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

Teachers in the Bedford Area school district are observed and evaluated using a differentiated model. Different levels of teacher experience and knowledge require a variety of options for professional growth in an observation/evaluation plan. This plan in particular offers teacher’s eight options for professional growth and evaluation, with a ninth option to develop an individualized plan. Non-tenured staff are observed a minimum of twice per year, with four observations being the norm. Formal evaluations using the 426 occur twice per year for all non-tenured staff. Tenured staff members have the ability to select their professional supervision plan using a differentiated approach; however, a final evaluation is completed one time per year using a 428 form. Tenured staff members are observed on a four year rotation that allows them choices for professional growth/observation. Tenured staff members are observed at least one formal observation every four years and formal evaluation using the 428 on a yearly basis. The Bedford Area School District’s differentiated supervision and evaluation system recognizes that individual teachers have different needs in addressing their professional growth and development. This system provides different levels of supervision in order to meet the individual needs of each professional. The following components are included in the differentiated supervision and evaluation system: formal supervision, focused assistance, reflective visitation, self-evaluation with conferencing, videotaping with assessment, peer coaching/collaboration, peer exchange, and teacher in the workplace. The plan also allows for the administrator and teacher to develop a customized plan collaboratively. Building level administrators are trained professional employees that supervise staff. It is only those administrators which hold the supervision certification that are permitted to evaluate teachers. Periodic trainings are provided for administrators as a refresher or to introduce a new observation tool. Building level administrators are also involved in the PIL trainings and are required 180 hours of Act 45 credits that often address observation and evaluation. Teacher evaluations are
performed by building level administrators and submitted to central office at the conclusion of each semester and school year. Evaluations are reviewed by central office administration and signed designating approval or disapproval of the rating for each teacher employee.

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

- Teacher Development? Yes
  Development plans are tailored to the needs of teachers based on data available.
- Teacher Compensation? No
- Teacher Promotions? No
- Teacher Retention and Removal? No

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

- Student Achievement Outcomes? No
- Student Growth Data? No

How often does the LEA formally evaluate:

- New Teachers (Less than 3 Years)? Twice a year
- Experienced Teachers (More than 3 Years)? Annually

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

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

Does the LEA publicly report teacher evaluation data by school?

- Yes or No? (Web link provided if applicable.) No

LEA Teacher Evaluations Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Rated</th>
<th>128</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Not Rated</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Employed</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>Level 5</th>
<th>Level 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford El Sch</td>
<td>44</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford MS</td>
<td>32</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford SHS</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>1 1.9 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>1 0.8 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 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)
- 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

Describe the LEA’s system used to evaluate the performance of your Principals:
The Bedford Area School District uses a self-reflection process to evaluate principal performance. Principals are required to submit two personal goals, one district initiative, and three building level goals at the beginning of each school year. Principal goals must be in line with district goals and the district’s strategic plan. Building level goals should directly impact student performance and should be measurable goals that can be supported by data. Twice per year chief school administrators will meet with principals to evaluate progress, once at the end of the first semester and once at the end of each school year. Discussions revolve around building level goals and specific action plans in place to meet those benchmarks for student performance. The focus at mid-year is to provide support and direction for each individual building level administrator and their building level plan. An end of the year meeting will aide in determining a principal’s professional needs and in evaluating building level performance. Central office administrators are responsible for evaluating building level administrators and for recommending improvement plans. There is no formal evaluation document used for principal evaluation. Documents are written up in a narrative fashion and stored in personnel files.

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

a. Principal Development? Yes

Areas of strength and improvement are used to influence Professional Development

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

Unsatisfactory may result in some chance of removal.

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 Standarized Principal Evaluation System? Yes

LEA Principal Evaluations Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number Rated</th>
<th>Number Not Rated</th>
<th>Total Number Employed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Employed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEA Principal Evaluation Detail:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td></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>
<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