

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

---

GENERAL INFORMATION

---

**LEA Name:**

Cumberland-Perry AVTS

**AUN Number:**

115211657

**Address:**

110 Old Willow Mill Rd Mechanicsburg, PA 17050-1816

**Name Superintendent or Chief School Administrator:**

Cindy Mortzfeldt

**For Information Contact:**

Mary E. Rodman

**Email:**

mrodman@cpavts.org

**Phone:**

717.697.0354

---

TEACHER INFORMATION

---

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

CPAVTS uses the PDE-5501 for the evaluation of professional instructional staff. CPAVTS implements a modified clinical supervision and evaluation model. Teachers are evaluated based on the four components of the PDE-5501: Planning, Preparation, Technique, and Pupil Reaction. Administrators conduct daily walk-throughs. Administrators conduct formal observations two to four times per year. Each formal observation is a minimum of 40 minutes. Tenured teachers are formally evaluated in writing with the PDE-5501 based on lesson plan submissions, walk-through data, at least one formal observation of a minimum of a 40-minute period, and all other aspects of their teaching performance on an annual basis at a minimum. Other aspects of their teaching performance include but are not limited to attendance and punctuality, classroom management, and interactions with students, administrators, and parents. The process may be modified if a teacher earns an unsatisfactory rating. In the case of an unsatisfactory rating, the teacher will be re-evaluated after implementation of a formal, written improvement plan, and a minimum of a four-month improvement plan implementation period. Non-tenured teachers are formally evaluated in writing with the PDE-5501 based on all of the aforementioned strategies, and are formally observed (40 minute minimum period per observation) twice per semester, and formally evaluated with the PDE-5501 in writing twice per year. The principal and assistant principals conduct all walk-throughs and observations. The principal makes the recommendation for a formal evaluation or rating, supported by documentation, anecdotal records, and the recommendation of the administrative director, who may also conduct a formal observation. If the recommendation for an unsatisfactory rating is approved by the administrative director, the documentation, records, and other pertinent data is reviewed by the Chief School Administrator, who may then approve or disapprove the rating. The Chief School Administrator makes the final determination for unsatisfactory evaluations based on the data supplied by the administrative director. Training of administrators for the supervision and evaluation of teachers occurs through formal workshops provided by legal consultants, the school solicitor, the Pennsylvania Association of Career and Technical Administrators (PACTA), and through conferences with the administrative director and chief school administrator. Teachers receive feedback on all submissions to administration, including lesson plans, essential questions, and each formal observation includes a post-observation conference to encourage and aid improvement of instruction. Formal observations may be scheduled in advance or unscheduled. Any unsatisfactory observation would lead to additional formal observations, a written improvement plan signed by both the principal and the teacher, and would include input from the administrative director. At any administrator-teacher conference for performance that is less than satisfactory, a representative of the CPAVTS Teachers Association would also be invited to be present. A first rating of unsatisfactory performance would include a closely monitored written performance improvement plan with specific benchmarks, activities, and objective and measurable outcomes for improvement. An unsatisfactory observation by one administrator would require a second administrator to conduct the next observation. However, the final evaluation of the teacher would be conducted by the principal or administrative director.

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

a. Teacher Development? Yes

A single evaluation indicating a performance that may be improved through education and training is used to develop the individual performance improvement plan. If multiple evaluations indicate that performance may be improved through education and training, a school-wide professional development activity may be planned.

b. Teacher Compensation? No

c. Teacher Promotions? Yes

Although we do not have a JOC policy guide to this effect, a teacher rated as unsatisfactory would never be considered for or offered a promotion or any type of administrative position.

d. Teacher Retention and Removal? Yes

A teacher rated as unsatisfactory would not be offered continued employment after one year if the teacher had not yet acquired tenure. If the teacher has acquired tenure, the teacher would be terminated after two consecutive unsatisfactory evaluations. The school strictly follows the PA Code and dismisses tenured teachers who have accumulated two 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

NA

**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

NA

**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	34
Number Not Rated	
Total Number Employed	34

**LEA Teacher Evaluations Detail:**

**Standard Evaluation System:**

Building	Total Employed	Not Rated		Satisfactory		Unsatisfactory	
	(Denominator)	(Numerator)	%	(Numerator)	%	(Numerator)	%
Cumberland-Perry AVTS	34	0	0 %	33	97.1 %	1	2.9 %
<b>Totals</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0 %</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>97.1 %</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2.9 %</b>

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 principal meets with the administrative director after July 1 to determine focus areas for the succeeding school year. The administrative director monitors and reviews weekly walk-through data, monthly progress reports, student performance data on NOCTI pre-tests and post-tests, after-school professional education sessions conducted by the principal for instructional staff, written data documenting conferences between the principal and the teachers, lesson plan data, and other areas of the principal's performance including attendance, interactions with staff, students, and parents, presentations at advisory and Joint Operating Committee meetings. The administrative director meets with the principal in January to conduct a preliminary evaluation and to provide feedback. Formative feedback is provided throughout the school year. In June, a second evaluation conference is conducted for the final evaluation for the year. Based on this conference and evaluation, salary increases are recommended to the JOC for approval at the end of June. If an unsatisfactory rating occurs in January, a written performance improvement plan is developed, signed by the principal and administrative director with objective, measurable benchmarks for improvement.

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

a. Principal Development? Yes

Any areas in need of improvement would be cited for required professional development. CPAVTS pays for all coursework required, recommended, or at the principal's discretion for the purpose of professional development.

b. Principal Compensation? Yes

A range of salary increases are allowed based on the final evaluation. Commendable = 4%; Satisfactory = 3.5%; NI = 2%; Unsatisfactory = no raise.

c. Principal Promotions? Yes

Although not formalized through a JOC policy, a principal with less than a satisfactory rating would not be considered for a promotion or new assignment, unless it was a demotion.

d. Principal Retention and Removal? Yes

CPAVTS follows the PA Code, and terminates personnel after two consecutive unsatisfactory performance ratings with implementation of a formal performance improvement plan between each rating.

**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)? Twice a year

b. Experienced Principals (More than 3 Years)? Twice a year

**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:**

Rating System

Standard

Number Rated	1
Number Not Rated	_____
Total Number Employed	1

**LEA Principal Evaluation Detail:**

	Total Employed	Not Rated	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6
	(Denominator)	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %
RatingTitle			Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory			Commendable
Unsatisfactory/Satisfactory			Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory			Satisfactory
<b>Totals</b>	*	* %	* %	* %	* %	* %	* %	* %

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