Pennsylvania
Department of Education
Teacher and Principal Evaluation Information
Individual LEA Data
For the 2013-14 Rating Period

GENERAL INFORMATION

Name of LEQ or Charter School:
Central Montco Technical High School

AUN Number:
123460957

Address of LEA or Charter School:
821 Plymouth Road  Plymouth Meeting, PA  19462

Name Superintendent or Chief School Administrator:
R. Walter Slauch

For Information Contact:
Angela Kern

Email:
akern@cmths.org

Phone:
610-277-2301 - 244

TEACHER INFORMATION

If the LEA does not use their teacher evaluation system as a basis for the following, their decision criteria is provided:

a.  Professional Development?

b.  Teacher Compensation?

c.  Teacher Advancement/Promotions?
d. Teacher Retention and Removal?

Does the LEA use weighting formula(e) and/or rubric(s) to guide teacher evaluators? (Charter Schools Only)

a. Yes or No? If Yes, describe background and process.

Does the LEA teacher evaluation system described above include the following as evaluation criterion? (Charter Schools Only)

a. Student Achievement Outcomes?

b. Student Growth Data?

How often does the LEA formally evaluate:

a. Temporary Professionals (Less than 3 Years)? Twice a year

b. Professionals (More than 3 Years)? Annually

LEA Teacher Evaluations Summary:

<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>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</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>Central Montco Technical High</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Describe the LEA’s system used to evaluate the performance of your Principals:

The principal at CMTHS is evaluated using a system that combines the numerical results of an evaluation instrument with the level of achievement on personal and organizational goals. The principal is formally evaluated by the director at the end of each school year with a progress meeting at mid-term. The evaluation instrument incorporates the use of self-evaluation. The evaluator considers the self-evaluation ratings in the final year-end rating. The evaluation instrument focuses on three categories: Planning, Evaluating and Coordinating; Decision Making; and Communicating. Using the performance indicators listed in each category, the evaluator will attach a numerical value to the principal’s performance on each indicator using the following scale: Outstanding = 4 Satisfactory = 3 Needs Improvement = 2 Unsatisfactory = 1. The evaluator will add the numerical values of each performance indicator and divide by the number of performance indicators to determine the Final Numerical Rating for each category. The Overall Numerical Rating will be determined by adding the Final Numerical Rating for each category and dividing by four (4). In addition, the principal is evaluated on the achievement of four (4) personal and/or organizational goals developed at the beginning of the school year in collaboration with the director. The goals are established based on student and organizational performance data and other personal and organizational needs. The evaluator will attach a numerical value to each goal using the following scale: Goal Achieved = 1, Goal Not Achieved = 0. Using the above scale the principal can earn a total of four (4) points. The principal’s year-end rating (Rating Points) is determined by adding the Final Numerical Rating on the evaluation instrument with the points earned by goals achievement for a total of eight (8) points. The Final Rating Points are used to inform principal compensation. If the principal receives an unsatisfactory rating, the rating will be discussed with the principal and supported by anecdotal records. These anecdotal records and other information collected during the evaluation are used as the basis for an intervention plan to improve performance. Two consecutive unsatisfactory ratings of a principal may result in dismissal.

If the LEA does not use their principal evaluation system as a basis for the following, their decision criteria is provided:

a. Principal Development?

b. Principal Compensation?

c. Principal Promotions?

d. Principal Retention and Removal?

Does the LEA principal evaluation system described above include the following as evaluation criterion:

a. Student Achievement Outcomes? No

b. Student Growth Data? Yes

One or more of the organizational goals developed by or for the principal would include implementing a plan to increase the pre-test to post-test scores on the NOCTI exam by a given percentage.

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 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>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LEA Principal Evaluation 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>%</td>
<td>(Numerator)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>(Numerator)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>(Numerator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory/Satisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>*</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.*