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

- The system utilized at Forbes Road CTC is based on the Charlotte Danielson model, as well as PDE's 426-428 forms.  • Each subsection lists individual criteria which are rated as (NR) Not Rated, (S) Satisfactory, (N) Needs Improvement or (U) Unsatisfactory. Then if 50% or more of the criteria under the specific heading are "satisfactory" then the section is considered satisfactory; conversely if 50% or more of the criterion are "needs improvement" or "unsatisfactory" then the category is determined as "unsatisfactory". • The Administrative Director, Assistant Director/Principal and the Assistant Director/Supervisor of Vocational Education are the evaluators.  • Teachers that are non-tenured have bi-annual formal evaluations with informal observations occurring randomly throughout the year. Tenured staff have an annual performance review unless they are on a PIP plan, in which case it is bi-annual or more often as dictated by the circumstances of the PIP. • The training of the evaluators has occurred during their certification process at the collegiate level. At the end of the evaluation there is an area that has been included for teacher comments, as well as observation general notes/comments, commendations, and recommendations.
Does the LEA use the results of the teacher evaluation system described above in decisions regarding:

a. Teacher Development? Yes
   - As individual teachers have specific instructional remediation needs the administration develops a "PIP" (Professional Improvement Plan) to address the deficiencies. That "PIP" has benchmarks for success and timelines for institution and completion. - If notable areas of concern exist across the faculty, i.e. "Classroom Management/Discipline Strategies" - the administration procures the services of an outside service provided to present training such as "CHAMPS" and "MAX Teaching Strategies" staff wide. The unified in-service trainings are planned collaboratively with the subject matter experts/presenters.

b. Teacher Compensation? No

c. Teacher Promotions? No

d. Teacher Retention and Removal? Yes
   - Two, back-to-back, unsatisfactory ratings within four months, and/or an incomplete PIP plan, not maintaining certification requirements (ACT 48 Hours), not maintaining a valid certificate, not successfully passing the required PRAXIS exams, or not passing the NOCTI Occupational Competency Assessment (OCA) are just cause for termination.

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? Yes
   - Forbes Road CTC utilizes a rubric scoring method which is a copulation of PDE 426/428 as well as Charlotte Danielson's work. It is scaled on: (NR) - Not Rated; (S) - Satisfactory; (N) - Needs Improvement; and (U) - Unsatisfactory. Major Duty areas include: Planning and Preparation with Subsections of: - Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy, - Demonstrating Knowledge of Students, - Selecting Instructional Goals, - Designing Coherent Instruction, - Assessing Student Learning, - Classroom Environment with Subsections of: - Promoted an environment of respect and trust with students, - Establishing a Culture of Learning, - Managing Classroom Procedures, - Managing Student Behavior, - Instructional Delivery with Subsections of: - Communicating Clearly and Accurately, - Engaging Students in the Learning Process, - Providing Student Feedback, - Professional Responsibilities with Subsections of: - Maintaining Accurate Records, - Demonstrating Professionalism. If 50% or more of the criterion under and individual subsection is rated as satisfactory then the entire section is satisfactory. Conversely if 50% or more of the criterion are rated as unsatisfactory then the entire section is unsatisfactory. If 50% of more of the criterion are identified as "needs improvement" then a Professional Improvement Plan (PIP) is developed to improve the areas identified.

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

LEA Teacher Evaluations Summary:
LEA Teacher Evaluations Detail:

<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>Unsatisfactory/Satisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbes Road CTC</td>
<td>35 0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>35 0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 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.

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

The current Forbes Administrative Staff Evaluation tool is a 0-4 point system with one additional NA (Not Applicable) category available. The points system is then divided into five (5) overall ratings categories which are: Excellent - 160-144 points; Above Average - 143 - 128 points; Satisfactory - 127 - 112 points; Needs Improvement - 111 - 96 points; and Unsatisfactory - 95 - 0 points. This system was developed under a former Director's regime and has been in place for a number of years. At this time there is not any known research basis for the tool. There are two major skill categories: Personal Attributes and Management Skills. Each of these major categories contains 15 and 25 specific criteria respectively, which are specifically related to the heading. The specific criteria for the Personal Attributes includes, but are not limited to: Joint Operating Committee (JOC) relations; parent relations; ethics/professionalism; time management; decision making; oral and written communication skills; work ethic/punctuality; community relations; self-motivated. The specific criteria for the Management Skills includes, but are not limited to for the category; carries out JOC policies; schedules/organizes/supervises staff; team work; accepts constructive criticism; delegates authority/maintains accountability; leadership; provides timely and accurate reports/data analysis; keep Administrative Director informed on issues; engages in professional growth and development; maintains student discipline; demonstrates position knowledge; student/staff morale; understands/complies with Collective Bargaining Agreements (CBA(s); conducts objective subordinate staff evaluation; budget financial resources and appropriate use of same; as well as prioritize duties and responsibilities of the position. The Assistant Director/Principal is evaluated by the Administrative Director. This evaluation is conducted on annual basis which occurs by June 30.

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

a. Principal Development? Yes
If significant deficiencies are noted then a Professional Improvement Plan (PIP) is constructed to improve those deficit areas.

b. Principal Compensation? Yes
   A two-tier bonus system is in place for high end performances above the satisfactory level. Those bonuses are $700 or $1,000 respectively for "Above Average" and "Excellent" performance.

c. Principal Promotions? Yes
   The next step up for the Assistant Director/Principal, should a vacancy occur, is the Administrative Director's position provided the person is certificated. The next promotional step up for the Assistant Director/Supervisor of Vocational Education is the Assistant Director/Principal or Administrative Directors position; again provided proper certification is in place, as well as the Administrative PRAXIS test has been successfully passed.

d. Principal Retention and Removal? Yes
   Two consecutive unsatisfactory ratings and/or not successfully completing a PIP program will result in loss of position.

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)? 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? Yes
   This system was developed under a former Director's regime and has been in place for a number of years. At this time there is not any known research basis for the tool. There are two major skill categories, which are: Personal Attributes and Management Skills. Each of these major categories contains 15 and 25 specific criteria respectively, which are related to the heading. The specific criteria for the Personal Attributes includes, but are not limited to: Joint Operating Committee (JOC) relations; parent relations; ethics/professionalism; time management; decision making; oral and written communication skills; work ethic/punctuality; community relations; self-motivated. The specific criteria for the Management Skills includes, but are not limited to for the category: carries out JOC policies; schedules/organizes/supervises staff; team work; accepts constructive criticism; delegates authority/maintains accountability; leadership; provides timely and accurate reports/data analysis; keep Administrative Director informed on issues; engages in professional growth and development; maintains student discipline; demonstrates position knowledge; student/staff morale; understands/complies with Collective Bargaining Agreements (CBA(s)); conducts objective subordinate staff evaluation; budget financial resources and appropriate use of same; as well as prioritize duties and responsibilities of the position. The Assistant Director/Principal is evaluated by the Administrative Director. These evaluations are conducted on annual basis which occurs by June 30.

Does the LEA publicly report principal evaluation data by school?

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

Does your LEA have at least one Principal position? Yes

Does your LEA have at Standarized Principal Evaluation System? Yes

LEA Principal Evaluations Summary:

| Number Rated | 1 |
### LEA Principal Evaluation Detail:

<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>%</td>
<td>(Numerator)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>(Numerator)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>(Numerator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory/Satisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</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.