

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:**

Centre Learning Community CS

**AUN Number:**

110143060

**Address of LEA or Charter School:**

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

---

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

---

a. Professional Development?

Traditional professional development practices focus on delivering content rather than enhancing learning. An alternative research based alternative is based on how professionals learn, where the focus shifts from delivering and evaluating programs to understanding and supporting authentic professional development. Therefore, when an area of need or challenge is seen either individually or collectively for the group through our Peer Review system, professional development activities in that area are suggested to the individual(s) indicated or to the whole group. Professional development opportunities may be provided either on or off site. We have used a trainer of trainers model in some cases. For a brief review of the literature see: Accomplished California Teachers (2012). Promoting Quality Teaching: New Approaches to Compensation and Career Pathways (PDF). Stanford, CA: National Board Resource Center, Stanford University. Alliance for Excellent Education (2011). Teacher and School Leader Effectiveness: Lessons Learned from High-Performing Systems (PDF). Beltman, S., Mansfield, C.F., and Price, A. (2011). Thriving Not Just Surviving: A Review of Research on Teacher Resilience (PDF). Educational Research Review, 6(3), 185-207. Blank, R.K., de las Alas, N., and Smith, C. (2008).

Does Teacher Professional Development Have Effects on Teaching and Learning?: Evaluation Findings from Programs in 14 States (PDF). Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers. Blank, R.K., and de las Alas, N. (2009). Effects of Teacher Professional Development on Gains in Student Achievement: How Meta-Analysis Provides Scientific Evidence Useful to Education Leaders (PDF). Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers. Bryk, A.S., and Schneider, B. (2003). Trust in Schools: A Core Resource for School Improvement. *Creating Caring Schools*, 60(6), 40-45. Darling-Hammond, L. (2012). Creating a Comprehensive System for Evaluating and Supporting Effective Teaching (PDF). Stanford, CA: Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education. Darling-Hammond, L., Wei, R.C., Andree, A., Richardson, N., and Orphanos, S. (2009). Professional Learning in the Learning Profession: A Status Report on Teacher Development in the United States and Abroad (PDF). Stanford, CA: National Staff Development Council and the School Redesign Network at Stanford University. Gallimore, R., Ermeling, B.A., Saunders, W.M., and Goldenberg, C. (2009). Moving the Learning of Teaching Closer to Practice: Teacher Education Implications of School-Based Inquiry Teams (PDF). *Elementary School Journal*. Stoll, L., Bolam, R., McMahon, A., Wallace, M., and Thomas, S. (2006). Professional Learning Communities: A Review of the Literature (PDF). *Journal of Educational Change*, 7(4), 221-258.

Vescio, V., Ross, D., and Adams, A. (2008). A Review of Research on the Impact of Professional Learning Communities on Teaching Practice and Student Learning [Abstract]. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24(1), 80-91. Webster-Wright, A. (2009). Reframing Professional Development through Understanding Authentic Professional Learning [Abstract]. *Review of Educational Research*, 79(2), 702-739.

b. Teacher Compensation?

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 Advancement/Promotions?

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.

d. Teacher Retention and Removal?

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 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

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 teachers 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. For examples of research on PEER Reviews see: <http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/nov12/vol70/num03/The-Potential-of-Peer-Review.aspx> and [http://www.cecr.ed.gov/pdfs/PAR\\_Report2011.pdf](http://www.cecr.ed.gov/pdfs/PAR_Report2011.pdf)

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

- a. Student Achievement Outcomes? No
- b. Student Growth Data? No

**How often does the LEA formally evaluate:**

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

**LEA Teacher Evaluations Summary:**

Number Rated	10	
Number Not Rated	3	
Total Number Employed	13	

**LEA Teacher Evaluations Detail:**

	Total Employed	Not Rated	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory
	(Denominator)	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %
Centre Learning Community C	13	3 23.1%	0 0%	0 0%	7 53.8%	3 23.1%	0 0%	10 76.9%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>3 23.1%</b>	<b>0 0%</b>	<b>0 0%</b>	<b>7 53.8%</b>	<b>3 23.1%</b>	<b>0 0%</b>	<b>10 76.9%</b>

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:**

**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?
- b. Student Growth Data?

**How often does the LEA formally evaluate:**

- a. New Principals (Less than 3 Years)?
- b. Experienced Principals (More than 3 Years)?

**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.

**Does your LEA have at least one Principal position?** No

**Does your LEA have at Standardized Principal Evaluation System?**

**LEA Principal Evaluations Summary:**

Number Rated \_\_\_\_\_

Number Not Rated \_\_\_\_\_ 0

Total Number Employed \_\_\_\_\_

**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

<b>Totals</b>	*	* %	* %	* %	* %	* %	* %	* %

Note: - 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**