificate (see § 49.142), and
- Vocational Instructional II Certificate (see § 49.143).

Department—The Department of Education of the Commonwealth.

Distinguished—The employee's performance consistently reflects teaching at the highest level of practice.

District-designed measures and examinations, and locally developed school district rubrics—A measure of student performance created or selected by an LEA. The development or design of the measure shall be documented via a Student Learning Objective.

Education Specialist—A person who holds an educational specialist certificate issued by the Commonwealth, including a certificate endorsed in the area of elementary school counselor, secondary school counselor, social restoration, school nurse, home and school visitor, school psychologist, dental hygienist, instructional technology specialist or nutrition service specialist.

Employee—A person who is a professional employee or temporary professional employee.

Failing—The employee does not meet performance expectations required for the position.

Keystone Exam—An assessment developed or caused to be developed by the Department pursuant to 22 Pa. Code § 4.51 (relating to state assessment system).

LEA—A local education agency, including a public school district, area vocational-technical school, career technology center and intermediate unit, which is required to use a rating tool established pursuant to section 1123 of the Public School Code (24 P. S. § 11-1123).

Needs Improvement—The employee is functioning below proficient for performance expectations required for continued employment.

Nonteaching Professional Employee—A person who is an education specialist or a professional employee or temporary professional employee who provides services other than classroom instruction.

Performance Improvement Plan—A plan, designed by an LEA with input of the employee, that may include mentoring, coaching, recommendations for professional development and intensive supervision based on the results of the rating provided for under this chapter.

Principal—A building principal, an assistant principal, a vice principal or a director of vocational education.

Professional Employee—An individual who is certificated as a teacher, supervisor, principal, assistant principal, vice-principal, director of vocational education, dental hygienist, visiting teacher, home and school visitor, school counselor, child nutrition program specialist, school nurse, or school librarian.

Proficient—The employee’s performance consistently reflects practice at a professional level.

PSSA—The Pennsylvania System of School Assessment established in 22 Pa. Code § 4.51 (relating to state assessment system).

PVAAS—The Pennsylvania Value-Added Assessment System established in compliance with 22 Pa. Code § 403.3 (relating to single accountability system) and its data made available by the Department under Section 221 of the Public School Code (24 P. S. § 2-221).

SLO—The Student Learning Objective is a record of the development and application of student performance measures selected by an LEA. It documents the process used to determine a student performance measure and validate its assigned weight. This record will provide for quality assurance in rating a student performance measure on the zero-to-three-point rating scale.

Temporary Professional Employee—An individual who has been employed to perform for a limited time the duties of a newly created position or of a regular professional employee whose service has been terminated by death, resignation, suspension or removal.

(II.) General Provisions.

1. The rating of an employee shall be performed by or under the supervision of the chief school administrator, or, if so directed by the chief school administrator, by an assistant administrator, a supervisor or a principal, who has supervi-

sion over the work of the professional employee or temporary professional employee being rated, provided that no unsatisfactory rating shall be valid unless approved by the chief school administrator. (24 P. S. § 11-1123(h)(3))

2. The rating form shall be marked to indicate whether the employee is a professional employee or temporary professional employee.

3. A temporary professional employee must be notified as to the quality of service at least twice a year. (24 P. S. § 11-1108)

4. The rating form includes four measures or rated areas: Teacher Observation and Practice, Building Level, Teacher Specific, and Elective. Application of each measure is dependent on the availability of data. A rating in the range of zero to three based on the "0 to 3 Point Scale" must be given to each of the four rating areas.

5. Teacher Observation and Practice is divided into four domains: I. Planning and Preparation; II. Classroom Environment; III. Instruction; and IV. Professional Responsibilities. For each domain, an employee must be given a rating of zero, one, two or three which is based on classroom observation, practice models, evidence or documented artifacts.

6. The Building Level Score will be provided by the Department or its designee, and published annually on the Department's website.

7. The Teacher Specific Rating will include statewide assessments and value-added assessment system data if and when such data is available.

8. Data, ratings and weights assigned to measures for locally developed school district rubrics, progress in meeting the goals of student individualized education plans, and the Elective Rating must be recorded by a process provided by the Department.

9. Each of the four measures in Final Teacher Effectiveness Rating shall be rated on the zero-to-three-point scale. Each number in Rating (C) shall be multiplied by the Factor (D) and the sum of the Earned Points or Total Earned Points shall be converted into a Performance Rating using the table marked Conversion to Performance Rating.

10. An overall performance rating of Distinguished or Proficient shall be considered satisfactory.

11. An initial overall performance rating of Needs Improvement shall be considered satisfactory.

12. The second overall performance rating of Needs Improvement issued by the same employer within 10 years of the first rating of Needs Improvement where the employee is in the same certification shall be considered unsatisfactory.

13. For professional employees, two consecutive overall unsatisfactory ratings, which include classroom observations, and are not less than four months apart, shall be considered grounds for dismissal.

14. No temporary professional employee shall be dismissed unless rated unsatisfactory, and notification, in writing, of such unsatisfactory rating shall have been furnished the employee within 10 days following the date of such rating.

15. An employee who receives an overall performance rating of Needs Improvement or Failing must participate in a performance improvement plan. No employee will be rated Needs Improvement or Failing based solely on student test scores.

16. The rating form shall be marked to indicate the appropriate performance rating and whether the overall final rating is satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

17. The rating form must be signed by the chief school administrator or by a designated rater, who is an assistant administrator, supervisor or principal, has supervision over the work of the professional employee or temporary professional employee being rated, and is directed by the chief school administrator to perform the rating.

18. A final rating of unsatisfactory will not be valid unless signed by the chief school administrator.

19. A signed copy of the rating form shall be provided to the employee.

20. The rating tool is not intended to establish mandates or requirements for the formative process of supervising classroom teachers.

21. This rating form, section or chapter may not be construed to limit or constrain the authority of the chief school administrator of an LEA to initiate and take action on a personnel matter, including dismissal of a classroom teacher, based on information and data available at the time of the action.

(III.) Standards of Use for Teacher Observation and Practice.

Part (A) “Teacher Observation and Practice” in the rating form shall be completed using the following standards, calculations and procedures.

(a) *Teacher observation and practice domains.* The rating of a classroom teacher for effectiveness in teacher practice shall be based on classroom observation or other supervisory methods. Teacher practice shall comprise 50% of the Final Teacher Effectiveness Rating of the employee. The percentage factor for each domain is listed in Table C:

Table C: Four Domains	
<i>Domains</i>	<i>% of 50% allotment</i>
I. Planning and preparation.	20.0
II. Classroom environment.	30.0
III. Instruction.	30.0
IV. Professional responsibilities.	20.0

(b) *Summative process of evaluation.* LEAs shall utilize classroom practice models (e.g., Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*) that address the areas related to classroom observation and practice contained in section 1123(b)(1)(i) of the Public School Code (24 P.S. § 11-1123(b)(1)(i)) and are approved by the Department. The Department shall publish a list of approved practice models for assessing the four domains annually on the Department's website. A classroom teacher must be given a rating in each of the four domains. In determining a rating for an employee, an LEA may use any portion or combination of the practice models related to the domains. The four domains and classroom practice models establish a framework for the summative process of evaluating classroom teachers. The form and standards do not impose mandates on the supervisory and formative processes utilized by an LEA.

(c) *Evidentiary sources.* Teacher observation and practice evaluation results and ratings shall be based on evidence. Information, including dates and times, if applicable, on the source of the evidence shall be noted in the employee's record. As appropriate for the employee and their placement in a classroom and educational program, records may include, but not be limited to, any combination of the following items:

- (1) Notations of classroom observations, teacher/rater conferences or interviews, or informal observations or visits, including dates for observations, interviews and conferences.
- (2) Lesson unit plans (types, titles and numbers), materials, technology, teacher resource documents, visual technology, utilization of space, student assignment sheets, student work, instructional resources, student records, grade book, progress reports and report cards.
- (3) Interaction with students' family members.
- (4) Family, parent, school and community feedback.
- (5) Act 48 documentation.
- (6) Use of teaching and learning reflections.
- (7) Examination of sources of evidence provided by the teacher.

The documentation, evidence and findings of the rater shall provide a basis for the rating of the employee in the domains of teacher observation and practice.

(d) *Scoring.* An LEA must provide a rating score in each domain. The four teacher observation and practice domains shall be rated and scored on a zero-to-three-point scale. The ratings of Failing, Needs Improvement, Proficient and Distinguished are given numeric values as shown in Table D.

Table D: Domain Rating Assignment— 3 Point Scale	
<i>Performance Rating</i>	<i>Value</i>
Failing	0
Needs Improvement	1
Proficient	2
Distinguished	3

(e) *Ratings and weighted scoring.* The four domains of teacher observation and practice in Part (A) of the form are each assigned a percentage factor. Each domain shall be scored on the “0-to-3-point scale.” The individual score or rating for each domain is adjusted by the percentage factor attributed to that domain. The score of zero, one, two or three for each domain is calculated into points based on its percentage factor. The sum of the points for all domains will be the total Teacher Observation and Practice Rating. The calculation for each domain is set forth in Table E.

Table E: Teacher Observation and Practice Rating					
<i>Domain</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Rating (A)</i>	<i>Factor (B)</i>	<i>Earned Points (A x B)</i>	<i>Max Points</i>
I.	Planning & Preparation		20%		0.60
II.	Classroom Environment		30%		0.90
III.	Instruction		30%		0.90
IV.	Professional Responsibilities		20%		0.60
<i>Teacher Observation & Practice Points/Rating</i>					3.00

(f) *Administrative action based on available data.* Nothing in these standards of use for teacher observation and practice, this section or this chapter shall be construed to limit or constrain the authority of the chief school administrator of an LEA to initiate and take action on a personnel matter, including dismissal of a classroom teacher, based on information and data available at the time of the action.

(IV.) Standards of Use for Multiple Measures of Student Performance.

Student Performance is comprised of Building Level, Teacher Specific and Elective data. In total, these three measures are 50% of the Final Teacher Effec-

tiveness Rating for a classroom teacher. Each area has a prescribed percentage factor of the performance rating as described in Table F.

Table F: Multiple Measure Rating Areas and Percentage Factors of Performance Rating	
<i>Multiple Measure Rating Area</i>	<i>Factor</i>
Building Level Rating	15%
Teacher Specific Rating	15%
Elective Rating	20%

(a) *Building level data.*

(1) For the purposes of Paragraph (IV) relating to Standards of Use for Multiple Measures of Student Performance, the term “building” shall mean a school or configuration of grades that is assigned a unique four-digit identification number by the Department unless the context clearly indicates otherwise.

(2) This area comprises 15% of the Final Teacher Effectiveness Rating. Building level data shall include, but is not limited to, the following when data is available and applicable to a building where the educator provides service:

- (i) Student performance on assessments.
- (ii) Value-added assessment system data made available by the Department under section 221 of the Public School Code (24 P. S. § 2-221).
- (iii) Graduation rate as reported to the Department under section 222 of the Public School Code (24 P. S. § 2-222).
- (iv) Promotion rate.
- (v) Attendance rate as reported to the Department under section 2512 of the Public School Code (24 P. S. § 25-2512).
- (vi) Industry certification examinations data.
- (vii) Advanced placement course participation.
- (viii) Scholastic aptitude test and preliminary scholastic aptitude test data.

(3) The Department or its designee will provide the Building Level Score for each building within an LEA based on available data. LEA building data will be published annually on the Department’s website. An explanation of the calculation of the building level data and the weight given to each measure utilized for a specific building will be published annually on the Department’s website. The Department may add to the list of measures for building level data set forth in Paragraph (IV)(a)(2). Notice of these changes will be published on the Department’s website.

(4) Each LEA shall utilize the conversions in Table G below to calculate the Building Level Rating for each building with eligible building level data.

Table G: Conversion from 100 Point Scale to 0—3 Scale for Building Level Rating	
<i>Building Level Score</i>	<i>0—3 Rating Scale*</i>
90.0 to 107	2.50—3.00
70.0 to 89.9	1.50—2.49
60.0 to 69.9	0.50—1.49
00.0 to 59.9	0.00—0.49

*The Department will publish the full conversion table on its website.

LEAs shall add the Building Level Rating to (B)(2) and (C)(2) of the Rating Form.

(5) For classroom teachers in positions for which there is no Building Level Score reported on the Department website, the LEA shall utilize the rating from the teacher observation and practice portion of the rating form in Part (A)(1) in place of the Building Level Rating.

(b) *Teacher specific data.*

(1) Teacher specific data shall comprise 15% of the Final Teacher Effectiveness Rating. Teacher specific data shall include, but is not limited to, the following when data is available and applicable to a specific classroom teacher:

- (i) Student performance on assessments.
- (ii) Value-added assessment system data made available by the Department under section 221 (24 P. S. § 2-221).
- (iii) Progress in meeting the goals of student individualized education plans required under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (Public Law 91-230, 20 U.S.C. § 1400 et seq.).
- (iv) Locally developed school district rubrics.

Any data used for a rating must be attributable to the specific classroom teacher who is being evaluated and rated.

(2) The following provisions in this subparagraph apply to teacher specific measures based on assessments and value-added assessment system data (Paragraphs (IV)(b)(1)(i) and (ii)).

- (i) The portion of the Teacher Specific Rating related to assessments (Paragraph (IV)(b)(1)(i)) shall be calculated annually for a classroom teacher with available assessment data based upon a percentage of students who score proficient or advanced on the assessments. The Department or its designee will provide the performance level results for each student to the LEA. The LEA shall utilize the conversions in Table H below to rate the classroom teacher's rating on a zero to three scale.

Table H: Conversion from % Scale to 0—3 Scale for Assessments Rating	
<i>% Students at Proficient or Advanced</i>	<i>0—3 Rating Scale</i>
95—100%	3.0
90—94.9%	2.5
80—89.9%	2.0
70—79.9%	1.5
65—69.9%	1.0
60—64.9%	0.5
Below 60%	0.0

(ii) Any score based upon student performance on assessments (Paragraph (IV)(b)(1)(i)) for a classroom teacher with available assessment data shall comprise not more than 5% of the classroom teacher's Final Teacher Effectiveness Rating.

(iii) For the purposes of this section, the portion of the Teacher Specific Rating related to value-added assessment system data made available by the Department under section 221 of the Public School Code (24 P. S. § 2-221) (Paragraph (IV)(b)(1)(ii)) shall be known as PVAAS data.

(iv) Any PVAAS data score attributable to a classroom teacher shall be based on a rolling average of available assessment data during the most recent three consecutive school years.

(v) The Department or its designee will provide the initial 3 year average PVAAS data score to LEAs based on PVAAS data from school years 2013-2014, 2014-2015 and 2015-2016, and will provide the PVAAS rating every year thereafter for classroom teachers with three consecutive school years of PVAAS rating data.

(vi) Each LEA shall use the PVAAS data score provided by the Department or its designee and the conversions in Table I below to calculate a classroom teacher's rating on the zero to three rating scale.

Table I: Conversion from 100 Points Scale to 0—3 Scale for PVAAS Rating	
<i>PVAAS Score</i>	<i>0—3 Scale*</i>
90.0 to 100	2.50—3.00
70.0 to 89.9	1.50—2.49
60.0 to 69.9	0.50—1.49

Table I: Conversion from 100 Points Scale to 0—3 Scale for PVAAS Rating	
<i>PVAAS Score</i>	<i>0—3 Scale*</i>
00.0 to 59.9	0.00—0.49

*The Department will publish the full conversion table on its website.

(vii) A score based upon available PVAAS data shall comprise not less than 10% of the classroom teacher's Final Teacher Effectiveness Rating.

(viii) The Department or its designee will annually publish on the Department's website an explanation for the PVAAS data based on the value-added assessment system data (Paragraph (IV)(b)(1)(ii)).

(ix) Whenever PVAAS data is unavailable for evaluation, other data may be substituted under the following conditions:

(A) In school year 2013-2014, an LEA shall use the rating from Subpart (A)(1) of the Teacher Observation and Practice Rating for a classroom teacher with PVAAS data in place of the portion of the Teacher Specific Rating based on assessments and value-added assessment system data (Paragraphs (IV)(b)(2)(i) to (vii)) in Subparts (B)(3) and (C)(3) of the rating form.

(B) Starting in school year 2014-2015 and every school year thereafter, if three consecutive school years of PVAAS data are unavailable for the rating of a classroom teacher who provides direct instruction in subjects or grades subject to the assessments, an LEA shall use ratings developed through SLOs for data relating to "progress in meeting the goals of student individualized education plans required under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act" (IEPs progress) if applicable, and locally developed school district rubrics (Paragraph (IV)(b)(3)).

(3) The following provisions in this subparagraph apply to teacher specific measures based on data related to IEPs progress and locally developed school district rubrics (Paragraphs (IV)(b)(1)(iii) and (iv)).

(i) The portion of the Teacher Specific Rating based on IEPs progress (Paragraph (IV)(b)(1)(iii)) shall be developed by the LEA and validated through an SLO pursuant to Paragraph (IV)(c)(2).

(ii) Any score attributable to a classroom teacher relating to IEP progress (Paragraph (IV)(b)(1)(iii)) and calculated through an SLO shall comprise no more than 5% of the classroom teacher's Final Teacher Effectiveness Rating.

(iii) The portion of the Teacher Specific Rating related to locally developed school district rubrics as listed in Paragraph (IV)(b)(1)(iv) may be based upon rubrics created by the LEA or an LEA may select a measure available through Paragraph (IV)(c) relating to Elective Data. An LEA shall

utilize an SLO as set forth in Paragraph (IV)(c)(2) of this section to measure and validate a locally developed school district rubric.

(iv) Any score obtained from locally developed school district rubrics shall comprise not more than 5% of the Final Teacher Effectiveness Rating for a classroom teacher with PVAAS data as defined in Paragraph (IV)(b)(2)(iii).

(v) For a classroom teacher without any attributable assessment or PVAAS data (Paragraphs (IV)(b)(1)(i) and (ii)), or data related to IEP progress (Paragraph (IV)(b)(1)(iii)), the locally developed school district rubric or rubrics as described in Paragraphs (IV)(b)(1)(iv) and (b)(3)(iii) shall comprise no more than 15% of a classroom teacher's Final Teacher Effectiveness Rating.

(vi) For classroom teachers with no assessment data, no PVAAS data and no SLOs for IEP progress or locally developed school district rubrics in school year 2013-2014, an LEA shall use the rating from Subpart (A)(1) for total Teacher Observation and Practice Rating for a classroom teacher in Subparts (B)(3) and (C)(3) of the rating form.

(4) If a classroom teacher, who is working or has worked for other LEAs in the Commonwealth, is being considered for employment by a different LEA, the prospective employer may ask the teacher for written authorization to obtain the teacher's teacher specific data from a current or previous employer to provide for the continuity of the 3 year rolling average described in Paragraph IV(b)(2)(iv).

(c) *Elective data.*

(1) This third area will comprise 20% of the Final Teacher Effectiveness Rating. Elective Data shall consist of measures of student achievement that are locally developed and selected by the LEA from a list approved by the Department and published in the *Pennsylvania Bulletin* by June 30 of each year, including, but not limited to, the following:

- (i) District-designed measures and examinations.
- (ii) Nationally recognized standardized tests.
- (iii) Industry certification examinations.
- (iv) Student projects pursuant to local requirements.
- (v) Student portfolios pursuant to local requirements.

(2) LEAs shall use an SLO to document the process to determine and validate the weight assigned to Elective Data measures that establish the Elective Rating. An SLO shall be used to record and verify quality assurance in validating measures of Elective Data, IEPs progress or locally developed school district rubrics on the zero-to-three-point scale and the assigned weight of a measure in the overall performance rating of a classroom teacher. The Department will provide direction, guidance and templates for LEAs to use SLOs in selecting, developing and applying Elective Data measures.

(3) All LEAs shall have SLOs in place for collecting Elective Data and ratings for school year 2014-2015. If Elective Data is unavailable in school year 2013-2014, an LEA shall use the rating in Subpart (A)(1) total Teacher Observation and Practice Rating of the form for a classroom teacher. The rating from Subpart (A)(1) in the form shall be used in Subparts (B)(4) and (C)(4) for the 20% of the classroom teacher's overall performance rating.

(4) If multiple Elective Data measures are used for one classroom teacher, the LEA shall determine the percentage weight given to each Elective Data measure.

(d) *Transfer option.* A classroom teacher who transfers from one building, as defined for building level data (Paragraph (IV)(a)(1)), to another within an LEA, shall have the option of using the Teacher Specific Rating in place of the Building Level Rating for the employee's evaluation in the new placement for two school years starting on the date when the classroom teacher begins the assignment in the new location. A classroom teacher who elects this option shall sign a statement of agreement giving the LEA permission to calculate the final rating using this method.

(e) *Administrative action based on available data.* Nothing in these standards of use for multiple measures of student performance, this section or this chapter shall be construed to limit or constrain the authority of the chief school administrator of an LEA to initiate and take action on a personnel matter, including dismissal of a classroom teacher, based on information and data available at the time of the action.

(V.) Recordkeeping: Maintenance of Rating Tool Data, Records and Forms

(a) *Records to be maintained.* It shall be the duty of the LEA to establish a permanent record system containing ratings for each employee within the LEA and copies of all her or his ratings for the year shall be transmitted to the employee upon her or his request; or if any rating during the year is unsatisfactory copy of same shall be transmitted to the employee concerned. No employee shall be dismissed for incompetency or unsatisfactory performance unless such rating records have been kept on file by the LEA.

(b) *Reporting of data restricted to aggregate results.* Pursuant to Section 1123(i) of the Public School Code 11-1123(i), LEAs shall provide to the Department the aggregate results of all classroom teacher evaluations.

(c) *Confidentiality.* Each LEA shall maintain records in accordance with Section 708(b)(7) of the act of February 14, 2008 (P. L. 6, No. 3), known as the "Right-to-Know Law," (65 P. S. § 67.708(b)(7)), and Sections 221(a)(1) and 1123(p) of the Public School Code (24 P. S. §§ 2-221(a)(1) and 11-1123(p)).

(VI.) LEA Alternative Rating Tool.

The Department will review at the request of an LEA an alternative rating tool that has been approved by the LEA governing board. The Department may

approve for a maximum period of not more than five years any alternative rating tool that meets or exceeds the measures of effectiveness established under 24 P. S. § 1123.

Cross References

This section cited in 22 Pa. Code § 19.2 (relating to principal/school leader effectiveness rating tool); and 22 Pa. Code § 19.3 (relating to nonteaching professional employee effectiveness rating tool).

§ 19.2. Principal/school leader effectiveness rating tool.

The rating tool functions as a framework for the evaluation and summative process for principals, assistant principals, vice principals and directors of vocational education, and is designed for local education agencies providing early childhood, elementary or secondary education across this Commonwealth. The tool is comprised of the form and instructions. The following rating form shall be used to record the results of the data collection process.

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

PRINCIPAL/SCHOOL LEADER RATING FORM

PDE 82-2 (4/14)

Last Name	First	Middle
District/LEA	School	
Rating Date: Evaluation: (Check one) <input type="checkbox"/> Semi-annual <input type="checkbox"/> Annual		

(A) Leadership Observation and Practice

Domain	Title	*Rating* (A)	Factor (B)	Earned Points (A x B)	Max Points
I.	Strategic/Cultural Leadership		25%		0.75
II.	Systems Leadership		25%		0.75
III.	Leadership for Learning		25%		0.75
IV.	Professional and Community Leadership		25%		0.75
(1) Leadership Observation & Practice Rating					3.00

<i>*Domain Rating Assignment* 0 to 3 Point Scale (A)</i>	
Rating	Value
Failing	0
Needs Improvement	1
Proficient	2
Distinguished	3

(B) Student Performance—Building Level Data, Correlation Data, and Elective Data

(2) Building Level Score Converted to 3 Point Rating	
(3) Correlation Rating	
(4) Elective Rating	

(C) Final Principal/School Leader Effectiveness Rating—All Measures

Measure	Rating (C)	Factor (D)	Earned Points (C x D)	Max Points	Conversion to Performance Rating	
					Total Earned Points	Rating
(1) Leadership Observation & Practice Rating		50%		1.50	0.00-0.49	Failing
(2) Building Level Rating*		15%		0.45	0.50-1.49	Needs Improvement
(3) Correlation Rating*		15%		0.45	1.50-2.49	Proficient
(4) Elective Rating*		20%		0.60	2.50-3.00	Distinguished
<i>Total Earned Points</i>						Performance Rating

* Substitutions permissible pursuant to Paragraphs (IV)(a)(6), (b)(4), (c)(3), or (d).

Rating: Professional Employee, **OR** Rating: Temporary Professional Employee
 I certify that the above-named employee for the period beginning _____ and ending _____ has received a performance rating of: (month/day/year) (month/day/year)
 DISTINGUISHED PROFICIENT NEEDS IMPROVEMENT FAILING
 SATISFACTORY 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 unsatisfactory. A rating of Failing shall be considered unsatisfactory.

Date _____ Designated Rater/Position: _____ 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. _____
 Date _____ Signature of Employee _____

The four domains for Leadership Observation and Practice in the rating form give due consideration to and incorporate the professional practice areas of planning and preparation, school environment, delivery of service, and professional development, as set forth in sections 1123(c)(1)(i)—(iv) of the Public School Code (24 P. S. §§ 11-1123(c)(1)(i)—(iv)). Descriptions of the four domains in Part (A) Leadership Observation and Practice are summarized in Table A.

Table A: Descriptions of Four Domains	
Domain	Description
I. Strategic/Cultural Leadership* 25%	Principals/School Leaders systematically and collaboratively develop a positive culture to promote continuous student growth and staff development. They articulate and model a clear vision of the school's culture that involves students, families, and staff.
II. Systems Leadership* 25%	Principals/School Leaders ensure that there are processes and systems in place for budgeting, staffing, problem solving, communicating expectations and scheduling that result in organizing the work routines in the building. They must manage efficiently, effectively and safely to foster student achievement.
III. Leadership for Learning* 25%	Principals/School Leaders ensure that a Standards Aligned System is in place to address the linkage of curriculum, instruction, assessment, data on student learning and teacher effectiveness based on research and best practices.
IV. Professional and Community Leadership* 25%	Principals/School Leaders promote the success of all students, the positive interactions among building stakeholders and the professional growth of staff by acting with integrity, fairness and ethics.

* Crosswalks pertaining to the four domains in Leadership Observation and Practice in the rating form and the professional practice areas of planning and preparation, school environment, delivery of service, and professional development, as set forth in sections 1123(c)(1)(i)—(iv) of the Public School Code (24 P. S. §§ 11-1123(c)(1)(i)—(iv)) will be available at the Department's website.

Table B summarizes leadership performance levels for each of the Domain Rating Assignments and for the ratings to be assigned for each domain in the “Rating (A)” column.

Table B: Four Levels of Performance in Four Domains				
Domain	Failing	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Distinguished
I. Strategic/Cultural Leadership 25%	The Principal/School Leader provides little or no strategic direction with most work being done by staff in isolation. Decisions are not student-focused and reflect opinion with little use of data. Despite the need for change, ineffective practices continue.	The Principal/School Leader provides some strategic direction with a few collaborative processes in place. Data is used sparingly to make decisions with some focus on improvement. The culture is moderately student-centered. Change occurs when required by external forces.	The Principal/School Leader utilizes a data-based vision that is student-centered. The culture is collaborative with a focus on continuous improvement. The staff is held accountable for student success. Change is evidence based.	The Principal/School Leader establishes a future-focused, data-based vision around individual student success. The culture is highly collaborative with staff accepting responsibility for the achievement of each student. Change for continuous improvement is embraced.
II. Systems Leadership 25%	The Principal/School Leader establishes an educational environment that is characterized by chaos and conflict with no plan evident for school safety. Resources are allocated with little or no focus on the needs of students. Staff is low performing with no system designed to improve instruction.	The Principal/School Leader establishes an educational environment that is moderately orderly with rules and regulations that partially support school safety. Teacher evaluations are completed as an administrative process. Resources are allocated solely on individual teacher requests.	The Principal/School Leader establishes and communicates a clear plan for the safety of all students and staff. An effective teacher evaluation system is used to improve instruction. Time schedules, student scheduling and other resources are structured to meet the needs of all students.	The Principal/School Leader clearly involves all staff in the development and implementation of a safe school plan. Peer observations, coaching and cooperative lesson planning are mainstays of a plan for improvement of instruction. All staff and students are highly respectful of each other and resources are allocated based upon student need and are aligned with a clearly stated vision.

Table B: Four Levels of Performance in Four Domains

Domain	Failing	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Distinguished
<p>III. Leadership for Learning 25%</p>	<p>The Principal/School Leader establishes an educational environment that is characterized by low expectations for both students and staff with curriculum, instruction and assessment viewed as independent entities. No plan for improvement exists. Significant interruptions disrupt instruction.</p>	<p>The Principal/School Leader establishes an educational environment that is characterized by varying and inconsistent expectations. Some effort is being made to align curriculum, instruction and assessment. School improvement efforts are sporadic and unclear while the quality of instruction is inconsistent. A moderate number of interruptions disrupt instruction.</p>	<p>The Principal/School Leader regularly and consistently communicates high expectations to staff, students and families. All curriculum, instruction and assessment are aligned. The Principal/School Leader is at the forefront of all improvement efforts and assures high quality instruction is delivered to all students. Instructional time is maximized with few or no interruptions.</p>	<p>The Principal/School Leader ensures students and staff support and maintain high expectations. The Principal/School Leader and staff meet on a consistent basis to align curriculum, instruction and assessment. School improvement efforts are jointly developed by the Principal/School Leader and staff. Instructional time is highly valued and maximized. Interruptions occur only when absolutely necessary.</p>

Table B: Four Levels of Performance in Four Domains

Domain	Failing	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Distinguished
<p>IV. Professional and Community Leadership 25%</p>	<p>The Principal/School Leader establishes little or no communication among school, families and the community. Staff members exhibit low ethical standards and levels of professionalism. Little or no professional development exists.</p>	<p>The Principal/School Leader establishes moderate levels of communication among school, families and the community. Staff members exhibit moderate levels of ethical standards and professionalism. Isolated professional development activities exist.</p>	<p>The Principal/School Leader ensures all staff members communicate regularly with families about their children's progress. Family and community members are partners in the educational program. All staff members exhibit high ethical standards and levels of professionalism. Professional development is based upon identified needs and is aligned with instructional priorities.</p>	<p>The Principal/School Leader ensures high levels of two-way communication exist between staff, families and the community. Staff members are involved in student participation opportunities outside the school day that support students' academic needs. Staff is highly involved in developing and implementing staff development aligned with instructional priorities.</p>

INSTRUCTIONS FOR RATING TOOL—STANDARDS OF USE

The rating form and related documents are available at the Department’s website in electronic versions and Excel worksheet format for scoring and rating tabulation.

I. Definitions.

The following words and terms, when used in this section, shall have the following meanings, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise:

Assessment—The term shall mean the Pennsylvania System of School Assessment test, the Keystone Exam, an equivalent local assessment or another test established by the State Board of Education to meet the requirements of section 2603-B(d)(10)(i) (24 P. S. § 26-2603-B(d)(10)(i)) and required under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (Public Law 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425) or its successor statute or required to achieve other standards established by the Department for the school or school district under 22 Pa. Code § 403.3 (relating to single accountability system).

Chief School Administrator—An individual who is employed as a school district superintendent, an executive director of an intermediate unit or a chief school administrator of an area vocational-technical school or career technology center.

Classroom Teacher—A professional or temporary professional employee who provides direct instruction to students related to a specific subject or grade level and usually holds one of the following:

- Instructional I Certificate (see § 49.82),
- Instructional II Certificate (see § 49.83),
- Vocational Instructional I Certificate (see § 49.142), and
- Vocational Instructional II Certificate (see § 49.143).

Department—The Department of Education of the Commonwealth.

Distinguished—The employee’s performance consistently reflects the employee’s professional position and placement at the highest level of practice.

District-designed measures and examinations, and locally developed school district rubrics—A measure of student performance created or selected by an LEA. The development or design of the measure shall be documented via a Student Learning Objective.

Education Specialist—A person who holds an educational specialist certificate issued by the Commonwealth, including, but not limited to, a certificate endorsed in the area of elementary school counselor, secondary school counselor, school counselor K-12, school nurse, home and school visitor, school psychologist, dental hygienist, or instructional technology specialist.

Employee—A person who is a professional employee or temporary professional employee.

Failing—The employee does not meet performance expectations required for the position.

Keystone Exam—An assessment developed or caused to be developed by the Department pursuant to 22 Pa. Code § 4.51 (relating to state assessment system).

LEA—A local education agency, including a public school district, area vocational-technical school, career technology center and intermediate unit, which is required to use a rating tool established pursuant to section 1123 of the Public School Code (24 P. S. § 11-1123).

Needs Improvement—The employee is functioning below proficient for performance expectations required for continued employment.

Nonteaching Professional Employee—A person who is an education specialist or a professional employee or temporary professional employee who provides services other than classroom instruction.

Performance Improvement Plan—A plan, designed by an LEA with input of the employee, that may include mentoring, coaching, recommendations for professional development and intensive supervision based on the results of the rating provided for under this chapter.

Principal/School Leader—A building principal, an assistant principal, a vice principal or a director of vocational education.

Professional Employee—An individual who is certificated as a teacher, supervisor, principal, assistant principal, vice-principal, director of vocational education, dental hygienist, visiting teacher, home and school visitor, school counselor, child nutrition program specialist, school nurse, or school librarian.

Proficient—The employee's performance consistently reflects practice at a professional level.

PSSA—The Pennsylvania System of School Assessment established in 22 Pa. Code § 4.51 (relating to state assessment system).

PVAAS—The Pennsylvania Value-Added Assessment System established in compliance with 22 Pa. Code § 403.3 (relating to single accountability system) and its data made available by the Department under Section 221 of the Public School Code (24 P. S. § 2-221).

SLO—The Student Learning Objective is a record of the development and application of student performance measures selected by an LEA. It documents the process used to determine a student performance measure and validate its assigned weight. This record will provide for quality assurance in rating a student performance measure on the zero-to-three-point rating scale.

Student Performance—A compilation of performance measures including building level, correlation and elective data as set forth in Paragraph (IV) relating to standards of use for multiple measures of student performance.

Temporary Professional Employee—An individual who has been employed to perform for a limited time the duties of a newly created position or of a regular professional employee whose service has been terminated by death, resignation, suspension or removal.

II. General Provisions.

1. The rating of a Principal/School Leader shall be performed by or under the supervision of the chief school administrator, or, if so directed by the chief school administrator, by an assistant administrator, a supervisor or a principal, who has supervision over the work of the professional employee or temporary professional employee being rated, provided that no unsatisfactory rating shall be valid unless approved by the chief school administrator. (24 P. S. § 11-1123(h)(3))
2. The rating form shall be marked to indicate whether the Principal/School Leader is a professional employee or temporary professional employee.
3. A temporary professional employee must be notified as to the quality of service at least twice a year. (24 P. S. § 11-1108)
4. The rating form includes four measures or rated areas: Leadership Observation and Practice, Building Level, Correlation, and Elective. Application of each measure is dependent on the availability of data. A rating in the range of zero to three based on the “0 to 3 Point Scale” must be given to each of the four rating areas.
5. Leadership Observation and Practice is divided into four domains: I. Strategic/Cultural Leadership; II. Systems Leadership; III. Leadership for Learning; and IV. Professional and Community Leadership. The four domains for Leadership Observation and Practice in the rating form give due consideration to and incorporate the professional practice areas of planning and preparation, school environment, delivery of service, and professional development, as set forth in sections 1123(c)(1)(i)—(iv) of the Public School Code (24 P. S. §§ 11-1123(c)(1)(i)—(iv)). For each domain, an employee must be given a rating of zero, one, two or three which is based on observation, practice models, evidence or documented artifacts.
6. The Building Level Score will be provided by the Department or its designee, and published annually on the Department’s website.
7. The Correlation Rating shall include a review of correlation data based on teacher-level measures facilitated through the Correlation Data Performance Level Descriptors and guidance provided by the Department.
8. Data, ratings and weights assigned to measures for the Elective Rating must be recorded by a process provided by the Department.
9. Each of the four measures in Final Principal/School Leader Effectiveness Rating shall be rated on the zero-to-three-point scale. Each number in Rating (C) shall be multiplied by the Factor (D) and the sum of the Earned Points or Total Earned Points shall be converted into a Performance Rating using the table marked Conversion to Performance Rating.
10. An overall performance rating of Distinguished or Proficient shall be considered satisfactory.
11. An initial overall performance rating of Needs Improvement shall be considered satisfactory.

12. The second overall performance rating of Needs Improvement issued by the same employer within 10 years of the first rating of Needs Improvement where the employee is in the same certification shall be considered unsatisfactory.

13. For professional employees, two consecutive overall unsatisfactory ratings, which include observations, and are not less than four months apart, shall be considered grounds for dismissal.

14. No temporary professional employee shall be dismissed unless rated unsatisfactory, and notification, in writing, of such unsatisfactory rating shall have been furnished the employee within 10 days following the date of such rating.

15. An employee who receives an overall performance rating of Needs Improvement or Failing must participate in a performance improvement plan. No employee will be rated Needs Improvement or Failing based solely on student test scores.

16. The rating form shall be marked to indicate the appropriate performance rating and whether the overall final rating is satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

17. The rating form must be signed by the chief school administrator or by a designated rater, who is an assistant administrator, supervisor or principal, has supervision over the work of the professional employee or temporary professional employee being rated, and is directed by the chief school administrator to perform the rating.

18. A final rating of unsatisfactory will not be valid unless approved and signed by the chief school administrator.

19. A signed copy of the rating form shall be provided to the employee.

20. The rating tool is not intended to establish mandates or requirements for the formative process of supervising professional employees.

21. This rating form, section or chapter may not be construed to limit or constrain the authority of the chief school administrator of an LEA to initiate and take action on a personnel matter, including dismissal of a Principal/School Leader, based on information and data available at the time of the action.

III. Standards of Use for Leadership Observation and Practice.

Part (A) "Leadership Observation and Practice" in the rating form shall be completed using the following standards, calculations and procedures.

(a) *Leadership observation and practice domains.* The rating of a Principal/School Leader for effectiveness in leadership practice shall be based on observation or other supervisory methods. Leadership practice shall comprise 50% of the Final Principal/School Leader Effectiveness Rating of the employee. The percentage factor for each domain is listed in Table C:

Table C: Four Domains	
<i>Domains</i>	<i>% of 50% allotment</i>
I. Strategic/Cultural Leadership	25.0
II. Systems Leadership	25.0
III. Leadership for Learning	25.0
IV. Professional and Community Leadership	25.0

(b) *Summative process of evaluation.* LEAs shall utilize leadership practice models (e.g., Department, *Framework for Leadership*) that address the areas related to professional leadership observation and practice contained in the four domains in Table C which give due consideration to and incorporate the professional practice areas of planning and preparation, school environment, delivery of service, and professional development, as set forth in sections 1123(c)(1)(i)—(iv) of the Public School Code (24 P. S. §§ 11-1123(c)(1)(i)—(iv)) and are approved by the Department. The Department shall publish a list of approved practice models for assessing the four domains annually on the Department’s website. A Principal/School Leader must be given a rating in each of the four domains. In determining a rating for a Principal/School Leader, an LEA may use any portion or combination of the practice models related to the domains. The four domains and professional practice models establish a framework for the summative process of evaluating Principal/School Leaders. The form and standards do not impose mandates on the supervisory and formative processes utilized by an LEA.

(c) *Evidentiary sources.* Leadership observation and practice evaluation results and ratings shall be based on evidence. Information, including dates and times, if applicable, on the source of the evidence shall be noted in the employee’s record. As appropriate for the employee and the employee’s placement in a leadership position, records may include, but not be limited to, any combination of the following items:

- (1) Notations of professional observations, employee/rater conferences or interviews, or informal observations or visits, including dates for observations, interviews and conferences.
- (2) Communication logs (emails, letters, notes regarding phone conversations, etc.) to parents, staff, students, and/or community members.
- (3) Utilization of formative and summative assessments that impact instruction and critiques of lesson plans.
- (4) Agendas and minutes of meetings, programs, courses, or planning sessions.
- (5) Family, parent, school and community feedback.

(6) Development and implementation of school improvement plans, professional growth programs, in-service programs, student assemblies, safety programs, and other events or programs that promote educational efficacy, health and safety.

(7) School budget and expenditure reports.

(8) Act 45 documentation.

(9) Examination of sources of evidence provided by the employee.

The documentation, evidence and findings of the rater shall provide a basis for the rating of the employee in the domains of observation and practice.

(d) *Scoring.* An LEA must provide a rating score in each domain. The four leadership observation and practice domains shall be rated and scored on a zero-to-three-point scale. The ratings of Failing, Needs Improvement, Proficient and Distinguished are given numeric values as shown in Table D.

<i>Performance Rating</i>	<i>Value</i>
Failing	0
Needs Improvement	1
Proficient	2
Distinguished	3

(e) *Ratings and weighted scoring.* The four domains of leadership observation and practice in Part (A) of the form are each assigned a percentage factor. Each domain shall be scored on the “0-to-3-point scale.” The individual score or rating for each domain is adjusted by the percentage factor attributed to that domain. The score of zero, one, two or three for each domain is calculated into points based on its percentage factor. The sum of the points for all domains will be the total Leadership Observation and Practice Rating. The calculation for each domain is set forth in Table E.

<i>Domain</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Rating (A)</i>	<i>Factor (B)</i>	<i>Earned Points (A x B)</i>	<i>Max Points</i>
I.	Strategic/Cultural Leadership		25%		0.75
II.	Systems Leadership		25%		0.75
III.	Leadership for Learning		25%		0.75
IV.	Professional and Community Leadership		25%		0.75
<i>Leadership Observation & Practice Points/Rating</i>					3.00

(f) *Administrative action based on available data.* Nothing in these standards of use for leadership observation and practice, this section or this chapter shall be construed to limit or constrain the authority of the chief school administrator of an LEA to initiate and take action on a personnel matter, including dismissal of a Principal/School Leader, based on information and data available at the time of the action.

(IV) Standards of Use for Multiple Measures of Student Performance.

Student Performance is comprised of building level, correlation and elective data. In total, these three measures are 50% of the Final Principal/School Leader Effectiveness Rating. Each area has a prescribed percentage factor of the performance rating as described in Table F.

Table F: Multiple Measure Rating Areas and Percentage Factors of Performance Rating	
<i>Multiple Measure Rating Area</i>	<i>Factor</i>
Building Level Rating	15%
Correlation Rating	15%
Elective Rating	20%

(a) *Building level data.*

(1) For the purposes of Paragraph (IV) relating to Standards of Use for Multiple Measures of Student Performance, the term “building” shall mean a school or configuration of grades that is assigned a unique four-digit identification number by the Department unless the context clearly indicates otherwise.

(2) Building level data comprises 15% of the Final Principal/School Leader Effectiveness Rating. Building level data shall include, but is not limited to, the following when data is available and applicable to a building where the Principal/School Leader provides service:

- (i) Student performance on assessments.
- (ii) Value-added assessment system data made available by the Department under section 221 of the Public School Code (24 P. S. § 2-221).
- (iii) Graduation rate as reported to the Department under section 222 of the Public School Code (24 P. S. § 2-222).
- (iv) Promotion rate.
- (v) Attendance rate as reported to the Department under section 2512 of the Public School Code (24 P. S. § 25-2512).
- (vi) Industry certification examinations data.
- (vii) Advanced placement course participation.
- (viii) Scholastic aptitude test and preliminary scholastic aptitude test data.

(3) As with 22 Pa. Code § 19.1(IV)(a), the Building Level Rating shall be determined through conversion of the Building Level Score. The percentage

weight given to each measure component contained in Appendix A will be utilized in Building Level Score computations using available data. The Department or its designee will provide the Building Level Score for each building within an LEA based on available data. Building Level Scores will be published annually on the Department's website.

(4) Each LEA shall utilize the conversions in Table G below to calculate the Building Level Rating for each building with eligible building level data.

Table G: Conversion from 100 Point Scale to 0-3 Scale for Building Level Rating	
<i>Building Level Score</i>	<i>0-3 Rating Scale*</i>
90.0 to 107	2.50-3.00
70.0 to 89.9	1.50-2.49
60.0 to 69.9	0.50-1.49
00.0 to 59.9	0.00-0.49

*The Department will publish the full conversion formula on its website.

LEAs shall add the Building Level Rating to Parts (B)(2) and (C)(2) of the Rating Form.

(5) If a Principal/School Leader is assigned to two or more buildings, the LEA will use building level data from each building based on the percentage of the employee's work performed in each building in calculating the whole 15% for this portion of the final rating.

(6) For Principal/School Leaders in positions for which there is no Building Level Score reported on the Department website, the LEA shall utilize the rating from the leadership observation and practice portion of the rating form in Part (A)(1) in place of the Building Level Rating.

(b) *Correlation data.*

(1) Correlation data will comprise 15% of the Final Principal/School Leader Effectiveness Rating and features correlation data based on teacher-level measures. For the purpose of Paragraph (IV)(b), the term "teacher-level measures" shall include, but not be limited to, any combination of one or more of the following data for classroom teachers who are evaluated by the Principal/School Leader:

- (i) Building level data (22 Pa. Code § 19.1(IV)(a)).
- (ii) Teacher specific data (22 Pa. Code § 19.1(IV)(b)).
- (iii) Elective data (22 Pa. Code § 19.1(IV)(c)).

(2) The Correlation Data Performance Level Descriptors in Table H below are provided for the rater to use as a basis for developing a rating of 0, 1, 2 or 3 for the Correlation Rating in Parts (B)(3) and (C)(3) of the Principal/School Leader Rating Form. The descriptors are designed to be used in evaluating the

Principal/School Leader’s knowledge, understanding and intended application of evidence presented regarding the relationship between teacher-level measures and observation and practice ratings (22 Pa. Code § 19.1(III)) for classroom teachers who are evaluated by the Principal/School Leader. The rater shall provide the Principal/School Leader with the opportunity to present evidence and sources.

Table H: Correlation Data Performance Level Descriptors				
<i>Correlation Rating (15%)</i>	<i>0—Failing</i>	<i>1—Needs Improvement</i>	<i>2—Proficient</i>	<i>3—Distinguished</i>
Degree of understanding of evidence presented regarding the relationship between teacher-level measures and teacher observation and practice ratings.	Responses demonstrate no understanding of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The presented teacher-level measures. 	Responses demonstrate a limited understanding of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The presented teacher-level measures. 	Responses demonstrate a solid understanding of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The presented teacher-level measures. 	Responses demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The presented teacher-level measures.
Quality of explanation provided for observed relationship between teacher-level measures and teacher observation and practice ratings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The nature and plausible cause of the observed relationship between teacher-level measures and teacher observation and practice ratings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The nature and plausible cause of the observed relationship between teacher-level measures and teacher observation and practice ratings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The nature and plausible cause of the observed relationship between teacher-level measures and teacher observation and practice ratings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The nature and plausible cause of the observed relationship between teacher-level measures and teacher observation and practice ratings.
Plans for how the data will be used to support school and LEA goals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to use this data to support the attainment of school and LEA goals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to use this data to support the attainment of school and LEA goals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to use this data to support the attainment of school and LEA goals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to use this data to support the attainment of school and LEA goals.

(3) The Department will provide guidance for LEAs to use in applying the Correlation Data Performance Level Descriptors in Table H and validating the Correlation Rating for a Principal/School Leader.

(4) For Principals/School Leaders in positions where their duties and responsibilities do not include evaluating and/or signing rating forms for classroom teachers, the LEA shall utilize the Elective Rating in Parts (B)(4) and (C)(4), pursuant to Paragraph (IV)(c), in place of the Correlation Rating.

(c) *Elective data.*

(1) This third area will comprise 20% of the Final Principal/School Leader Effectiveness Rating. Elective Data shall consist of measures of student

achievement that are locally developed and selected by the LEA from a list approved by the Department and published in the *Pennsylvania Bulletin* by June 30 of each year, including, but not limited to, the following:

- (i) District-designed measures and examinations.
- (ii) Nationally recognized standardized tests.
- (iii) Industry certification examinations.
- (iv) Student projects pursuant to local requirements.
- (v) Student portfolios pursuant to local requirements.

(2) LEAs shall use an SLO to document the process to determine and validate the weight assigned to Elective Data measures that establish the Elective Rating. An SLO shall be used to record and verify quality assurance in validating measures of Elective Data on the zero-to-three-point scale and the assigned weight of a measure in the overall performance rating of a Principal/School Leader. The Department will provide guidance and templates for LEAs to use SLOs in selecting, developing and applying Elective Data measures.

(3) All LEAs shall have SLOs in place for collecting Elective Data and ratings for school year 2015-2016 and for school years thereafter. If Elective Data is unavailable in school year 2014-2015, an LEA shall use the rating in Part (A)(1) total Principal/School Leader Observation and Practice Rating of the form for a Principal/School Leader. The rating from Part (A)(1) in the form shall be used in Parts (B)(4) and (C)(4) for the 20% of the Principal/School Leader's overall performance rating.

(4) If multiple Elective Data measures are used for one Principal/School Leader, the LEA shall determine the percentage weight given to each Elective Data measure.

(d) *Transfer option.* A Principal/School Leader who transfers from one building, as defined for building level data (Paragraph (IV)(a)(1)), to another within an LEA, shall have the option of using the Correlation Rating, as set forth in Paragraph (IV)(b) in place of the Building Level Rating for the employee's evaluation in the new placement for two school years starting on the date when the Principal/School Leader begins the assignment in the new location. A Principal/School Leader who elects this option shall sign a statement of agreement giving the LEA permission to calculate the final rating using this method.

(e) *Administrative action based on available data.* Nothing in these standards of use for multiple measures of student performance, this section or this chapter shall be construed to limit or constrain the authority of the chief school administrator of an LEA to initiate and take action on a personnel matter, including dismissal of a Principal/School Leader, based on information and data available at the time of the action.

(V) Recordkeeping: Maintenance of Rating Tool Data, Records and Forms.

(a) *Records to be maintained.* It shall be the duty of the LEA to establish a permanent record system containing ratings for each employee within the LEA

and copies of all her or his ratings for the year shall be transmitted to the employee upon her or his request; or if any rating during the year is unsatisfactory copy of same shall be transmitted to the employee concerned. No employee shall be dismissed for incompetency or unsatisfactory performance unless such rating records have been kept on file by the LEA.

(b) *Reporting of data restricted to aggregate results.* Pursuant to Section 1123(i) of the Public School Code (24 P. S. § 11-1123(i)), LEAs shall provide to the Department the aggregate results of all Principal/School Leader evaluations.

(c) *Confidentiality.* Each LEA shall maintain records in accordance with Section 708(b)(7) of the act of February 14, 2008 (P. L. 6, No. 3), known as the “Right-to-Know Law,” (65 P. S. § 67.708(b)(7)), and Sections 221(a)(1) and 1123(p) of the Public School Code (24 P. S. §§ 2-221(a)(1) and 11-1123(p)).

(VI) LEA Alternative Rating Tool.

The Department will review at the request of an LEA an alternative rating tool that has been approved by the LEA governing board. The Department may approve for a maximum period of not more than five years any alternative rating tool that meets or exceeds the measures of effectiveness established under 24 P. S. § 11-1123.

Authority

The provisions of this § 19.2 issued under section 1123(a), (c)(3), (d)(2), (e) and (j) of the Public School Code of 1949 (24 P. S. § 11-1123(a), (c)(3), (d)(2), (e) and (j)); and sections 201 and 506 of The Administrative Code of 1929 (71 P. S. §§ 61 and 186).

Source

The provisions of this § 19.2 adopted June 13, 2014, effective July 1, 2014, the phase-in for the principal rating tool will begin in the 2014-2015 school year, 44 Pa.B. 3497.

§ 19.3. Nonteaching professional employee effectiveness rating tool.

The rating tool functions as a framework for the evaluation and summative process for nonteaching professional employees, and is designed for local education agencies providing early childhood, elementary or secondary education across this Commonwealth. The tool is comprised of the form and instructions. The following rating form shall be used to record the results of the data collection process.

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

NONTEACHING PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEE (NTPE) RATING FORM

PDE 82-3 (4/14)

Last Name	First	Middle
District/LEA	School	
Rating Date:	Evaluation: (Check one) <input type="checkbox"/> Semi-annual <input type="checkbox"/> Annual	

(A) NTPE Observation and Practice

Domain	Title	*Rating* (A)	Factor (B)	Earned Points (A x B)	Max Points
I.	Planning & Preparation		25%		0.75
II.	Educational Environment		25%		0.75
III.	Delivery of Service		25%		0.75
IV.	Professional Development		25%		0.75
(1) NTPE Observation & Practice Rating					3.00

Domain Rating Assignment 0 to 3 Point Scale (A)	
Rating	Value
Failing	0
Needs Improvement	1
Proficient	2
Distinguished	3

(B) Student Performance

Building Level Score (0—107)	
(2) Building Level Score Converted to 3 Point Rating	

(C) Final NTPE Effectiveness Rating—All Measures

Measure	Rating (C)	Factor (D)	Earned Points (C x D)	Max Points
(1) NTPE Observation and Practice Rating		80%		2.40
(2) Student Performance Rating*		20%		0.60
<i>Total Earned Points</i>				3.00

<i>Conversion to Performance Rating</i>	
<i>Total Earned Points</i>	<i>Rating</i>
0.00-0.49	Failing
0.50-1.49	Needs Improvement
1.50-2.49	Proficient
2.50-3.00	Distinguished
Performance Rating	

* Substitutions permissible pursuant to Paragraph (IV)(g).

- Rating: Professional Employee, **OR** Rating: Temporary Professional Employee
- I certify that the above-named employee for the period beginning _____ and ending _____ has received a performance rating of:
- DISTINGUISHED PROFICIENT NEEDS IMPROVEMENT FAILING
- resulting in a FINAL rating of:
- SATISFACTORY 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 unsatisfactory. A rating of Failing shall be considered unsatisfactory.

Date _____ Designated Rater/Position: _____ Date _____ 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.

_____ Date _____ Signature of Employee

Descriptions of the four domains in Part (A) NTPE Observation and Practice are summarized in Table A.

Table A: Descriptions of Four Domains	
Domain	Description
I. Planning & Preparation* 25%	Effective nonteaching professional employees (NTPEs) plan and prepare to deliver high-quality services based upon extensive knowledge of their discipline/supervisory position relative to individual and/or systems-level needs and within the context of interdisciplinary collaboration. Service delivery outcomes are clear, measurable and represent relevant goals for the individual and/or system.
II. Educational Environment* 25%	Effective NTPEs assess and enhance the quality of the environment along multiple dimensions toward improved academic, behavioral and social-emotional outcomes. Environmental dimensions include adult-student relationships, staff interactions, security and maintenance, administration, student academic orientation, student behavioral values, student-peer relationships, parent and community-school relationships, instructional and intervention management and student activities.
III. Delivery of Service* 25%	Effective NTPE service delivery and practice emanates from a problem-solving process that can be applied to an individual and/or at the systems level and is used to: (a) identify priority areas for improvement; (b) analysis of variables related to the situation; (c) selection of relevant factors within the system; (d) fidelity of implementation of services and supports; and (e) monitoring of effectiveness of services.

Table A: Descriptions of Four Domains

Domain	Description
<p>IV. Professional Development* 25%</p>	<p>Effective NTPEs have high ethical standards and a deep sense of professionalism, focused on improving their own service delivery and supporting the ongoing learning of colleagues. Their record keeping systems are efficient and effective. NTPEs communicate with all parties clearly, frequently and with cultural sensitivity. These professionals assume leadership roles within the system and engage in a wide variety of professional development activities that serve to strengthen their practice. Reflection on their practice results in ideas for improvement that are shared across professional learning communities and contribute to improving the practice of others.</p>

Adapted by the Pennsylvania Department of Education with permission from copyrighted material of Charlotte Danielson.

* Crosswalks pertaining to the four domains for NTPE Observation and Practice in the rating form, as set forth in sections 1123(d)(1)(i)—(iv) of the Public School Code (24 P. S. §§ 11-1123(d)(1)(i)—(iv)), and to professional practice areas attributable to the certifications held by NTPEs will be available at the Department’s website.

Table B summarizes NTPE performance levels for each of the Domain Rating Assignments and for the ratings to be assigned for each domain in the “Rating (A)” column.

Table B: Four Levels of Performance in Four Domains				
Domain	Failing	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Distinguished
I. Planning & Preparation 25%	NTPE’s planning and preparation reflects little understanding of their discipline/supervisory position relative to individual and/or systems-level needs. Service delivery outcomes, as a function of planning and preparation, are not clear, not measurable and do not represent relevant goals for the individual and/or system.	NTPE’s planning and preparation reflects moderate understanding of their discipline/supervisory position relative to individual and/or systems-level needs. Some service delivery outcomes are clear, measurable and represent relevant goals for the individual and/or system.	NTPE’s planning and preparation reflects solid understanding of their discipline/supervisory position relative to individual and/or systems-level needs. Most service delivery outcomes are clear, measurable and represent relevant goals for the individual and/or system.	NTPE’s planning and preparation reflects extensive understanding of their discipline/supervisory position relative to individual and/or systems-level needs. All service delivery outcomes are clear, measurable and represent relevant goals for the individual and/or system.
II. Educational Environment 25%	Environment is characterized by chaos and conflict, with low expectations for improved academic, behavioral and social-emotional outcomes. There are no clear standards for interactions, student behavior, use of physical space, instruction and intervention with students, maintaining confidentiality, etc.	Adults communicate modest expectations for improved academic, behavioral and social-emotional outcomes. There are some clearly defined standards for interactions, student behavior, use of physical space, instruction and intervention with students, maintaining confidentiality, etc.	Environment functions smoothly, with little or no loss of service delivery time. Expectations for interactions, student behavior, use of physical space, instruction and intervention with students, and maintaining confidentiality are high. Standards for student conduct are clear and the environment supports academic, behavioral and social-emotional growth.	Recipients of services make a substantive contribution to various dimensions of the environment and contribute to improved academic, behavioral and social-emotional outcomes.

Table B: Four Levels of Performance in Four Domains

Domain	Failing	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Distinguished
<p>III. Delivery of Service 25%</p>	<p>Effective service delivery and practice does not emanate from a problem-solving process that can be applied to an individual and/or at the systems level and is used to:</p> <p>(a) identify priority areas for improvement; (b) analysis of variables related to the situation; (c) selection of relevant factors within the system; (d) fidelity of implementation of services and supports; and (e) monitoring of effectiveness of services.</p>	<p>Effective service delivery and practice partially emanates from a problem-solving process that can be applied to an individual and/or at the systems level and is used to:</p> <p>(a) identify priority areas for improvement; (b) analysis of variables related to the situation; (c) selection of relevant factors within the system; (d) fidelity of implementation of services and supports; and (e) monitoring of effectiveness of services.</p>	<p>Effective service delivery and practice emanates from a problem-solving process that can be applied to an individual and/or at the systems level and is used to:</p> <p>(a) identify priority areas for improvement; (b) analysis of variables related to the situation; (c) selection of relevant factors within the system; (d) fidelity of implementation of services and supports; and (e) monitoring of effectiveness of services. As a function of interdisciplinary collaboration and problem-solving, student and systems-level outcomes improve over time.</p>	<p>Effective service delivery and practice emanates from a problem-solving process that can be applied to an individual and/or at the systems level and is used to:</p> <p>(a) identify priority areas for improvement; (b) analysis of variables related to the situation; (c) selection of relevant factors within the system; (d) fidelity of implementation of services and supports; and (e) monitoring of effectiveness of services. As a function of interdisciplinary collaboration and problem-solving, student and systems-level outcomes improve over time.</p>

Table B: Four Levels of Performance in Four Domains

Domain	Failing	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Distinguished
IV. Professional Development 25%	<p>NTPE does not adhere to ethical standards or convey a deep sense of professionalism. There is an absence of focus on improving their own service delivery and supporting the ongoing learning of colleagues. Their record keeping systems are inefficient and ineffective. NTPEs communicate ineffectively with all parties as evidenced by lack of clarity, limited frequency and absence of cultural sensitivity. NTPEs do not assume leadership roles within the system and do not engage in a wide variety of professional development activities that would serve to strengthen their practice. Reflection on their practice does not result in ideas for improvement that are shared across professional learning communities and/or contribute to improving the practice of others.</p>	<p>NTPE partially adheres to ethical standards and conveys an emerging sense of professionalism. There is some focus on improving their own service delivery and supporting the ongoing learning of colleagues. Their record keeping systems are approaching efficiency and effectiveness. NTPEs communicate effectively, with all parties through clarity, frequency and cultural sensitivity. NTPEs inconsistently assume leadership roles within the system and engage in a wide variety of professional development activities that serve to strengthen their practice. Reflection on their practice is beginning to result in ideas for improvement that are shared across professional learning communities and/or contribute to improving the practice of others.</p>	<p>NTPE fully adheres to ethical standards and conveys an emerging sense of professionalism. There is a solid focus on improving their own service delivery and supporting the ongoing learning of colleagues. Their record keeping systems are efficient and effective. NTPEs communicate effectively with all parties through clarity, frequency and cultural sensitivity. NTPEs consistently assume leadership roles within the system and engage in a wide variety of professional development activities that serve to strengthen their practice. Reflection on their practice results in ideas for improvement that are shared across professional learning communities and/or contribute to improving the practice of others.</p>	<p>NTPE has exceptional adherence to ethical standards and professionalism. There is always evidence of improvement of practice and support to the ongoing learning of colleagues. Their record keeping systems are exceptionally efficient and effective. NTPEs always communicate effectively with all parties through clarity, frequency and cultural sensitivity. NTPEs always assume leadership roles within the system and engage in a wide variety of professional development activities that serve to strengthen their practice. Reflection on their practice always results in ideas for improvement that are shared across professional learning communities and/or contribute to improving the practice of others.</p>

From *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teacher, 2nd Edition* (pp 41-42), by Charlotte Danielson, Alexandria, VA ASCD® 2007. Adapted and reproduced with permission.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR RATING TOOL—STANDARDS OF USE

The rating form and related documents are available at the Department's website in electronic versions and Excel worksheet format for scoring and rating tabulation.

I. Definitions.

The following words and terms, when used in this section, shall have the following meanings, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise:

Assessment—The term shall mean the Pennsylvania System of School Assessment test, the Keystone Exam, an equivalent local assessment or another test established by the State Board of Education to meet the requirements of section 2603-B(d)(10)(i) (24 P. S. § 26-2603-B(d)(10)(i)) and required under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (Public Law 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425) or its successor statute or required to achieve other standards established by the Department for the school or school district under 22 Pa. Code § 403.3 (relating to single accountability system).

Chief School Administrator—An individual who is employed as a school district superintendent, an executive director of an intermediate unit or a chief school administrator of an area vocational-technical school or career technology center.

Classroom Teacher—A professional or temporary professional employee who provides direct instruction to students related to a specific subject or grade level and usually holds one of the following:

- Instructional I Certificate (see § 49.82),
- Instructional II Certificate (see § 49.83),
- Vocational Instructional I Certificate (see § 49.142), and
- Vocational Instructional II Certificate (see § 49.143).

Department—The Department of Education of the Commonwealth.

Distinguished—The employee's performance consistently reflects the employee's professional position and placement at the highest level of practice.

Education Specialist—A person who holds an educational specialist certificate issued by the Commonwealth, including, but not limited to, a certificate endorsed in the area of elementary school counselor, secondary school counselor, school counselor K-12, school nurse, home and school visitor, school psychologist, dental hygienist, or instructional technology specialist.

Employee—A person who is a professional employee or temporary professional employee.

Failing—The employee does not meet performance expectations required for the position.

Keystone Exam—An assessment developed or caused to be developed by the Department pursuant to 22 Pa. Code § 4.51 (relating to state assessment system).

LEA—A local education agency, including a public school district, area vocational-technical school, career technology center and intermediate unit, which is required to use a rating tool established pursuant to section 1123 of the Public School Code (24 P. S. § 11-1123).

Needs Improvement—The employee is functioning below proficient for performance expectations required for continued employment.

NTPE—A nonteaching professional employee or a person who is an education specialist or a professional employee or temporary professional employee who provides services other than classroom instruction, and includes supervisors and employees with instructional certification who are not categorized as “classroom teachers” by the LEA.

Performance Improvement Plan—A plan, designed by an LEA with input of the employee, that may include mentoring, coaching, recommendations for professional development and intensive supervision based on the results of the rating provided for under this chapter.

Principal—A building principal, an assistant principal, a vice principal or a director of vocational education.

Professional Employee—An individual who is certificated as a teacher, supervisor, principal, assistant principal, vice-principal, director of vocational education, dental hygienist, visiting teacher, home and school visitor, school counselor, child nutrition program specialist, school nurse, or school librarian.

Proficient—The employee’s performance consistently reflects practice at a professional level.

PSSA—The Pennsylvania System of School Assessment established in 22 Pa. Code § 4.51 (relating to state assessment system).

PVAAS—The Pennsylvania Value-Added Assessment System established in compliance with 22 Pa. Code § 403.3 (relating to single accountability system) and its data made available by the Department under Section 221 of the Public School Code (24 P. S. § 2-221).

Student Performance—A compilation of performance measures of all students in the school building in which the NTPE is employed as set forth in Paragraph (IV) relating to standards of use for student performance measures.

Temporary Professional Employee—An individual who has been employed to perform for a limited time the duties of a newly created position or of a regular professional employee whose service has been terminated by death, resignation, suspension or removal.

II. General Provisions.

1. The rating of an employee shall be performed by or under the supervision of the chief school administrator, or, if so directed by the chief school administrator, by an assistant administrator, a supervisor or a principal, who has

supervision over the work of the professional employee or temporary professional employee being rated, provided that no unsatisfactory rating shall be valid unless approved by the chief school administrator. (24 P. S. § 11-1123(h)(3))

2. The rating form shall be marked to indicate whether the employee is a professional employee or temporary professional employee.

3. A temporary professional employee must be notified as to the quality of service at least twice a year. (24 P. S. § 11-1108)

4. The rating form includes two measures or rated areas: NTPE Observation and Practice, and Student Performance of all students in the school building. Application of each measure is dependent on the availability of data. A rating in the range of zero to three based on the "0 to 3 Point Scale" must be given to each of the two rating areas.

5. NTPE Observation and Practice is divided into four domains: I. Planning and Preparation; II. Educational Environment; III. Delivery of Service; and IV. Professional Development. For each domain, an employee must be given a rating of zero, one, two or three which is based on observation, practice models, evidence or documented artifacts.

6. The Student Performance score shall be comprised of the Building Level Score which will be provided by the Department or its designee, and published annually on the Department's website.

7. Each of the two measures in Final NTPE Effectiveness Rating shall be rated on the zero-to-three-point scale. Each number in Rating (C) shall be multiplied by the Factor (D) and the sum of the Earned Points or Total Earned Points shall be converted into a Performance Rating using the table marked Conversion to Performance Rating.

8. An overall performance rating of Distinguished or Proficient shall be considered satisfactory.

9. An initial overall performance rating of Needs Improvement shall be considered satisfactory.

10. The second overall performance rating of Needs Improvement issued by the same employer within 10 years of the first rating of Needs Improvement where the employee is in the same certification shall be considered unsatisfactory.

11. For professional employees, two consecutive overall unsatisfactory ratings, which include professional observations, and are not less than four months apart, shall be considered grounds for dismissal.

12. No temporary professional employee shall be dismissed unless rated unsatisfactory, and notification, in writing, of such unsatisfactory rating shall have been furnished the employee within 10 days following the date of such rating.

13. An employee who receives an overall performance rating of Needs Improvement or Failing must participate in a performance improvement plan. No employee will be rated Needs Improvement or Failing based solely on student test scores.

14. The rating form shall be marked to indicate the appropriate performance rating and whether the overall final rating is satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

15. The rating form must be signed by the chief school administrator or by a designated rater, who is an assistant administrator, supervisor or principal, has supervision over the work of the professional employee or temporary professional employee being rated, and is directed by the chief school administrator to perform the rating.

16. A final rating of unsatisfactory will not be valid unless signed by the chief school administrator.

17. A signed copy of the rating form shall be provided to the employee.

18. The rating tool is not intended to establish mandates or requirements for the formative process of supervising NTPEs.

19. This rating form, section or chapter may not be construed to limit or constrain the authority of the chief school administrator of an LEA to initiate and take action on a personnel matter, including dismissal of an NTPE, based on information and data available at the time of the action.

III. Standards of Use for NTPE Observation and Practice.

Part (A) “NTPE Observation and Practice” in the rating form shall be completed using the following standards, calculations and procedures.

(a) *NTPE observation and practice domains.* The rating of an NTPE for effectiveness in professional practice shall be based on observation or other supervisory methods. Professional practice shall comprise 80% of the Final NTPE Effectiveness Rating of the employee. The percentage factor for each domain is listed in Table C:

Table C: Four Domains	
<i>Domains</i>	<i>% of 80% allotment</i>
I. Planning and preparation.	25.0
II. Educational environment.	25.0
III. Delivery of service.	25.0
IV. Professional development.	25.0

(b) *Summative process of evaluation.* LEAs shall utilize professional practice models (e.g., Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*; Department, *Framework for Leadership*; Department-developed

frameworks/rubrics for education specialists) that address the areas related to observation and practice contained in sections 1123(d)(1)(i)—(iv) of the Public School Code (24 P. S. §§ 11-1123(d)(1)(i)—(iv)) and are approved by the Department. The Department shall publish a list of approved practice models for assessing the four domains annually on the Department's website. The list of approved practice models will include frameworks for professional observation and practice, and relevant crosswalks linking frameworks to the four domains in Table C for professional and temporary professional employees holding certificates issued by the Department who are not assigned classroom teacher or principal positions. Examples of certificates for professional and temporary employees include, but are not limited to, the following:

- (1) Education specialist (22 Pa. Code §§ 49.101—105).
- (2) Instructional (22 Pa. Code §§ 49.82—83, 49.142—143).
- (3) Administrative and supervisory (22 Pa. Code §§ 49.111 and 49.121).

LEAs shall assign the appropriate practice model to each NTPE position description. LEAs shall notify NTPEs of the professional practice models assigned to the NTPEs' positions. An NTPE must be given a rating in each of the four domains. In determining a rating for an employee, an LEA may use any portion or combination of the practice models related to the domains. The four domains and practice models establish a framework for the summative process of evaluating NTPEs. The form and standards do not impose mandates on the supervisory and formative processes utilized by an LEA.

(c) *Evidentiary sources.* NTPE observation and practice evaluation results and ratings shall be based on evidence. Information, including dates and times, if applicable, on the source of the evidence shall be noted in the employee's record. As appropriate for the employee and the employee's placement in an LEA program, records may include, but not be limited to, any combination of the following items:

- (1) Notations of professional observations, employee/rater conferences or interviews, or informal observations or visits, including dates for observations, interviews and conferences.
- (2) Lesson unit plans (types, titles and numbers), materials, technology, resource documents, visual technology, utilization of space, student assignment sheets, student work, instructional resources, student records, grade book, progress reports and report cards.
- (3) Development and implementation of improvement plans, professional growth programs, in-service programs, student assemblies, and other events or programs that promote educational efficacy, health or safety.

- (4) Communication logs (emails, letters, notes regarding phone conversations, etc.) to parents, staff, students, and/or community members.
- (5) Utilization of formative and summative assessments that impact instruction and critiques of lesson plans.
- (6) Agendas and minutes of meetings, programs, courses, or planning sessions.
- (7) Budget and expenditure reports.
- (8) Interaction with students' family members.
- (9) Family, parent, school and community feedback.
- (10) Act 48 documentation or continuing education documentation directly related to the employee's position in the LEA.
- (11) Use of professional reflections.
- (12) Examination of sources of evidence provided by the employee.

The documentation, evidence and findings of the rater shall provide a basis for the rating of the employee in the domains of observation and practice.

(d) *Scoring.* An LEA must provide a rating score in each domain. The four NTPE observation and practice domains shall be rated and scored on a zero-to-three-point scale. The ratings of Failing, Needs Improvement, Proficient and Distinguished are given numeric values as shown in Table D.

Table D: Domain Rating Assignment—0-3 Scale	
<i>Performance Rating</i>	<i>Value</i>
Failing	0
Needs Improvement	1
Proficient	2
Distinguished	3

(e) *Ratings and weighted scoring.* The four domains of NTPE observation and practice in Part (A) of the form are each assigned a percentage factor. Each domain shall be scored on the "0-to-3-point scale." The individual score or rating for each domain is adjusted by the percentage factor attributed to that domain. The score of zero, one, two or three for each domain is calculated into points based on its percentage factor. The sum of the points for all domains will be the total NTPE Observation and Practice Rating. The calculation for each domain is set forth in Table E.

Table E: NTPE Observation and Practice Rating					
<i>Domain</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Rating (A)</i>	<i>Factor (B)</i>	<i>Earned Points (A x B)</i>	<i>Max Points</i>
I.	Planning and preparation.		25%		0.75
II.	Educational environment.		25%		0.75
III.	Delivery of service.		25%		0.75
IV.	Professional development.		25%		0.75
<i>NTPE Observation & Practice Points/Rating</i>					3.00

(f) *Administrative action based on available data.* Nothing in these standards of use for NTPE observation and practice, this section or this chapter shall be construed to limit or constrain the authority of the chief school administrator of an LEA to initiate and take action on a personnel matter, including dismissal of an NTPE, based on information and data available at the time of the action.

(IV) Standards of Use for Student Performance Measures.

(a) *Building, school or configuration.* For the purposes of Paragraph (IV) relating to Standards of Use for Student Performance Measures, the term “building” shall mean a school or configuration of grades that is assigned a unique four-digit identification number by the Department unless the context clearly indicates otherwise.

(b) *Percentage.* The student performance for all students in the school building in which the NTPE is employed will be derived from the Building Level Score. As set forth in 22 Pa. Code § 19.1(IV)(a)(3), the Department will provide the Building Level Score for each building within an LEA based on available data. Building Level Scores will be published annually on the Department’s website. The Student Performance Rating shall comprise 20% of the Final NTPE Effectiveness Rating.

(c) *Student performance measure.* The student performance measure derived from the Building Level Score shall include, but is not limited to, the following when data is available and applicable to a building where the NTPE is employed:

- (1) Student performance on assessments.
- (2) Value-added assessment system data made available by the Department under section 221 of the Public School Code (24 P. S. § 2-221).
- (3) Graduation rate as reported to the Department under section 222 of the Public School Code (24 P. S. § 2-222).
- (4) Promotion rate.
- (5) Attendance rate as reported to the Department under section 2512 of the Public School Code (24 P. S. § 25-2512).
- (6) Industry certification examinations data.

(7) Advanced placement course participation.

(8) Scholastic aptitude test and preliminary scholastic aptitude test data.

(d) *Building level score.* Comparable to 22 Pa. Code § 19.1(IV)(a), the Student Performance Rating shall be determined through conversion of the Building Level Score. The percentage weight given to each measure component contained in Appendix A will be utilized in Building Level Score computations using available data. The Department or its designee will provide the Building Level Score for each building within an LEA based on available data. Building Level Scores will be published annually on the Department's website.

(e) *Student performance rating.* Each LEA shall utilize the conversions in Table F below to calculate the Student Performance Rating derived from the Building Level Score for each building with eligible building level data.

Table F: Conversion from 100 Point Scale to 0-3 Scale for Student Performance Rating	
<i>Building Level Score</i>	<i>0-3 Rating Scale*</i>
90.0 to 107	2.50-3.00
70.0 to 89.9	1.50-2.49
60.0 to 69.9	0.50-1.49
00.0 to 59.9	0.00-0.49

*The Department will publish the full conversion formula on its website.

LEAs shall add the Student Performance Rating to Parts (B)(2) and (C)(2) of the Rating Form.

(f) *Multiple building assignments.* If an NTPE performs professional work in two or more buildings where the NTPE is employed, the LEA will use measures from each building based on the percentage of the employee's work performed in each building in calculating the whole 20% for this portion of the final rating.

(g) *Absence of Building Level Score.* For NTPEs employed in buildings for which there is no Building Level Score reported on the Department website, the LEA shall utilize the rating from the NTPE observation and practice portion of the rating form in Part (A)(1) in place of the Student Performance Rating.

(h) *Administrative action based on available data.* Nothing in these standards of use for student performance measures, this section or this chapter shall be construed to limit or constrain the authority of the chief school administrator of an LEA to initiate and take action on a personnel matter, including dismissal of an NTPE, based on information and data available at the time of the action.

(V) Recordkeeping: Maintenance of Rating Tool Data, Records and Forms.

(a) *Records to be maintained.* It shall be the duty of the LEA to establish a permanent record system containing ratings for each employee within the LEA

and copies of all her or his ratings for the year shall be transmitted to the employee upon her or his request; or if any rating during the year is unsatisfactory copy of same shall be transmitted to the employee concerned. No employee shall be dismissed for incompetency or unsatisfactory performance unless such rating records have been kept on file by the LEA.

(b) *Reporting of data restricted to aggregate results.* Pursuant to Section 1123(i) of the Public School Code (24 P. S. § 11-1123(i)), LEAs shall provide to the Department the aggregate results of all NTPEs evaluations.

(c) *Confidentiality.* Each LEA shall maintain records in accordance with Section 708(b)(7) of the act of February 14, 2008 (P. L. 6, No. 3), known as the “Right-to-Know Law,” (65 P. S. § 67.708(b)(7)), and Sections 221(a)(1) and 1123(p) of the Public School Code (24 P. S. §§ 2-221(a)(1) and 11-1123(p)).

(VI) LEA alternative rating tool.

The Department will review at the request of an LEA an alternative rating tool that has been approved by the LEA governing board. The Department may approve for a maximum period of not more than five years any alternative rating tool that meets or exceeds the measures of effectiveness established under 24 P. S. § 11-1123.

Authority

The provisions of this § 19.3 issued under section 1123(a), (c)(3), (d)(2), (e) and (j) of the Public School Code of 1949 (24 P. S. § 11-1123(a), (c)(3), (d)(2), (e) and (j)); and sections 201 and 506 of The Administrative Code of 1929 (71 P. S. §§ 61 and 186).

Source

The provisions of this § 19.3 adopted June 13, 2014, effective July 1, 2014, 44 Pa.B. 3497.

APPENDIX A

Percentage Weights for Data Components/Indicators of the Building Level Score for the Educator Effectiveness Rating Tool

Appendix A contains the percentage weights assigned to data components for “building level data” and “student performance of all students in the school building” pursuant to section 1123 of the Public School Code (24 P. S. § 11-1123). The data components or indicators comprise the “building level score” for the professional employee or temporary professional employee rating form. The building level score is also the School Performance Profile for a school or building. For the purposes of this appendix, the term “building” shall mean a school or configuration of grades that is assigned a unique four-digit identification number by the Department unless the context clearly indicates otherwise.

**Table 1: Building Level Score—All Building Configurations
School Years 2012-2013 and 2013-2014**

<i>Components/Indicators</i>	<i>Building Configurations</i>					
	<i>K-12 Schools</i>	<i>Secondary Schools</i>	<i>Comprehensive CTCs¹</i>	<i>K-8 Schools with Grade 3</i>	<i>K-8 Schools w/out Grade 3</i>	
<i>Academic Achievement (40%)</i>	<i>% Factor</i>	<i>% Factor</i>	<i>% Factor</i>	<i>% Factor</i>	<i>% Factor</i>	
Mathematics/Algebra I—Percent Proficient or Advanced on PSSA/Keystone Exam	7.50	7.50	4.75	7.50	10.00	
Reading/Literature—Percent Proficient or Advanced on PSSA/Keystone Exam	7.50	7.50	4.75	7.50	10.00	
Science/Biology—Percent Proficient or Advanced on PSSA/Keystone Exam	7.50	7.50	4.75	7.50	10.00	
Writing—Percent Proficient or Advanced on PSSA	7.50	7.50	4.75	7.50	10.00	
Industry Standards-Based Competency Assessments—Percent Competent or Advanced	2.50	5.00	25.00	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	
Grade 3 Reading—Percent Proficient or Advanced on PSSA	2.50	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	10.00	Not Applicable	
SAT/ACT College Ready Benchmark	7.50	7.50	4.75	7.50	10.00	
<i>Closing the Achievement Gap— All Group (5%)</i>	<i>% Factor</i>	<i>% Factor</i>	<i>% Factor</i>	<i>% Factor</i>	<i>% Factor</i>	
Mathematics/Algebra I—Percent of Required Gap Closure Met	1.25	1.25	0.75	1.25	1.25	

**Table 1: Building Level Score—All Building Configurations
School Years 2012-2013 and 2013-2014**

<i>Components/Indicators</i>	<i>Building Configurations</i>				
	<i>K-12 Schools</i>	<i>Secondary Schools</i>	<i>Comprehensive CTCs¹</i>	<i>K-8 Schools with Grade 3</i>	<i>K-8 Schools w/out Grade 3</i>
Reading/Literature—Percent of Required Gap Closure Met	1.25	1.25	0.75	1.25	1.25
Science/Biology—Percent of Required Gap Closure Met	1.25	1.25	0.75	1.25	1.25
Writing—Percent of Required Gap Closure Met	1.25	1.25	0.75	1.25	1.25
<i>Closing the Achievement Gap—Historically Underperforming Students (5%)</i>	<i>% Factor</i>	<i>% Factor</i>	<i>% Factor</i>	<i>% Factor</i>	<i>% Factor</i>
Mathematics/Algebra I—Percent of Required Gap Closure Met	1.25	1.25	0.75	1.25	1.25
Reading/Literature—Percent of Required Gap Closure Met	1.25	1.25	0.75	1.25	1.25
Science/Biology—Percent of Required Gap Closure Met	1.25	1.25	0.75	1.25	1.25
Writing—Percent of Required Gap Closure Met	1.25	1.25	0.75	1.25	1.25

Table 1: Building Level Score—All Building Configurations School Years 2012-2013 and 2013-2014					
<i>Components/Indicators</i>	<i>Building Configurations</i>				
	<i>K-12 Schools</i>	<i>Secondary Schools</i>	<i>Comprehensive CTCs¹</i>	<i>K-8 Schools with Grade 3</i>	<i>K-8 Schools w/out Grade 3</i>
<i>Academic Achievement Factor Total</i>	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00
<i>Academic Growth (40%)</i>	<i>% Factor</i>	<i>% Factor</i>	<i>% Factor</i>	<i>% Factor</i>	<i>% Factor</i>
Mathematics/Algebra I—Meeting Annual Academic Growth Expectations	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00
Reading/Literature—Meeting Annual Academic Growth Expectations	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00
Science/Biology—Meeting Annual Academic Growth Expectations	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00
Writing—Meeting Annual Academic Growth Expectations	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00
<i>Academic Growth Factor Total</i>	40.00	40.00	40.00	40.00	40.00
<i>Other Academic Indicators (10%)</i>	<i>% Factor</i>	<i>% Factor</i>	<i>% Factor</i>	<i>% Factor</i>	<i>% Factor</i>
Cohort Graduation Rate or Promotion Rate ² (If No Graduation Rate)	2.50	2.50	2.50	5.00	5.00
Attendance	2.50	2.50	2.50	5.00	5.00
Advanced Placement (AP) or International Baccalaureate (IB) or College Credit	2.50	2.50	2.50	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

Table 1: Building Level Score—All Building Configurations School Years 2012-2013 and 2013-2014				
Components/Indicators	Building Configurations			
	K-12 Schools	Secondary Schools	Comprehensive CTCs ¹	K-8 Schools with Grade 3
PSAT/Plan Participation	2.50	2.50	2.50	Not Applicable
Other Academic Indicators Factor Total	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00
Overall Factor Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
<i>Extra Credit for Advanced Achievement</i>				
<i>Added Factor is 1% of each of the following except 2% for Advanced Placement:</i>				
Mathematics/Algebra I—PSSA/Keystone Exam	Percent of Students Advanced on Mathematics/Algebra I PSSA/Keystone Exam			
Reading/Literature—PSSA/Keystone Exam	Percent of Students Advanced on Reading/Literature PSSA/Keystone Exam			
Science/Biology—PSSA/Keystone Exam	Percent of Students Advanced on Science/Biology PSSA/Keystone Exam			
Writing—PSSA	Percent of Students Advanced on Writing PSSA			
Industry Standards-Based Competency Assessments	Percent of Students Advanced on Industry Standards-Based Competency Assessments			
Advanced Placement	Percent of Grade 12 Students Scoring 3 or higher on any one AP Exam (x2.5)			

Notes for Table 1:

¹ Comprehensive CTCs include full-time career technology centers and full-time area vocational-technical schools. Comprehensive CTC academic achievement is weighted at 44% while Closing the Achievement Gap is weighted at 3% for each group.

² Promotion rate is not included in 2012-2013 calculations; it will be included in subsequent years.

**Table 2: Building Level Score—All Building Configurations
School Year 2014-2015 and Thereafter**

<i>Components/Indicators¹</i>	<i>Building Configurations</i>					
	<i>K-12 Schools % Factor</i>	<i>Secondary Schools % Factor</i>	<i>Comprehensive CTCs² % Factor</i>	<i>K-8 Schools with Grade 3 % Factor</i>	<i>K-8 Schools w/out Grade 3 % Factor</i>	
<i>Academic Achievement (40%)</i>						
Mathematics/Algebra I—Percent Proficient or Advanced on PSSA/Keystone Exam	7.50	7.50	4.75	7.50	10.00	
English Language Arts/Literature—Percent Proficient or Advanced on PSSA/Keystone Exam	15.00	15.00	9.50	15.00	20.00	
Science/Biology—Percent Proficient or Advanced on PSSA/Keystone Exam	7.50	7.50	4.75	7.50	10.00	
Industry Standards-Based Competency Assessments—Percent Competent or Advanced	2.50	5.00	25.00	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	
Grade 3 English Language Arts—Percent Proficient or Advanced on PSSA	2.50	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	10.00	Not Applicable	
SAT/ACT College Ready Benchmark	5.00	5.00	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	
<i>Closing the Achievement Gap—All Group (5%)</i>	<i>% Factor</i>	<i>% Factor</i>	<i>% Factor</i>	<i>% Factor</i>	<i>% Factor</i>	
Mathematics/Algebra I—Percent of Required Gap Closure Met	1.25	1.25	0.75	1.25	1.25	
English Language Arts/Literature—Percent of Required Gap Closure Met	2.50	2.50	1.50	2.50	2.50	

**Table 2: Building Level Score—All Building Configurations
School Year 2014-2015 and Thereafter**

<i>Components/Indicators¹</i>	<i>Building Configurations</i>				
	<i>K-12 Schools</i>	<i>Secondary Schools</i>	<i>Comprehensive CTCs²</i>	<i>K-8 Schools with Grade 3</i>	<i>K-8 Schools w/out Grade 3</i>
Science/Biology—Percent of Required Gap Closure Met	1.25	1.25	0.75	1.25	1.25
<i>Closing the Achievement Gap—Historically Underperforming Students (5%)</i>	% Factor	% Factor	% Factor	% Factor	% Factor
Mathematics/Algebra I—Percent of Required Gap Closure Met	1.25	1.25	0.75	1.25	1.25
English Language Arts/Literature—Percent of Required Gap Closure Met	2.50	2.50	1.50	2.50	2.50
Science/Biology—Percent of Required Gap Closure Met	1.25	1.25	0.75	1.25	1.25
<i>Academic Achievement Factor Total</i>	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00
<i>Academic Growth (40%)</i>	% Factor	% Factor	% Factor	% Factor	% Factor
Mathematics/Algebra I—Meeting Annual Academic Growth Expectations	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00
English Language Arts/Literature—Meeting Annual Academic Growth Expectations	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00
Science/Biology—Meeting Annual Academic Growth Expectations	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00

Table 2: Building Level Score—All Building Configurations School Year 2014-2015 and Thereafter					
<i>Components/Indicators¹</i>	<i>Building Configurations</i>				
	<i>K-12 Schools</i>	<i>Secondary Schools</i>	<i>Comprehensive CTCs²</i>	<i>K-8 Schools with Grade 3</i>	<i>K-8 Schools w/out Grade 3</i>
<i>Academic Growth Factor Total</i>	40.00	40.00	40.00	40.00	40.00
<i>Other Academic Indicators (10%)</i>	<i>% Factor</i>	<i>% Factor</i>	<i>% Factor</i>	<i>% Factor</i>	<i>% Factor</i>
<i>Cohort Graduation Rate or Promotion Rate³ (If No Graduation Rate)</i>	2.50	2.50	2.50	5.00	5.00
<i>Attendance</i>	2.50	2.50	2.50	5.00	5.00
<i>Advanced Placement (AP) or International Baccalaureate (IB) or College Credit</i>	2.50	2.50	2.50	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
<i>PSAT/Plan⁴ Participation</i>	2.50	2.50	2.50	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
<i>Other Academic Indicators Factor Total</i>	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00
<i>Overall Factor Total</i>	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
<i>Extra Credit for Advanced Achievement</i>	<i>Added Factor is 1% of each of the following except 2% for English Language Arts/Literature and Advanced Placement:</i>				
<i>Mathematics/Algebra I—PSSA/Keystone Exam</i>	Percent of Students Advanced on Mathematics/Algebra I PSSA/Keystone Exam				
<i>English Language Arts/Literature—PSSA/Keystone Exam</i>	Percent of Students Advanced on English Language Arts/Literature PSSA/Keystone Exam				
<i>Science/Biology—PSSA/Keystone Exam</i>	Percent of Students Advanced on Science/Biology PSSA/Keystone Exam				

**Table 2: Building Level Score—All Building Configurations
School Year 2014-2015 and Thereafter**

Components/Indicators ¹	Building Configurations			
	K-12 Schools	Secondary Schools	Comprehensive CTCs ²	K-8 Schools with Grade 3
Industry Standards-Based Competency Assessments	K-8 Schools w/out Grade 3			
Advanced Placement	Percent of Students Advanced on Industry Standards-Based Competency Assessments			
	Percent of Grade 12 Students Scoring 3 or higher on any one AP Exam (x2.5)			

Notes for Table 2:

- ¹ Previous factor weightings assigned to Writing are included in English Language Arts/Literature factor weightings.
- ² Comprehensive CTCs include full-time career technology centers and full-time area vocational-technical schools. Comprehensive CTC academic achievement is weighted at 44% while Closing the Achievement Gap is weighted at 3% for each group.
- ³ Promotion rate is not included in 2012-2013 calculations; it will be included in subsequent years.
- ⁴ Plan will be replaced by ACT Aspire when ACT Aspire is fully operational.

Authority

The provisions of this Appendix A issued under section 1123(a), (c)(3), (d)(2), (e) and (j) of the Public School Code of 1949 (24 P. S. § 11-1123(a), (c)(3), (d)(2), (e) and (j)); and sections 201 and 506 of The Administrative Code of 1929 (71 P. S. §§ 61 and 186).

Source

The provisions of this Appendix A adopted June 13, 2014, effective July 1, 2014, 44 Pa.B. 3497.

[Next page is 21-1.]

19-64