

Student Success Act

Overview of SB 736 Legislation
Pertaining to Personnel Evaluation
Systems
March 2011

Key Points for Today

- **District Evaluation Systems**
 - System Requirements
 - Procedural Requirements
 - Approval & Reporting Requirements
 - Evaluation Criteria
- **Student Learning Growth**
- **Timelines for RTTT/SB 736 Documentation and Implementation**

District Evaluation Systems: System Requirements

- **Designed to support effective instruction and student learning growth**
- **Results used when developing district and school level improvement plans**
- **Results used to identify professional development for instructional personnel and school administrators**

District Evaluation Systems: System Requirements

- Mechanism to examine performance data from multiple sources, including opportunities for parents to provide input into employee evaluations when appropriate
- Identification of teaching fields for which special evaluation procedures/criteria are necessary
- Annual evaluation for each employee, except classroom teachers newly hired by the district must be observed and evaluated at least twice in first year of teaching in the school district

District Evaluation Systems: Optional System Components

- **Allows each district to establish a peer assistance process – as part of evaluation system or for employee assistance**

District Evaluation Systems: Procedural Requirements

- **Training for evaluators**
- **Process for monitoring use of evaluation criteria by evaluators**
- **Process for monitoring the effectiveness of the system to improve student learning and instruction**

District Evaluation Systems: Procedural Options

- **The evaluator may consider input from other trained evaluation personnel.**
- **The evaluation may be amended if assessment data are available within 90 days of close of school year. If so, then all regular notification procedures must again be followed.**

Approval & Reporting Requirements

- **Each school district superintendent must:**
 - Annually report to FDOE evaluation results for instructional personnel and school administrators
 - Annually notify FDOE of instructional personnel or school administrators who receive 2 unsatisfactory evaluations
 - Notify FDOE of intent to terminate or not renew

Approval & Reporting Requirements

- **District school boards must:**
 - Review the system annually for compliance; changes to system must be approved by FDOE prior to use
 - Include a process for monitoring and evaluating the effective and consistent use of the evaluation criteria by employees with evaluation responsibilities
 - Include a process for monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of the system itself in improving instruction and student learning

Approval & Reporting Requirements

- FDOE approves and monitors district evaluation systems for compliance
- By December 1, 2012, and each year thereafter, Commissioner must report to Governor, President of Senate and Speaker of House status of each district's evaluation system for instructional personnel & school administrators
 - Report must include prior year data based on the 4 levels of performance specified in bill
 - Data shall be disaggregated by classroom teachers and other instructional personnel, by district and by school

District Evaluation Systems: Performance Levels

- Differentiate among 4 levels of performance:
 - Highly effective
 - Effective
 - Needs improvement, or for instructional personnel in first 3 years of employment, Developing
 - Unsatisfactory
- State Board of Education must establish student growth standards for each performance level (no date required)
- Commissioner must consult with experts, instructional personnel, school administrators and education stakeholders in developing the criteria for the performance levels

District Evaluation Systems: Evaluation Criteria

Evaluations for all instructional personnel and school administrators must:

- **Be based on sound educational principles and contemporary research in effective educational practices**
- **Include the following evaluation criteria:**
 - 1. Performance of students**
 - 2. Instructional practice or instructional leadership**
 - 3. Professional and job responsibilities**

Evaluation Criteria:

1. Performance of Students

All Instructional Personnel & School Administrators:

- At least 50% of evaluation must be based on student learning growth assessed annually and measured by statewide assessments or, for subjects not measured by statewide assessments, by district assessments in s. 1008.22(8), F.S.

Evaluation Criteria:

1. Performance of Students

Classroom Teachers, excluding substitutes:

- Growth data for 3 years of students assigned to the teacher
- If less than 3 years of data are available, years for which data are available must be used, and percentage of evaluation based on growth may be reduced to not less than 40%

Evaluation Criteria:

1. Performance of Students

When less than 3 years of data exists, what are the options and how do these relate to RTTT?

- **Leave percentages as they are (example: 50%-50%)**
- **Do a simple adjustment to 40% student growth and 60% on the remainder of the evaluation**
- **Leave percentages as 50%-50%, use 40% on required growth measures and add 10% district measures as contemplated in the RTTT MOU**

Evaluation Criteria:

1. Performance of Students

Instructional personnel who are not classroom teachers:

- Statewide assessment data for 3 years of students assigned to the individual
- May include student learning growth data and other measurable student outcomes related to the individual's job assignment, provided that growth on state assessments accounts for at least 30% of evaluation
 - If using the above provision and 3 years of student learning growth data are not available, years available must be used and not less than 20% of evaluation must be based on growth data

Evaluation Criteria:

1. Performance of Students

School administrators:

- Data of 3 years of students assigned to school
- If 3 years of data are not available, years available must be used and percentage of evaluation based on student learning growth must not be less than 40%

Evaluation Criteria:

2. Instructional Practice

Classroom teachers, excluding substitutes:

- FEAPs

Instructional personnel, not classroom teachers:

- FEAPs
- May include specific job expectations related to student support

Evaluation Criteria:

2. Instructional Leadership

School Administrators:

- Leadership standards adopted by State Board of Education, including:
 - ❑ performance measures related to effectiveness of classroom teachers
 - ❑ recruitment and retention of effective & highly effective teachers
 - ❑ improvement in the percentage of instructional personnel rated as highly effective & effective
 - ❑ appropriate use of evaluation criteria
 - ❑ other practices that result in student learning growth
- May include means to give parents and instructional personnel opportunities to provide input into evaluation

Evaluation Criteria:

3. Professional & Job Responsibilities

For ALL Instructional personnel and school administrators:

- **Other job responsibilities as adopted by State Board of Education**
- **District may identify additional responsibilities**

Student Learning Growth

- Commissioner must approve growth formula by June 1, 2011, to measure individual student learning growth on FCAT
- Formula must take into account each student's prior performance
- Expectations for student learning growth cannot be different based on student's gender, race, ethnicity or socioeconomic status
- Specifies other factors that must be considered in development of formula, such as attendance, disability or ELL status

Student Learning Growth

For subjects and grades associated with statewide assessments:

- Beginning in the 2011-12 school year, districts must use formula approved by the Commissioner for FCAT courses
- Commissioner shall select additional formulas as new state assessments (e.g., end-of-course assessments) are implemented
- Additional formulas shall be used by districts as the formulas become available
- Formulas must be adopted in State Board Rule

Student Learning Growth

For subjects and grades not assessed by statewide assessments:

- By 2014-15, districts shall measure growth using equally appropriate formulas. DOE shall provide models.
- Allows district to request through evaluation system review process to:
 - Use student achievement, rather than growth, or combination of growth and achievement for classroom teachers where achievement is more appropriate;
 - For courses measured by district assessments, include growth on FCAT Reading and/or Mathematics as part of a teacher's growth measure, with a rationale. In this instance, growth on district assessment must receive the greater weight.

Student Learning Growth 1012.34(7)(e)

- For classroom teachers of courses for which there are no appropriate assessments under s. 1008.22(8), F.S., and the district has not adopted growth measures:
 - Student growth must be measured by using results of assigned students on statewide assessments, OR
 - If the teacher's assigned students do not take statewide assessments, by established learning targets approved by principal that support the school improvement plan.
- For all instructional personnel: The superintendent may assign instructional personnel in an instructional team the growth of the team's students on statewide assessments.
- These provisions expire July 1, 2015.

Student Learning Growth

- **Requires State Board rules for:**
 - Approval of evaluation systems
 - Measurement of student growth
 - Monitoring processes
 - **Standards for the 4 performance levels, including:**
 - A learning growth standard that, if not met, will result in an unsatisfactory teacher evaluation rating
 - A learning growth standard that must be met to receive an effective rating
 - A learning growth standard that must be met to receive a highly effective rating
 - A process for instructional personnel to examine their class rosters for accuracy.

Value-Added Model Development Under Race to the Top

- The Department has contracted with a the American Institutes of Research (AIR) to help develop a value - added model to measure student growth on statewide assessments
- The Department has begun working collaboratively with a committee of stakeholders (Student Growth Implementation Committee) to identify the type of model and the factors that should be accounted for in Florida's value-added models
- The Department will also work with the contractor to provide example value-added models that districts may choose to use for use with other standardized assessments (year 2) and local assessments (year 3)

Value-Added Model Development Under Race to the Top

- **The Student Growth Implementation Committee is composed of 27 members from across the state. The group includes:**
 - Teachers (across various subjects and grade levels, including exceptional student education)
 - School administrators
 - District-level administrators (assessment and HR)
 - Representatives from postsecondary education
 - Representative from the business community
 - Parents

Reminder:

June 1 is only the beginning

- FLDOE has not pre-selected a value-added model; eight different value-added models will be analyzed and discussed with the Student Growth Implementation Committee before making a recommendation to the Commissioner
- The June 1 deadline to make a recommendation to the Commissioner is fast approaching; however, the recommendation and selection of a statewide FCAT value-added model is not the end point for that model
- Over the next four years, FLDOE and AIR will continue to analyze the value-added model and seek feedback to make adjustments even before the first year of calculation using the Spring 2012 results.
- To be clear, while the June 1 deadline is tight, it is a starting point and not the final answer

Overview of SGIC Meetings

Meeting	Date	Topics
Webinar	March 24, 2011	Introductions, project and process overview
In Person Orlando	April 4-5, 2011	Overview of value added models; eight different types to analyze; discussion of business rules; selection of factors; direction from committee on which models to review
Conf. Call	April 14, 2011	Additional discussion on variables in the Data Warehouse
In Person Orlando	May 19-20, 2011	Present and discuss results of analysis of the eight different models and form preliminary recommendations on final model
Webinar	May 25, 2011	Reach consensus on recommendation for the final model to present to the Commissioner on June 1

Timelines - Teacher Evaluation System Re-design

- **RTTT Participating LEAs:**
 - June 1, 2011 – documentation due to FDOE in electronic format
 - June 17, 2011 – DOE will return approval results to LEAs

Timelines - Principal Evaluation System Redesign

- **RTTT Participating LEAs Re-designing in Year 1**
 - June 1, 2011 – documentation due to DOE
 - June 24, 2011 – DOE returns approval information to LEAs
- **RTTT Participating LEAs Re-designing in Year 2**
 - May 1, 2012 – documentation due to DOE