

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

This report provides information on attendees of Indiana University of Pennsylvania's teacher preparation program(s) who were hired as Pittsburgh Public Schools (PPS) teachers between July 2010 and May 2017. The charts below demonstrate how these 86 teachers fared once hired in order to support a dialogue between the institution and the school district, so both can best meet the needs of pre-service teachers and PPS students.

Performance

Teachers in PPS receive information about their performance through multiple measures of effectiveness: observation of professional practice, student learning and growth results, and student feedback. While this information is used collectively to determine teachers' annual ratings, each measure's primary use is to help teachers identify their areas of strength and opportunities for growth.

Professional Practice

Teachers' professional practice is rated using a Danielson-based observation rubric, with a focus on 15 core components of practice. Teachers are rated on each component as Distinguished, Proficient, Basic, or Unsatisfactory; those ratings are then translated to a score of 300, 200, 100, or 0, respectively. The table below shows the average score on each component across teachers who attended this institution as compared to all hires. For example, a 200 means that, on average, these teachers performed at the Proficient level in that component. The last row reflects the average of teachers' overall scores when the 15 components are combined for purposes of annual ratings.

	Indiana University of PA	All Hires	Comparison to All Hires ¹
1b: Demonstrating Knowledge of Students	217	215	About the same
1c: Setting Instructional Outcomes	210	204	About the same
1e: Planning Coherent Instruction	212	206	About the same
2a: Creating a Learning Environment of Respect and Rapport	237	228	About the same
2b: Establishing a Culture of Learning	215	209	About the same
2c: Managing Classroom Procedures	223	213	About the same
2d: Managing Student Behavior	213	207	About the same
3a: Communicating with Students	210	209	About the same
3b: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques	178	173	About the same
3c: Engaging Students in Learning	197	193	About the same
3d: Using Assessment to Inform Instruction	191	189	About the same
3g: Implementing Lessons Equitably	203	202	About the same
4a: Reflecting on Teaching and Student Learning	221	217	About the same
4b: System for Managing Student Data	210	204	About the same
4c: Communicating with Families	227	217	About the same
Overall	219	217	About the same

¹ Differences that are statistically significant at the $\alpha=0.05$ level are noted as *slightly better* or *slightly worse* depending on the direction of the relationship. Differences that are statistically significant at the $\alpha=0.01$ level are noted as *significantly better* or *significantly worse*. Differences with an $\alpha>0.05$ are noted as *about the same*. Comparison controls for teachers' years of PPS experience and calendar year.



Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Student Learning and Growth

Student learning and growth is defined by the Pennsylvania Department of Education using PVAAS, a value-added measure that gauges the extent to which students gained or lost ground compared to their peers when holding constant students' prior assessment results. A PVAAS score of 0 means students neither gained nor lost ground. A positive score means students gained ground, while a negative score means they lost ground.

	Indiana University of PA	All Hires	Comparison to All Hires
PVAAS Score	-1.32	-1.80	About the same

Student Feedback

PPS students take the Tripod to provide feedback on their classroom experiences through seven constructs of instruction. On each of the seven constructs, teachers receive a score that ranges from 1 to 99, where a score of 50 means that a teacher is about average. A score higher than 50 indicates more positive feedback from students, while a score lower than 50 indicates more negative feedback. The last row reflects the average composite of teachers' scores when the seven constructs are combined for purposes of annual ratings.

	Indiana University of PA	All Hires	Comparison to All Hires
Care	54	50	About the same
Captivate	51	49	About the same
Confer	51	49	About the same
Classroom Management	44	44	About the same
Clarify	51	49	About the same
Challenge	51	48	About the same
Consolidate	52	50	About the same
Composite	51	49	About the same

Overall Performance

Teachers receive an annual rating based on combining these measures. The combined effectiveness measure (CEM) is a score between 0 and 300, with each score translating to an overall level of performance in the following way: Distinguished (210-300), Proficient (150-209), Needs Improvement (140-149), and Failing (0-139).

	Indiana University of PA	All Hires	Comparison to All Hires
CEM Score	218	214	About the same

Retention

The table below demonstrates the share of teachers who attended this institution as compared to all hires who remained with the district after one, two, and three years.

	Indiana University of PA	All Hires	Comparison to All Hires
Retained 1 Year (%)	91%	84%	Slightly better
Retained 2 Years (%)	77%	72%	About the same
Retained 3 Years (%)	76%	64%	Slightly better