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

The system used at Central Westmoreland Career and Technology Center is based on the Charlotte Danielson model, as well as, PDE forms 426-428. Each subsection lists individual criteria which are rated as (NR) Not Rated, (S) Satisfactory, (N) Needs Improvement or (U) Unsatisfactory. Then 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 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 has an annual performance review unless they are on a professional improvement plan, in which case, it is bi-annual or more often as directed by the circumstances of the professional improvement plan. 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 observations, 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? No
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 National 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? 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Rated</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Not Rated</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Employed</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEA Teacher Evaluations Detail:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>Un satisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Westmoreland CTC</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>1 3.2 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>30 96.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>1 3.2 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>30 96.8 %</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 system was developed under the 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 this tool. The new administration team is working to correct this deficit.

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

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

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?  If Yes, describe background and process.  
      No

Does the LEA publicly report principal evaluation data by school?
   a. Yes or No?  (Web link provided if applicable.)  
      No

Does your LEA have at least one Principal position?  
Yes

Does your LEA have a Standardized Principal Evaluation System?  
Yes

LEA Principal Evaluations Summary:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Rated</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Not Rated</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Employed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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>(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>Satisfactory</td>
<td></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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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.

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