

Pennsylvania
Department of Education
Teacher and Principal Evaluation Information
Individual LEA Data
For the 2009-10 Rating Period

GENERAL INFORMATION

LEA Name:

Greater Johnstown CTC

AUN Number:

108112607

Address:

445 Schoolhouse Road Johnstown, PA 15904-2927

Name Superintendent or Chief School Administrator:

John S. Augustine II

For Information Contact:

John S. Augustine II

Email:

jaugustine@gjctc.org

Phone:

814-269-4545

TEACHER INFORMATION

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

Our district uses PDE forms 5501 and 426 to evaluate our teachers. The PDE forms are based on the Danielson model of effective teaching and supporting research. We use the indicators on these forms to help our principals as they evaluate the teachers during annual observations of Instructional/Vocational II teachers (form 5501) and semi-annual observations of Instructional/ Vocational I teachers (form 426). GJCTC follows the Standards for use of the form PDE 5501 GENERAL RATING¹. Designated rater shall use this rating card for each and every official employee rating.² The designated rater will place his/her signature in the block provided for either the satisfactory or unsatisfactory rating at the top of the card. ³ Professional employees shall be rated a minimum of once each year. ⁴ Due consideration shall be given in the rating process to the following factors: professional assignment, intellectual level of students and learning/behavioral problems which might affect professional performance and factors over which the professional has control.⁵ Using the descriptors listed in each category on the card, the rater will attach a numerical value to the employee's performance in each of the four categories – Personality, Preparation, Technique and Pupil Reaction – to a maximum numerical value of 20 points per category. The aggregate numerical value will not exceed 80 points when adding the four categories.⁶ The final numerical rating for each category will appear in the designated block at the bottom of each category column. The total numerical score of the four categories shall be placed in the rating box. ⁷ Descriptors in each category shall not be weighted. The objective is to substantiate the numerical score with anecdotal records using the descriptors simply as guides.⁸ A rating in any category of less than 20 points shall be substantiated by anecdotal records and discussed with the employee.⁹ A copy of the rating shall be provided to any employee upon request.**DETAILED APPRAISAL FOR UNSATISFACTORY RATING**¹. When an unsatisfactory rating in any major category I, II, III or IV is given an employee, the rater must place a check in the block opposite that category designation.² It is possible that a gross deficiency in a single category might be sufficiently serious to warrant a total rating of unsatisfactory.³ Wherever an unsatisfactory rating is given, each such recorded rating must be stated and the specific circumstances supported by anecdotal records. The records must include specific details of evidence likely to be important in the event the services of an employee are to be discontinued.⁴ Two consecutive unsatisfactory ratings of a professional employee are necessary to support a dismissal on the grounds of incompetency.GJCTC also follows the directions for form PDE 426**PERFORMANCE EVALUATION**Directions: Examine all sources of evidence provided by the teacher and bear in mind the aspects of teaching for each of the four categories used in this form. Refer to the rubric language, checking the appropriate aspects of teaching, and indicating the sources of evidence used to determine the evaluation of the results in each category. Finally, assign an overall evaluation of performance, sign the form and gain the signature of the employee.

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

- a. Teacher Development? No
- b. Teacher Compensation? No
- c. Teacher Promotions? No
- d. Teacher Retention and Removal? Yes

Our district follows the PA Code and dismisses teachers who have accumulated 2 consecutive unsatisfactory evaluations.

Does the LEA teacher evaluation system described above include the following as evaluation criterion:

- a. Student Achievement Outcomes? No
- b. Student Growth Data? No

How often does the LEA formally evaluate:

- a. New Teachers (Less than 3 Years)? Twice a year
- b. Experienced Teachers (More than 3 Years)? Annually

Does the LEA use weighting formula(e) and/or rubric(s) to guide teacher evaluators?

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

Does the LEA publicly report teacher evaluation data by school?

- a. Yes or No? (Web link provided if applicable.) No

LEA Teacher Evaluations Summary:

Number Rated	17
Number Not Rated	
Total Number Employed	17

LEA Teacher Evaluations Detail:

Standard Evaluation System:

Building	Total Employed	Not Rated		Satisfactory		Unsatisfactory	
	(Denominator)	(Numerator)	%	(Numerator)	%	(Numerator)	%
Greater Johnstown CTC	17	0	0 %	17	100 %	0	0 %
Totals	17	0	0 %	17	100 %	0	0 %

Note: - All Building percentages are the result of dividing the number of ratings at each level (Numerator) by the building total (Denominator)

- All Total percentages are the result of dividing the total number of ratings at each level (Numerator) by the overall total (Denominator)

***In order to ensure that individual ratings can not be deduced , we have not reported any Teacher or Principal information if building level or LEA level data is less than or equal to 5**

PRINCIPAL INFORMATION

Describe the LEA's system used to evaluate the performance of your Principals:

GJCTC follows Joint Operating Committee Policy No. 312 for evaluation of Administrative Director. The JOC evaluates the Administrative Director and the same format is used for the Administrative Director to evaluate the Principal, locally know as Assistant Administrator of Secondary Education.No. 312SECTION: EMPLOYEEESTITLE: EVALUATION OFADMINISTRATIVE DIRECTORADOPTED: January 22, 2008312. EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE DIRECTOR1. Authority Regular, periodic evaluation of the Administrative Director's performance is a JointOperating Committee responsibility. In carrying out this responsibility, the JointOperating Committee recognizes that the Administrative Director is entitled to sucha review in an objective and straightforward manner so that leadership of the centermay be as effective as possible.SC 1850.1 The Joint Operating Committee shall evaluate the performance of the AdministrativeDirector annually and at any time such action is prudent.Prior to the beginning of the period under evaluation, the Joint Operating Committeeand Administrative Director shall agree upon the criteria to be used for evaluationpurposes.Evaluation criteria may include any of the following:1.Administrative Director's self-evaluation.2.Objectives/Goals agreed upon annually by the Joint Operating Committee andAdministrative Director.3.Working relationship between the Joint Operating Committee and theAdministrative Director.4.Administrative Director's relationship with staff, students and community.5.Administrative Director's professional growth.6.Compilation of assessments by individual Joint Operating Committee members,which shall then be reviewed by the Joint Operating Committee andAdministrative Director.7.Evaluation interviews between the Joint Operating Committee andAdministrative Director during which no other business is discussed.8.Consideration of objective data.As an outcome of the Administrative Director's evaluation, the Joint OperatingCommittee should:1.Recognize strengths and assist the Administrative Director in capitalizing onthem.2.Identify weaknesses and establish a course of action that will assist theAdministrative Director in improving performance in these areas.3.Establish specific objectives to advance the center toward its goals.Pol. 302 4. Determine the necessity of any action regarding the employment of theAdministrative Director.

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

- a. Principal Development? No
N/A
- bPrincipal Compensation? No
N/A
- c. Principal Promotions? No
N/A
- d. Principal Retention and Removal? Yes

The focus of the GJCTC is to improve the performance of principals. Principals receiving an ineffective rating will receive intensive professional development and a specific performance plan for the following year. A second ineffective rating will result in dismissal.

Does the LEA principal evaluation system described above include the following as evaluation criterion:

- a. Student Achievement Outcomes? No
- b. Student Growth Data? No
N/A

How often does the LEA formally evaluate:

- a. New Principals (Less than 3 Years)? Annually
- b. Experienced Principals (More than 3 Years)? Annually

Does the LEA use weighting formula(e) and/or rubric(s) to guide principal evaluators?

- a. Yes or No? If Yes, describe background and process. No
N/A

Does the LEA publicly report principal evaluation data by school?

- a. Yes or No? (Web link provided if applicable.) No

LEA Principal Evaluations Summary:

Rating System	No
Number Rated	2
Number Not Rated	_____
Total Number Employed	2

LEA Principal Evaluation Detail:

	Total Employed	Not Rated	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6
	(Denominator)	(Numerator) %						
RatingTitle								
Unsatisfactory/Satisfactory			Unsatisfactory					Satisfactory
Totals	*	* %	* %	* %	* %	* %	* %	* %

Note: - All Total percentages are the result of dividing the total number of ratings at each level (Numerator) by the overall total (Denominator)

***In order to ensure that individual ratings can not be deduced , we have not reported any Teacher or Principal information if building level or LEA level data is less than or equal to 5**