Alliance for Progress Charter School uses forms PDE-426 and PDE-428 to complete teacher evaluations. The CEO, Instructional Director and Curriculum Specialist complete teacher evaluations. Teachers at AFPCS receive 2 formal unannounced observations. Post-conferences are held after each observation and are intended to identify strengths (areas of instruction you should continue to implement in your classroom) and areas to improve. There will always be an identified area of improvement – an instructional strategy that you should continue to improve or areas that need to be incorporated into your instruction that are currently not evident. Any instructional observation that is deemed unsatisfactory, with more instructional components to refine, rather than to reinforce, an Individual Growth Plan will be created to provide you with further support and teaching resources. The goal is to improve teacher instruction in order to improve student academic achievement. We want every teacher to feel as though they have access to instructional resources and the support necessary to implement these resources in the classroom. An Individual Growth Plan will focus on 1-2 instructional component(s) at a time to strengthen with the support of the Instructional Director, Curriculum Specialist and a Mentor Teacher. Once an Individual Growth Plan has been created, the teacher will: Meet at least weekly with the Instructional Director to discuss progress, student achievement, express concerns, review lesson plans, and ask questions. Receive model lesson(s) by the Instructional Director, Curriculum Specialist, and / or a Mentor Teacher. Participate in co-teaching opportunities as needed. Self-reflect about instruction in writing to track progress and discuss self-reflection at weekly meetings.
Does the LEA use the results of the teacher evaluation system described above in decisions regarding:

a. Teacher Development? Yes
   Throughout the year the Instructional Director and Curriculum Specialist review teacher evaluations and keep track of the improvements that are noted on reports that need to be made in classrooms. When a specific area of improvement is evident in multiple classrooms, a professional development session is planned to support teachers in this area.

b. Teacher Compensation? No

c. Teacher Promotions? No

d. Teacher Retention and Removal? Yes
   Teachers with 2 or more formal unsatisfactory observations are at risk for termination of a classroom position. All teachers are informed of this at the start of the school year.

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)? Twice a year

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>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Rated</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Not Rated</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Employed</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance for Progress CS</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>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 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

**PRINCIPAL INFORMATION**

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

The AFPCS principal evaluation system focuses on the principal's main goals and job description. They are rated on their ability to effectively perform their duties. The CEO evaluates the principals twice a year. They receive a mid and end of year evaluation.

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

- a. Principal Development? Yes
  - The principal's professional growth plan is developed using information from the evaluation
- b. Principal Compensation? No
- c. Principal Promotions? No
- d. Principal Retention and Removal? Yes
  - If the evaluation results call for training and or professional development it will be given. After support has been provided if the evaluation continues to be unsatisfactory then the principal may be removed.

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. Yes
      The rating rubric is: Outstanding: Exceptional performance that results in extraordinary accomplishments with superior contributions to objectives of the school./ Commendable: Great performance. Consistently generates results above those expected of the position. Contributes in a significant manner to achieve the objectives of the school/ Proficient: Good performance/ Needs Improvement: Only meets the requirements of the position.

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 Standarized Principal Evaluation System?  Yes

LEA Principal Evaluations Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number Rated</th>
<th>Number Not Rated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Employed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</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></td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</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 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