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---

### TEACHER INFORMATION

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

- Professional Development?
  
  N/A

- Teacher Compensation?
  
  N/A
c. Teacher Advancement/Promotions?  N/A  
d. Teacher Retention and Removal?  N/A

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.  Yes
   The evaluation form utilizes three performance indicators (Above Expectations, Meeting Expectations, and Below Expectations) when scoring a teacher's performance on the following areas: Planning/Preparation, Classroom Environment, Instructional Delivery, and Professionalism. Under each area, there are numerous questions listed. After each question, a tally mark is created under each appropriate performance indicator. At end of evaluation, the tally marks are counted up. The teacher's overall performance is then calculated based on which indicator showed most tally marks under. This is based on the Charlotte Danielson model of evaluating. There a total of 24 tally marks that will be recorded (6 under Planning/Preparation, 6 under Classroom Environment, 5 under Instructional Delivery, and 7 under Professionalism.

b. N/A

How often does the LEA formally evaluate:

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

LEA Teacher Evaluations Summary:

- Number Rated: 53
- Number Not Rated: 0
- Total Number Employed: 53

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>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Numerator)</td>
<td>(Numerator) %</td>
<td>(Numerator) %</td>
<td>(Numerator) %</td>
<td>(Numerator) %</td>
<td>(Numerator) %</td>
<td>(Numerator) %</td>
<td>(Numerator) %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Antonia Pantoja Community Ch | 53 | 0 0% | 0 0% | 1 1.9% | 52 98.1% | 0 0% | 53 100% |
| Totals | 53 | 0 0% | 0 0% | 1 1.9% | 52 98.1% | 0 0% | 53 100% |

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 form and procedure utilized in the evaluation of the Principal is one that is created by our LEA. The Chief Academic Officer (CAO) evaluates the Principal on a 2 page report based on the following 7 standards: Strategic Leadership, Instructional Leadership, Cultural Leadership, Human Resource Leadership, Managerial Leadership, External Development Leadership, and Micro-Political Leadership. Within the standards, there are 20 sub-areas. The Principal is scored on the following rubric scale: Developing, Proficient, Accomplished, Distinguished, and Not Observed. Data utilized when completing the evaluation is based on the combination of the following: classroom and site visits, local indicator findings (student/teacher attendance), bi-monthly Principal reports to the CAO, agendas/results of Professional Development facilitated by the Principal, Parent and Staff Survey results, student achievement data findings, and on-going communication between the CAO and the Principal. All standards and sub-areas are weighed evenly. The overall findings are geared towards establishing and noting the Principal's interpersonal, communication, and instructional leadership skills. Then areas of reinforcement and refinement are then targeted for an upcoming evaluation meeting agenda. Once finalized, the CAO meets with the Principal to review and discuss the results of the evaluation. The conversation would include targeted areas of reinforcement as well as areas for refinement and possible professional development. This is completed once a year.

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

a. Principal Development?
   - N/A
b. Principal Compensation?
   - N/A
c. Principal Promotions?
   - N/A
d. Principal Retention and Removal?
   - N/A

Does the LEA principal evaluation system described above include the following as evaluation criterion:
a. Student Achievement Outcomes? No
b. Student Growth Data? No

N/A

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. Yes

The Principal are evaluated based on the building's strategic plan. Compliance, follow-through, and success of integration of initiatives as outlined in the strategic plan. All steps and interventions are based on students and schools needs (based on various data). The 7 standards within the evaluation plans are weighted evenly.

Does your LEA have at least one Principal position? Yes

Does your LEA have a Standardized 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>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>Unsatisfactory/Satisfactory</td>
<td>* %</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>
</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