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

The Allegheny Valley School District developed a differentiated teacher supervision/performance assessment system through K-12 administrative and teacher collaboration over a two-year period. The sytem, which was implemented fully two years ago, is premised on the work of the Charlotte Danielson model. Walkthroughs and full-period classroom observations are methods employed by the building principals who are responsible for completing the formative and summative teacher performance assessments. The frequency of Walkthroughs and classroom observations varies, depending upon teaching activities and the individual. However, nontenured teachers are observed for full periods at least twice annually.

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

a. Teacher Development? Yes
Administrators and teachers collaborate to create individual professional growth plans as part of the differentiated supervision/evaluation model that is implemented. These conversations influence personalized and group learning opportunities for teachers.

b. Teacher Compensation? No
c. Teacher Promotions? No
d. Teacher Retention and Removal? Yes

All teachers must perform at a satisfactory level minimally with the performance assessment process honored in accordance with local and state expectations.

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. 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:

Number Rated 86
Number Not Rated 0
Total Number Employed 86

LEA Teacher Evaluations Detail:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</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>(Numerator) %</td>
<td>(Numerator) %</td>
<td>(Numerator) %</td>
<td>(Numerator) %</td>
<td>(Numerator) %</td>
<td>(Numerator) %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acmetonia Primary Sch</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>23 100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springdale JSHS</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>43 100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colfax Upper El Sch</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>20 100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>86 100 %</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 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 performance assessment tool applied for evaluating principals was developed collaboratively among the principals based on research that included models shared by other colleagues as well as researched literature on skills/qualities necessary for the position. The principals are expected to develop S.M.A.R.T. goals that reflect individual interests/needs and are aligned with building-level and District-level goals. The superintendent meets frequently with all principals to discuss performance assessment and progress achieved on goals. Self-evaluation is a consideration in the summative written evaluation prepared by the superintendent.

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

a. Principal Development? Yes
   Professional development is highly personalized for all principals based on their needs, strengths and areas of interest as well as District- and building-level goals.

b. Principal Compensation? Yes
   The percentage increase in compensation is based on performance related to specific criteria indicated on the performance assessment tool as well as progress achieved on S.M.A.R.T. goals that are created and approved at the beginning of each school year.

c. Principal Promotions? NA

d. Principal Retention and Removal? Yes
   All principals are expected to perform at a satisfactory level minimally to maintain their current positions.

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)? 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 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 Standardized Principal Evaluation System? Yes

LEA Principal Evaluations Summary:

| Number Rated | 4 |
| Number Not Rated | 0 |
| Total Number Employed | 4 |

LEA Principal Evaluation Detail:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Employed (Denominator)</th>
<th>Not Rated (Numerator) %</th>
<th>Level 1 (Numerator) %</th>
<th>Level 2 (Numerator) %</th>
<th>Level 3 (Numerator) %</th>
<th>Level 4 (Numerator) %</th>
<th>Level 5 (Numerator) %</th>
<th>Level 6 (Numerator) %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory/Satisfactory</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td></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>
</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.