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Introduction

The goal of this document is to explain the specifics of how teacher evaluation works in 2015-16. To accomplish this goal we will review answers to the following questions:

- What is Act 82 and how does it affect PPS?
- How does teacher evaluation work in the 2015-16 school year?
- Why is the District taking this approach?
- How did we arrive at these decisions?
- When was this finalized?
- Who is included in this new system?
- What if I have a special situation?
  - Pre-tenure teachers
  - Teachers who don’t have an individual value-added measure
  - Teachers who don’t have school value-added measures or are at multiple schools
  - Teachers who don’t have Tripod student survey results
- How has RISE evolved in the 2015-16 school year?
  - RISE power components and their weighting
  - Intensive Support
  - Independent Growth Year (IGY)
  - RISE Observation Guidelines
- How do end-of-year ratings work?
  - Performance Levels and Ratings
  - Implications of Unsatisfactory Ratings
  - Performance Level Ranges
  - Impact on Teachers on the Career Ladder Salary Schedule
  - Receiving End-of-Year Ratings
First, let’s quickly revisit how we got here.

Just like in other complex professions, there’s no single tool that can paint a complete picture of the work teachers do.

That’s why we’ve worked collaboratively with teachers, administrators, and the PFT over the last five years to adopt new tools that identify differences in teacher effectiveness, and provide useful information to help teachers improve.

- Starting in 2010-11, end-of-year ratings have been based on our observation system, the Research-based Inclusive System of Evaluation (RISE). Up until 2013-14, some teachers stepped out of the RISE process to work through an Employee Improvement Plan (EIP).

- We introduced value-added measures (VAMs) in 2010-11, allowing schools, teams, and many teachers to see how their efforts contribute to student learning and growth.

- In 2011-12, we began asking PPS students for feedback about their classroom experience through the Tripod student survey.

Through this work—and by conferring with national experts such as Dr. Pedro Noguera and Battelle for Kids, and consulting the Measures of Effective Teaching Project, Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for Teaching, and our own Pathways to the Promise—we have developed the following description of an effective teacher in PPS. This definition will evolve as we continue our journey to understand effective teaching in Pittsburgh Public Schools:

An effective teacher in Pittsburgh Public Schools is a professional, who knows his or her subject and teaches it well, inspiring and engaging all students as individuals to fulfill their personal and career goals, and accelerating learning so that all students are Promise-Ready.

Because of our work with teachers, administrators, the PFT, and national experts, when Act 82 passed in July 2012, it confirmed that PPS is following the right path and that we are ahead of the curve.
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What is Act 82 and how does it affect PPS?

Act 82 of 2012 is a comprehensive education reform bill signed in July 2012 that, among other changes, requires schools districts in Pennsylvania to use multiple measures when evaluating teachers, school leaders, and other non-teaching professional staff.

Specifically, Act 82 requires that teacher evaluation be based **50% on observation and 50% on student outcomes.**

Act 82 allows districts some flexibility to develop a unique rating tool, so long as it works within the established framework, is of equal rigor to the guidelines that the legislation establishes, and is approved by the Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE). The new evaluation system went into effect in 2013-14 for teachers and in 2014-15 for principals and other professional staff.

Because we were ahead of the rest of the state in implementing new ways of looking at teacher effectiveness, we were able to propose a system that will build on the work we have already done in Pittsburgh.

Like Act 82’s model, PPS’ model uses 50% classroom observation and practice and 50% student outcomes. Two differences include:

- Reducing the weight of Building-Level Results from 15% to 5% and Elective Data from 20% to 15%, and increasing the weight of Teacher-Specific Data to 30%.

- Using our own value-added model instead of PDE’s building level formula.

In addition to the Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory ratings with which teachers are already familiar, Act 82 also introduced four performance levels for teacher evaluation: Distinguished, Proficient, Needs Improvement, and Failing. This was a new feature in teacher evaluation that began in 2013-14 and is addressed in greater detail later in this document.
How does teacher evaluation work in the 2015-16 school year?

The **Annual Rating Form** brings the individual measures together to arrive at a single numerical value and applies a performance level and rating.

1. This is the form that employees and supervisors sign as part of the evaluation process.

2. District staff took the ideas generated by the subcommittee on reaching a combined measure of the RISE Leadership Team to create a draft of a new Annual Rating Form.

3. This form was reviewed and refined through input from Battelle for Kids, PDE, PPS and PFT staff, principals, teachers and administrators on the VIEW committee, and technical experts including representatives from Mathematica and the American Federation of Teachers.

4. In January 2013, the PPS Board of Directors approved the new rating form. It was subsequently approved by PDE.

We also developed the **Educator Effectiveness Report**, which details the results associated with each part of a teacher’s evaluation. Additionally, it shows the relative weighting of each measure. This document can act as a stand-alone document independent from the rating form and is much more useful than the Annual Rating Form for identifying and prioritizing opportunities for growth and support.

Teachers will still receive their full school and individual value-added measures and Tripod student survey reports (where applicable), which provide an even closer look at results to inform professional learning opportunities.
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#### Annual Rating Form

For Professional and Temporary Professional Teachers
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**School Year 20XX-XX**

**Mid-Year** ○ **End-of-Year** ○

### Personal Information

- **Name:** Last Name, First Name
- **Location(s):** ABC School
- **PPS ID:** 000011223
- **Title:** Teacher
- **Assignment Area(s):** Elementary

### Your Summative Evaluation

- **Professional Practice**
  - Building-Level Results
  - Teacher-Specific Results
  - Elective Data

- **Category**
  - Your Observation of Teacher Practice: 50%
  - Your Student Learning and Growth Results: 30%
  - Your Student Perception Results: 15%
  - Your School Student Learning and Growth Results: 5%

- **Total Points** * 

- **Performance Level**

- **Rating**

  * Where sufficient multiple measures are not available, no points are listed. Performance Level is based on the preponderance of observation evidence. See your Educator Effectiveness Report for detailed information.

### Signatures

- **Employee (print)**
- **Employee (signature)**
- **Date**

- **Supervisor (print)**
- **Supervisor (signature)**
- **Date**

- **Superintendent (print)**
- **Superintendent (signature)**
- **Date**

Employee signature acknowledges receipt of the completed rating form and Educator Effectiveness Report and does not constitute agreement with the rating. Superintendent signature is only required for Unsatisfactory ratings.
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### Educator Effectiveness Report

**Based on PPS Combined Measure of Effective Teaching**

**School Year 2014-15**

#### Your Student Learning and Growth Results

For teachers with a current VAM Report that includes three years of data, the overall VAM composite score is used. For all other teachers, the Student Learning Objective (SLO) rating from the current school year is used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Value-Added Measure (VAM)</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>VAM</th>
<th>Points *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Test-based VAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*When calculating points, the mean and standard deviation of the teacher value-added scores are set equal to the mean and standard deviation of SLO ratings so as not to either advantage or disadvantage teachers with or without value-added scores.*

For teachers without a current VAM Report that includes three years of data, the Student Learning Objective (SLO) rating from the current school year is used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Objective</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Your School Student Learning and Growth Results

For all teachers, the prior year School VAM score from the teacher’s prior year school is used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Value-Added Measure (VAM)</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>VAM</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Educator Effectiveness Report**

Based on PPS Combined Measure of Effective Teaching

School Year 2013-14

### Your Student Perception Results

Tripod Student Survey results are calculated based on current year data as well as prior year data when available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tripod Student Survey</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>0-20</th>
<th>21-40</th>
<th>41-60</th>
<th>61-80</th>
<th>81-100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tripod C1 – Caring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripod C2 – Captivating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripod C3 – Conferring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripod C4 – Controlling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripod C5 – Clarifying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripod C6 – Challenging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripod C7 - Consolidating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above is shown for informational purposes only and shows the range of your Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) score for each of the 7Cs. In the calculation of the combined measure, your Overall Score reported in Normal Curve Equivalent is used. Like the favorability scores reported to teachers in the Tripod Teacher 7C Reports, NCE’s are calculated based on students’ responses to survey questions on the 7Cs, but unlike favorability scores, NCEs are standardized across grade ranges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tripod Student Survey (teacher-level)</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>NCE Score</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Score reported in Normal Curve Equivalent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For teachers who do not have student survey results, the district average Tripod score is used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Average Tripod Student Survey</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Why did the District take this approach?

This approach to teacher evaluation:

- Is consistent with our values;
- Is preferred to the model defined by new state legislation;
- Holds teachers accountable at higher weights for factors most within their control;
- Treats teachers equitably across schools, students, grades, and subject areas;
- Emphasizes growth measures over attainment measures; and
- Builds on the work that we have already done in Pittsburgh.

How did we arrive at these decisions?

Since 2009, we have been committed to developing an evaluation process that values multiple measures and includes student outcomes.

- While many districts also embarking on this work hurried to create a formula for an overall measure of teacher effectiveness and attached stakes to their measures right from the start, we took a different approach.

- We spent more than three years studying and learning new tools, and began to use them to grow as professionals. During that time, only RISE has been used for evaluation.

- Through technical analysis and feedback from experts and educators, PPS reviewed eight different approaches to teacher evaluation that met the requirements of new state policy. After reviewing these options, consensus was strong for the model we submitted for approval.

- We have also been very careful about sharing teacher-level results. Up until 2013-14, only teachers have had access to their own individual data, allowing them to reflect on this new information, identify strengths, and figure out ways they can improve.

- School administrators and central office staff with a role in supporting teachers must participate in responsible data use training and sign confidentiality forms prior to accessing individual teacher-level results.

When was this finalized?

On August 2, 2013, PDE approved our Annual Rating Form and our model for use in teacher evaluation for the 2013-14 school year. The new Annual Rating Form was used for 2013-14 end-of-year ratings, as dictated in Act 82. Educator Effectiveness Reports were also provided to help teachers identify and prioritize opportunities for growth and support. On July 28, 2014, PDE extended their approval for our teacher growth and evaluation system for the next three years.
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Before it was submitted to and approved by PDE, the PPS Board approved our new Annual Rating Form on January 23, 2013. PDE published their own statewide regulations pertaining to educator effectiveness rating tools in June 2013.

We were able to provide preview Annual Rating Forms and Educator Effectiveness Reports to teachers prior to the start of the 2013-14 school year. These reports included teachers’ real data from the 2012-13 school year and were for information and growth purposes.

**Who is included in this system?**

Act 82 of 2012 establishes that:

- Evaluation for “classroom teachers” will be based 50% on observation and 50% on student outcomes beginning in 2013-14.
- Evaluation for school leaders will be based 50% on observation and 50% on other measures beginning in 2014-15.
- Evaluation for “non-teaching professional employees” will be based 80% on observation and 20% on school-level student outcomes beginning in 2014-15.

For the purposes of 2015-16 implementation, we categorized *classroom teachers* into two groups:

**Teachers evaluated with multiple measures** (about 1,500 teachers)

- Classroom teachers who will receive Educator Effectiveness Reports and Annual Rating Forms populated using multiple measures. Teachers in this group will have their rating based on calculations using a weighted average of multiple measures.

- Teachers in this group include core and elective teachers, ESL teachers, PSE ES/LS teachers, and PSE regional ES teachers.

**Teachers evaluated with preponderance of observation evidence** (about 400 teachers)

- Classroom teachers who will receive Educator Effectiveness Reports and Annual Rating Forms populated using observation evidence (RISE) only. Teachers in this group will have their rating based on an evaluator’s score taking into consideration evidence collected through RISE.

- Teachers in this group include teachers at special schools, pre-tenure teachers in their first three semesters, PSE speech, vision, and hearing teachers, PSE ES/LS inclusion support teachers, PSE Mercy teachers, PSE SOS teachers, PSE City Connections teachers, EC classroom and replacement teachers, EI classroom and itinerant teachers, EHS teachers, CTE math/ELA integration teachers, ESL itinerant teachers, music specialists, homebound teachers, and librarians serving as classroom teachers.
What if I have a special situation?

We’ll focus on the ones that are most common, or where there is the most variation from our standard evaluation model:

- Pre-tenure teachers
- Teachers who don’t have an individual value-added measure
- Teachers who don’t have school-level value-added measure or are at multiple schools
- Teachers who don’t have Tripod student survey results

Pre-tenure teachers

All pre-tenure teachers must receive a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating every semester for their first six semesters. Pre-tenure teacher ratings are based first on preponderance of evidence and include multiple measures once available.

- All mid-year ratings are based on the preponderance of evidence on the 15 RISE power components.
- Where sufficient information from multiple measures is unavailable (for example, first year teachers), end-of-year ratings will be based on a preponderance of evidence on the 15 RISE power components.
- Where sufficient information from multiple measures is available, end-of-year ratings will be based on multiple measures for any pre-tenure teacher in his/her 4th semester and beyond.

The following guidelines dictate how preponderance of RISE evidence leads to a performance level and rating that meet the requirements of Act 82:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preponderance* of RISE evidence</th>
<th>Performance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished</td>
<td>Distinguished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Failing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Preponderance is determined by the RISE rating (Distinguished, Proficient, Basic, Unsatisfactory) assigned to the most Power Components. See 2015-16 RISE Business Rules for additional information.

Teachers who don’t have an individual value-added measure

Act 82 requires districts to evaluate teachers using multiple measures. The PPS model assigns 30% weight to teacher specific measures. Only teacher value-added results that include three years of data are used for end-of-year ratings. For teachers without value-added measures that include three years of data, Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) are used.
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For this portion of the evaluation, VAM and SLO results are aligned through a centering adjustment so that one group is not advantaged over the other. Our data shows that teachers with VAM and without VAM are equally likely to perform at different levels when each lens on effective teaching is brought together.

**Teachers who don’t have a school value-added measure or are at multiple schools**
Teachers at special schools do not have school value-added measures. Teachers at special schools are evaluated based on a preponderance of evidence until multiple measures are available.

For teachers teaching at multiple schools, a weighted average of each school’s VAM is used.

**Teachers who don’t have Tripod student survey results**
There are teachers who will likely not have Tripod results. For example, teachers who teach first-year ESL students, teachers at some special schools, teachers who are not the teacher of record in a classroom (such as inclusion teachers), music specialists and .2 librarians will generally not have results.

We consulted with teachers, principals, PPS and PFT leadership, and national experts to consider our options for including teachers without Tripod results. The groups agreed on a few key points:

- When available, multiple years of survey data should be considered.
- The District should continue to work to expand coverage of the Tripod student survey.

We asked outside experts to analyze the impact of using various substitute measures and provide a recommendation. Analysis showed that using District-level Tripod results has a neutral impact more so than the other options.

Based on this analysis and the recommendation of experts, when teachers do not have individual Tripod results sufficient for inclusion in the combined measures model, **the District Tripod score is substituted**. The District Tripod score is defined as the average of all teacher level Tripod scores included in the combined measure model.
How has RISE evolved in the 2015-16 school year?
The RISE process remains largely unchanged in 2015-16:

- RISE power components and their weighting
- Intensive Support
- Independent Growth Year (IGY)
- RISE Observation Guidelines

There are two changes that are intended to streamline the RISE process and make it more supportive. These changes were recommended by the District’s advisory council comprised of teachers, school leaders, and PPS and PFT staff:¹

- Teachers will no longer receive summative ratings on non-power components
- Teachers will no longer receive ratings during informal observation cycles

2015-16 RISE power components and their weighting
In order for our system to be approved by PDE, RISE components had to be weighted equally as rigorous as the statewide system. In March 2013, the RISE Leadership Teams, representing all PPS schools, provided input on their and their colleagues’ preferred domain weighting. As a result, we implemented the following:

- Domain 1 (Planning and Preparation): 15%
- Domain 2 (The Classroom Environment): 30%
- Domain 3 (Instruction): 40%
- Domain 4 (Professional Responsibilities): 15%

RISE power components have not changed for the 2015-16 school year:

- Demonstrating Knowledge of Students (1b), Setting Instructional Outcomes (1c), and Planning Coherent Instruction (1e) - **weighted at 5% each**
- Creating a Learning Environment of Respect and Rapport (2a), Establishing a Culture for Learning (2b), Managing Classroom Procedures (2c), and Managing Classroom Behavior (2d) - **weighted at 7.5% each**
- Communicating with students (3a), Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (3b), Engaging Students in Learning (3c), Using Assessment to Inform Instruction (3d), and Implementing Lessons Equitably (3g) - **weighted at 8% each**
- Reflecting on Teaching and Student Learning (4a), System for Managing Student Data (4b), and Communicating with Families (4c) - **weighted at 5% each**

¹ The advisory council met throughout 2014-15 to develop recommendations to streamline and enhance the teacher growth and evaluation system. Four of their five recommendations were approved by Dr. Lane; the fifth will undergo further consideration in 2015-16.
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Intensive Support
Act 82 had implications for how we thought about Employee Improvement Plans:

- Teachers who receive final performance levels of Needs Improvement or Failing are required to participate in a performance improvement plan. The law does not specify what the levels of support for teachers with these ratings should look like.

- All teachers are required to be on a Danielson-based rubric, which for PPS, is RISE.

What does this mean for teachers and how does it impact our approach to improvement plans?

- Identification for intensive support will be based on multiple lenses on teaching effectiveness, not solely on observation of practice.

- For tenure teachers, identification for intensive support can occur only at the end of the school year providing more consistency and certainty to employees about where they stand.

- The school code specifies that a second consecutive Unsatisfactory rating must occur at least four months after the first. Act 82 did not change this part of the school code. Thus, it remains possible that a second Unsatisfactory rating could be issued mid-year.

- For pre-tenure teachers, a principal can identify a teacher as in need of intensive support at any point during the year.
  - Because pre-tenure teachers are rated twice per year, and one Unsatisfactory rating can lead to dismissal, pre-tenure teachers may be identified by their principal for intensive support at any point in the year.
  - If a pre-tenure teacher receives a Needs Improvement performance level, they must participate in an intensive support plan the very next semester.

Independent Growth Year
In 2014-15, the District introduced the Independent Growth Year (IGY) and it continues to be in place in 2015-16. The Independent Growth Year process allows tenured teachers who have demonstrated Proficient or Distinguished performance in the most recent school year based on their Annual Rating Form to focus on their professional growth independently for up to two consecutive school years.

- During an IGY, teachers may participate in cycles of observations, feedback, and support with their principal and/or ITL2. Informal and formal observations can occur and other support (ie.co-planning, coaching, modeling), can be provided according to teacher need or request. Teachers on IGY can also access professional growth resources throughout the year.
• During the IGY, a summative RISE rating for the current school year is not given. Instead, all RISE ratings from the most recent year available carry over for use in their current year’s summative evaluation (see below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Level</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished</td>
<td>At least 1 announced formal&lt;br&gt;&lt;em&gt;Recommended: 5-7 classroom observations (formal and informal)&lt;/em&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>At least 1 announced formal&lt;br&gt;&lt;em&gt;Recommended: 5-7 classroom observations (formal and informal)&lt;/em&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>A minimum of 2 Formals (at least 1 announced)&lt;br&gt;&lt;em&gt;Recommended: Up to 15 classroom observations (formal and informal)&lt;/em&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failing</td>
<td>A minimum of 2 Formals (at least 1 announced)&lt;br&gt;&lt;em&gt;Recommended: Up to 15 classroom observations (formal and informal)&lt;/em&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is not recommended that teachers participate in IGY for two consecutive years, though some discretion is left to the administrator to define caseloads with some additional flexibility for teachers performing at the Distinguished level.

For more information about IGY, see the 2015-16 RISE Business Rules.

RISE Observation Guidelines
How do end of year ratings work?

There are several things to consider when discussing how end-of-year ratings work:

- Performance Levels and Ratings
- Implications of Unsatisfactory Ratings
- Performance Level Ranges
- Impact on teachers on the Career Ladder Salary Schedule
- Receiving end of year ratings

Performance Levels and Ratings

Act 82 identifies four performance levels for teacher evaluation: Distinguished, Proficient, Needs Improvement, and Failing.

- There are, and must be, next steps associated with each of these performance levels.
- These next steps must provide support for professional growth and increase the percent of PPS students who experience highly effective teaching each year.
- Teachers at all levels should have the opportunity to improve and to take responsibility for their professional growth.

Act 82 specifies four performance levels and two rating categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Levels</th>
<th>Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance levels convert to a rating of Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory based on rules defined in Act 82.

Per the regulations established by Act 82, a performance level of Failing results in an Unsatisfactory rating. All other performance levels result in Satisfactory ratings. However, if a teacher receives two Needs Improvement ratings in the same certification area within ten years, this will result in an Unsatisfactory rating.
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Implications of Unsatisfactory Ratings
Act 82 did not change some relevant aspects of the School Code:

- Act 82 did **not** change the requirement that dismissal for performance for tenured teachers be based on two consecutive Unsatisfactory ratings.

- Act 82 does not permit dismissals based on Unsatisfactory ratings that are not consecutive.
Performance Level Ranges
Through the evaluation process, teachers earn between 0 and 300 points. Performance ranges define the point values associated with each performance level introduced by Act 82 (Distinguished, Proficient, Needs Improvement, and Failing). The table to the right shows the performance ranges used for end-of-year ratings. These ranges establish the standard for teaching performance in Pittsburgh.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Level</th>
<th>Points Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished</td>
<td>210 - 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>150 - 209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>140 - 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failing</td>
<td>0 - 139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact on Teachers on the Career Ladder Salary Schedule
Teachers hired on or after July 1, 2010 are on a salary schedule that ties performance to compensation. This schedule provides for horizontal movement across Professional Growth Levels after Steps 4, 7, and 10, and every three years thereafter. Movement to a higher Professional Growth Level results in an increase in base salary.

Teachers and principals on the VIEW Subcommittee of the Rewards and Recognition Advisory Committee provided recommendations to guide the creation of business rules around Professional Growth Level advancement on the Career Ladder Salary Schedule. The following recommendation was made:

- A teacher’s performance level, as it appears on his or her rating form, will be the evidence used to support Professional Growth Level decisions on the Career Ladder Salary Schedule.

- Evidence available from the three years prior to Professional Growth Level decision point will be used to determine advancement decisions.

- In general, Professional Growth Level advancement is enabled by the presence of at least one year’s Distinguished performance level within the three years of evidence available at the time of a level decision.

For more information about the Career Ladder Salary Schedule, log on to My PPS.

Receiving End-of-Year Ratings
Teachers will receive their Annual Rating Forms and Educator Effectiveness Reports on June 14, 2016 through PPS Insight. Principals will also receive access to the Annual Rating Forms and Educator Effectiveness Reports for the teachers in their building on the same day. All RISE ratings will be due to the Office of Human Resources by June 1, 2016. Keep in mind that any ratings submitted after this date will result in the delay of delivery of Annual Rating Forms and Educator Effectiveness Reports. Delayed reports will also be available through PPS Insight.