

Pennsylvania
Department of Education
Teacher and Principal Evaluation Information
Individual LEA Data
For the 2011-12 Rating Period

GENERAL INFORMATION

LEA Name:

Centre Learning Community CS

AUN Number:

110143060

Address:

2643 W College Ave State College, PA, 16801

Name Superintendent or Chief School Administrator:

Kosta Dussias

For Information Contact:

Kosta Dussias

Email:

kosta@clccharter.org

Phone:

814-861-7980

TEACHER INFORMATION

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

Although our peer review evaluation system has not been evaluated by PDE following is a brief description of the process: A Summary of the Centre Learning Community Peer Assessment System: The Centre Learning Community Peer Assessment System is multifaceted and comprehensive. It is also uniquely suited to meet the needs of our teacher lead school. There are three components to the assessment system; a weekly curriculum meeting, peer observations, and year-end staff presentations. Each of these components is designed to assist the CLC staff in assessing the overall performance of individual teachers. What follows is a brief summary of the system. Weekly Curriculum Meetings Each Monday, the instructional staff meets from 3:00 to 4:30 in order to review and discuss instructional methodology and issues that impact the learning environment. Each teacher is expected to contribute to these discussions, develop and implement instructional methods that come out of these discussions, and assess the effectiveness of these instructional methods. In the end, these meetings become a cyclical process of discussion, development, implementation, assessment, and discussion. Peer Observations A CLC teacher is observed by at least one of their peers twice a year, once in the fall and once in the spring, The observation may occur over several days, and it is designed to be a cooperative effort in which the teacher being observed and the teacher doing the observation work together in order to assess and improve performance. The teacher being observed receives meaningful feedback. The teacher conducting the observation is able to observe new instructional techniques that he or she may implement in their classroom. Following the observation, the participating teachers meet to discuss the observation and complete an observation report that details what each teacher learned from the observation. This report will then be made available to all members of the CLC staff.

Year-end Staff Presentations In April of each year, each instructional staff member is responsible for giving a presentation that documents what that teacher and his/her students have done throughout the year. Think of this presentation as a living-portfolio. Teachers are encouraged to provide curriculum examples, test results, and student work as evidence of student progress. The teacher should also provide evidence of contributions to the community as a whole. In summary, the teacher should demonstrate how the instructional environment that he/she has created is enabling and has enabled their students to acquire important skills, knowledge, and attributes, and how they have supported the overall learning community of the school. Having been provided this information (this living-portfolio), the staff assesses the teacher's yearly performance using a comprehensive rubric that was developed by the staff. It is important to note that the staff will also draw information from the yearly observations and weekly meetings in order to assess the teacher's performance. The assessment rubric is made up of the following categories: • Assessment Strategies • Building Relationships with Kids • Classroom Management • Student Progress • Extracurricular Duties • Mentorship • Curriculum Development and Implementation • Parent Communication • Participation in Staff Meetings • Professional Goals • Staff Communication • Unique Contributions Within each of these categories are several subtopics upon which the teacher is rated on a 4-point scale. If, in any of the areas, the teacher receives an average score of less than 3, the teacher will be asked to meet with the staff to discuss the deficiency or deficiencies. At this point, the staff or teacher may suggest a number of ways in which to rectify the problem or provide professional development targeted toward rectifying the problem. Given ample evidence that the teacher is unable to correct the problem, negligent in their duties, and/or more importantly, unable to carry out their responsibilities, the staff may decide to not renew the teacher's contract. This is clearly stated in each teacher's contract. We believe that The Centre Learning Community Peer Assessment System is a multifaceted, comprehensive teacher assessment system that is unique in that it is based upon peer review and peer assessment. Through weekly meetings, peer observations, and year-end presentations (living-portfolios), CLC teachers are able to assess each other's performance and provide meaningful feedback and professional development.

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

a. Teacher Development? Yes

When an area of need or challenge is seen either individually or collectively for the group outside professional development activities in that area are suggested to the individual(s) indicated or professional development opportunities is provided on site. We have used a trainer of trainers model in some cases.

b. Teacher Compensation? Yes

There is a formula based calculation taking the results of the peer review process into consideration. A total dollar amount is available to all evaluated staff, and based on the results of the peer review

c. Teacher Promotions? No

d. Teacher Retention and Removal? Yes

Each teacher is on a yearly contract, and renewal is based upon the evaluation process. If at mid-year a teacher is found to be in need of substantial areas for improvement, they are counseled in ways to improve their overall teaching. Successful improvement typically results in continued employment.

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

Totals	11	2 18.2 %	0 0 %	9 81.8 %				
---------------	-----------	-----------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	-----------------

Note: - All Building percentages are the result of dividing the number of ratings at each level (Numberator) by the building total (Denominator)

- All Total percentages are the result of dividing the total number of ratings at each level (Numberator) 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:

Currently being reviewed and updated.

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

a. Principal Development? NA

b. Principal Compensation? Yes

This is being reviewed and updated.

c. Principal Promotions? NA

d. Principal Retention and Removal? Yes

This is being reviewed and updated.

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. NA

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 at Standardized Principal Evaluation System? Yes

LEA Principal Evaluations Summary:

Number Rated	
Number Not Rated	_____ 1
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) %
Unsatisfactory/Satisfactory			Unsatisfactory					Satisfactory
Totals	*	* %	* %	* %	* %	* %	* %	* %

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