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

At Central Westmoreland Career and Technology Center, we utilize the Danielson Framework rubric which encompasses four primary domains with twenty-three established criteria contained within those domains. Within each of those criteria are artifacts, evidence, and examples of what constitutes distinguished, proficient, needs improvement or failing. According to current trends in educator effectiveness; preconference, observations and follow up post conference are identified as best practices. Included in the post conference is the teacher reflection piece. We utilize the Danielson Framework rubrics with our professional staff; as long as, 50% or more of the criteria, in an individual domain, are proficient or above, the domain is rated as satisfactory. If two domains of the four are unsatisfactory, an improvement plan is established; yet the overall rating is considered satisfactory. Conversely, if three or more of the domains are unsatisfactory then the entire evaluation is unsatisfactory. As per Pennsylvania School Code, tenured teachers receive annual evaluations while non-tenured teachers are evaluated biannually. If an unsatisfactory (failing) overall observation occurs and a subsequent unsatisfactory observation occurs within the next four months then the employee will not be retained. Furthermore, if an employee that is on an improvement plan does not satisfactorily meet the goals and objectives of the plan, dismissal proceedings may result. Evaluators at our facility include the Administrative Director, Assistant Director and Principal. The entire professional staff is divided among the three evaluators. Evaluator professional development training is provided through the Department and local Intermediate Units as available.
Does the LEA use the results of the teacher evaluation system described above in decisions regarding:

a. Teacher Development? Yes
   Since domains which are less than proficient require the development of professional improvement plan those areas which were deemed as "needs improvement" are the basis for the plan.

b. Teacher Compensation? No

c. Teacher Promotions? No

d. Teacher Retention and Removal? Yes
   Yes based on school code.

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. Yes
   We utilize the Danielson Framework rubrics with our professional staff; as long as 50% or more of the criteria, in an individual domain, are proficient or above, the domain is rated as satisfactory. If 2 domains of the 4 are unsatisfactory, an improvement plan is established; yet the overall rating is considered satisfactory. Conversely, if 3 or more of the domains are unsatisfactory then the entire evaluation is unsatisfactory.

Does the LEA publicly report teacher evaluation data by school?

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

LEA Teacher Evaluations Summary:

<p>| Number Rated | 31 |
| Number Not Rated | 0 |
| Total Number Employed | 31 |</p>
<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>Central Westmoreland CTC 31</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>
<td>31 100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals 31</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>
<td>31 100 %</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:
Currently we do not have a standard system for evaluating the Principal.

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 at Standardized Principal Evaluation System? No

LEA Principal Evaluations Summary:

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

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