HOW HAS PITTSBURGH IMPLEMENTED MULTIPLE MEASURES OF TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS?

School systems across the country are looking at ways to reform their teacher evaluation systems to develop and reward effective teachers. Pittsburgh Public Schools, a member of REL Mid-Atlantic’s Teacher Evaluation Research Alliance, partnered with the REL to develop and analyze teacher evaluation measures. This report was based on 2011/12 data provided by the district.

The Pittsburgh Public Schools teacher evaluation system includes three types of measures:

**Professional Practice**
An observational measure of teacher practice, known as the Research-based Inclusive System of Evaluation (RISE), is based on evaluations by the school principal and draws on the Danielson Framework for Teaching.

**Student Surveys**
The 7Cs* survey, developed by Harvard University and administered by Cambridge Education, is used to measure student perceptions of teacher practices.

*The 7Cs are: Caring for students, Controlling the classroom, Clarifying the message, Challenging learners, Captivating the classroom, Confering with students, and Consolidating lessons learned.

**Student Achievement**
A value-added measure (VAM) is based on the year-to-year test score growth of individual students.

Why use multiple measures to analyze teacher effectiveness?

Together, the three new measures are expected to yield a valid and reliable overall gauge of teacher effectiveness.

Note: Overlap among circles represents correlations between measures of teacher effectiveness.

Key Findings:

- All three measures of teacher effectiveness being developed by the Pittsburgh Public Schools—professional practice, student surveys, and student achievement measures—have the potential to differentiate teacher performance.

- The measures are positively, if moderately, correlated, suggesting that they are valid and complementary measures of teacher effectiveness.

- Variation across schools on the professional practice rating (which is assigned to teachers by the school principal) suggests that principals’ standards might not be fully consistent across schools and that the measure might be improved by using more than one rater for each teacher.