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

CCCTC uses the standard Pennsylvania Department of Education teacher evaluation form PDE-428. The PDE forms are based on the Danielson models of effective teaching and supporting research. The indicators on these forms are used to help the assistant director as he evaluates the teachers during semi-annual observations of Vocational I teachers and annual observations of Vocation II teachers. Following the formal evaluation, the Assistant Director then meets with each teacher individually to discuss and review the evaluation. Should a teacher be identified as unsatisfactory, he/she would then be required to complete an individualized teacher improvement plan, observed regularly, both formal and informal, and coached between observations. The plan would be developed specifically for that teacher by the director and/or assistant director to include additional professional development to address weaknesses noted in the evaluation. (Note: This step has not been necessary, as all 15 teachers had satisfactory performance.) All teachers are informally evaluated daily through walk-throughs, discussions/conversations with administration, administrators talking with students, etc. Training for all teachers on topics covered under school goals takes place at five (5) in-service days annually. The school does not use the evaluation system to make salary decisions; however, unsatisfactory evaluations could lead to dismissal if the teacher improvement plan intervention is not productive.
Does the LEA use the results of the teacher evaluation system described above in decisions regarding:

a. Teacher Development? No

NA

b. Teacher Compensation? No

NA

c. Teacher Promotions? No

NA

d. Teacher Retention and Removal? Yes

If a teacher receives a poor evaluation, he/she is put on a teacher improvement plan. If he/she would receive two unsatisfactory evaluations, he/she would then be terminated. However, because of the effectiveness of teacher improvement plans, no teacher has been terminated for a number of years.

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

NA

LEA Teacher Evaluations Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Rated</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Not Rated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Employed</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LEA Teacher Evaluations Detail:

Standard Evaluation System:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Total Employed</th>
<th>Not Rated</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Denominator)</td>
<td>(Numerator)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearfield County CTC</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

The Clearfield County Career & Technology Center's Joint Operating Committee (board) informally evaluates its Executive Director on a monthly basis. The school continues to grow, having both added and accomplished a number of new endeavors over the last year. The Executive Director recently led the school through a successful $10M renovation. The school's NOCTI (end-of-program assessment) scores have risen from 56% in 2004 at the beginning of the tenure of the current Executive Director to 72% in 2010. The Executive Director participates in professional development activities yearround, which include PA Association of Career and Technical Administrators, as well as those provided by the Pennsylvania Department of Education. Because of these successful activities, the Executive Director continues to be retained by the board. A formal evaluation system will be in place for the upcoming year.

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

a. Principal Development? NA
b. Principal Compensation? NA
c. Principal Promotions? NA
d. Principal Retention and Removal? NA

Does the LEA principal 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 Principals (Less than 3 Years)?  Other
b. Experienced Principals (More than 3 Years)?  Other

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.  NA

Does the LEA publicly report principal evaluation data by school?

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

LEA Principal Evaluations Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating System</th>
<th>No</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/Title</th>
<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></td>
<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>Unsatisfactory/Satisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Satisfactory</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.