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

Our IU uses PDE forms 426 and 428 to evaluate our teachers. The PDE forms are based on the Danielson model of effective teaching and supporting research. We used that criteria to develop our rubric which further delineates our expectations for performance in each of the four main domains. Teacher ratings on each domain can range from unsatisfactory through basic and proficient to distinguished. The indicators on the rubrics help our supervisors as they evaluate the teachers during annual observations of Instructional II teachers and semi-annual observations of Instructional I teachers. Teachers who are identified as needing improvement are issued Improvement Plans with specific criteria for improvement. The supervisor provides more intense supervision through walk-through evaluations and classroom visits. Additional professional development is focused on the area of identified teacher need. Our IU does not use the evaluation system to inform salary decisions; however a second unsatisfactory evaluation may lead to dismissal.

Does the LEA use the results of the teacher evaluation system described above in decisions regarding:
a. Teacher Development? Yes
Our IU uses a differentiated supervision model. As a result of teacher evaluations, the supervisor confers with the professional employee to determine what the employee’s professional goal will be for the next year. If the employee has not demonstrated proficiency in all four areas, they will be assigned to a more regulated professional development option.

b. Teacher Compensation? No

c. Teacher Promotions? Yes
Informally. We do not have any official policy regarding the promotion or advancement of professional employees. All employees are permitted to apply for any position for which they would be qualified. However, past performance would be taken into consideration during the interview process.

d. Teacher Retention and Removal? Yes
If a professional employee is not performing satisfactorily, they are put on an improvement plan which is closely monitored (usually by a different administrator than the one who gave the first unsatisfactory evaluation). Should a second unsatisfactory evaluation occur, the employee is counseled to seek employment elsewhere.

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
Our rubric is based on Danielson’s framework for teaching and aligns with the PDE 426 & 428. All professional staff are evaluated on a scale from 1 (unsatisfactory), 2 (basic), 3 (proficient), 4 (distinguished).

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>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Rated</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Not Rated</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Employed</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### LEA Teacher Evaluations 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>115</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9 %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9 %</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).

*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:

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

- 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 the LEA publicly report principal evaluation data by school?
   a. Yes or No? (Web link provided if applicable.)

Does your LEA have at least one Principal position?
   No

Does your LEA have a Standarized Principal Evaluation System?

LEA Principal Evaluations Summary:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Rated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Not Rated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>(Numerator)</td>
<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>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory/Satisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>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>
<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.*