Pennsylvania
Department of Education
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For the 2009-10 Rating Period

GENERAL INFORMATION

LEA Name:
Central Montco Technical High School

AUN Number:
123460957

Address:
821 Plymouth Road  Plymouth Meeting, PA 19462-2575

Name Superintendent or Chief School Administrator:
R. Walter Slauch

For Information Contact:
Walt Slauch

Email:
wslauch@cmths.org

Phone:
610-277-2301

TEACHER INFORMATION

Describe the LEA’s system used to evaluate the performance of your teachers:
CMTHS uses an alternative evaluation instrument based on the PDE 426 and 428, yet with Performance Indicators that have been adapted to the unique nature of Career and Technical Education. The indicators focus on the PDE’s Bureau of Career and Technical Education’s emphasis on the integration of academic standards with technical skills and follows the key components of the SREB Technical Centers that Work (TCTW) model. The Assistant Director performs the evaluation of the professional and support staffs. All Professional Employees at Central Montco Technical High School are rated a minimum of twice a year. Temporary Professional Employees are rated a minimum of twice a year. Evaluations are performed on a formal and informal basis. All ratings are discussed with the employee and substantiated by anecdotal records supplied by the employee and/or collected by the evaluator. CMTHS uses a rubric to define, for the evaluator and teacher, the levels of proficiency of each Performance Indicator on the evaluation instrument. Using the Performance Indicators listed in each category, the evaluator will attach a numerical value to the teacher’s performance on each indicator using the following scale: Exemplary/Satisfactory 6-7 points Proficient/Satisfactory 4-5 points Needs Improvement/Satisfactory 2-3 points Unsatisfactory 0-1 points. The evaluator will add the numerical values of each Performance Indicator and divide by the number of Performance Indicators to determine the Final Numerical Rating for each category. The Overall Numerical Rating will be determined by adding the Final Numerical Rating for each category and dividing by four (4). Whenever an unsatisfactory rating is given, the rating will be discussed with the employee and supported by anecdotal records. These anecdotal records and other information collected during the evaluation are used as the basis for an intervention plan to improve performance. Two consecutive unsatisfactory ratings of a professional employee may result in dismissal. It is possible that a gross deficiency in a single category is sufficiently serious to warrant an overall rating of unsatisfactory.

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

a. Teacher Development?
   Yes

   If a teacher is rated “Needs Improvement” or “Unsatisfactory” individual improvement goals and/or full intervention plans are established. In addition, if a clear “Needs Improvement” trend emerges among a series of teachers, professional development plans are also established. At CMTHS, professional development needs are usually determined by school-wide initiatives and through the use of survey data.

d. Teacher Retention and Removal?
   Yes

   Two consecutive unsatisfactory ratings of a professional employee can be used to support a dismissal on the grounds of incompetence. It is possible that a gross deficiency in a single category of the evaluation instrument is sufficiently serious to warrant an overall rating of unsatisfactory.

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.
   Yes
CMTHS uses a rubric to define, for the evaluator and teacher, the levels of proficiency of each Performance Indicator on the evaluation instrument. These Performance Indicators are used to determine teacher competence in the following categories using the following point ranges: Planning and Preparation – Point Range = 0-7; Classroom Environment – Point Range = 0-7; Instructional Delivery – Point Range = 0-7; Professionalism – Point Range = 0-7. Using the Performance Indicators listed in each category, the evaluator will attach a numerical value to the teacher’s performance on each indicator using the following scale: Exemplary/Satisfactory 6-7 points Proficient/Satisfactory 4-5 points Needs Improvement/Satisfactory 2-3 points Unsatisfactory 0-1 points. The evaluator will add the numerical values of each Performance Indicator and divide by the number of Performance Indicators to determine the Final Numerical Rating for each category. The Overall Numerical Rating will be determined by adding the Final Numerical Rating for each category and dividing by four (4).

Does the LEA publicly report teacher evaluation data by school?

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

No

NA

LEA Teacher Evaluations Summary:

Number Rated 25
Number Not Rated
Total Number Employed 25

LEA Teacher Evaluations Detail:

Alternate Approved Evaluation System:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Employed</th>
<th>Not Rated</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
<th>Level 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Denominator)</td>
<td>(Numerator)%</td>
<td>(Numerator)%</td>
<td>(Numerator)%</td>
<td>(Numerator)%</td>
<td>(Numerator)%</td>
<td>(Numerator)%</td>
<td>(Numerator)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RatingTitle</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory/Satisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Montco Technical High</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>25 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Describe the LEA's system used to evaluate the performance of your Principals:

The principal at CMTHS is evaluated using a system that combines the numerical results of an evaluation instrument with the level of achievement on personal and organizational goals. The principal is formally evaluated by the director at the end of each school year with a progress meeting at mid-term. The evaluation instrument incorporates the use of self-evaluation. The evaluator considers the self-evaluation ratings in the final year-end rating. The evaluation instrument focuses on three categories: Planning, Evaluating and Coordinating; Decision Making; and Communicating. Using the performance indicators listed in each category, the evaluator will attach a numerical value to the principal’s performance on each indicator using the following scale: Outstanding = 4 Satisfactory = 3 Needs Improvement = 2 Unsatisfactory = 1 The evaluator will add the numerical values of each performance indicator and divide by the number of performance indicators to determine the Final Numerical Rating for each category. The Overall Numerical Rating will be determined by adding the Final Numerical Rating for each category and dividing by four (4). In addition, the principal is evaluated on the achievement of four (4) personal and/or organizational goals developed at the beginning of the school year in collaboration with the director. The goals are established based on student and organizational performance data and other personal and organizational needs. The evaluator will attach a numerical value to each goal using the following scale: Goal Attained = 1 Goal Not Attained = 0 Using the above scale the principal can earn a total of four (4) points. The principal’s year-end rating (Rating Points) is determined by adding the Final Numerical Rating on the evaluation instrument with the points earned by goals achievement for a total of eight (8) points. The Final Rating Points are used to inform principal compensation. If the principal receives an unsatisfactory rating, the rating will be discussed with the principal and supported by anecdotal records. These anecdotal records and other information collected during the evaluation are used as the basis for an intervention plan to improve performance. Two consecutive unsatisfactory ratings of a principal may result in dismissal.

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

a. Principal Development? No

b. Principal Compensation? Yes

At CMTHS, the principal’s year-end rating (Rating Points) is determined by adding the final numerical rating on the evaluation instrument to the points earned by goals achievement. That total score becomes part of a mathematical formula that determines the principal’s compensation. This is a Joint Operating Committee approved procedure.

c. Principal Promotions? No

d. Principal Retention and Removal? Yes

If the principal receives an unsatisfactory rating, the rating will be discussed with the principal and supported by anecdotal records. These anecdotal records and other information collected during the evaluation are used as the basis for an intervention plan to improve performance. Two consecutive unsatisfactory ratings of a principal may 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? Yes

One or more of the organizational goals developed by or for the principal would include implementing a plan to increase the pre-test to post-test scores on the NOCTI exam by a given percentage.
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

NA

Does the LEA publicly report principal evaluation data by school?

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

NA

LEA Principal Evaluations Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating System</th>
<th>Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Rated</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Not Rated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Employed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEA Principal Evaluation Detail:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Not Rated</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
<th>Level 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Numerator) %</td>
<td>(Numerator) %</td>
<td>(Numerator) %</td>
<td>(Numerator) %</td>
<td>(Numerator) %</td>
<td>(Numerator) %</td>
<td>(Numerator) %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory/Satisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>* %</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>* %</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>* %</td>
<td>* %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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