Greetings ...
• Legislative Updates
• Future of Professional Development
• Professional Development System Evaluation Protocol & Site Visits
Legislative Updates

- Senate Bill 736 (Student Success Act) – Signed into law March 24, 2011 – Revises
  - s. 1012.34, F.S., Assessment procedures and criteria
  - s. 1008.22, F.S., Student assessment programs
  - s. 1012.33, F.S. Contracts with instructional staff, supervisors, and school principals
  - s. 1012.335, F.S., Contracts with instructional personnel hired on or after July 1, 2011
  - s. 1002.33, F.S., Charter schools
  - Others …
Key Points for Today

- District Evaluation Systems
  - System Requirements
  - Procedural Requirements
  - Approval & Reporting Requirements
  - Evaluation Criteria
- Student Learning Growth
District Evaluation Systems: System Requirements

- Designed to support effective instruction & student learning growth.
- Results used when developing district & 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 newly hired classroom teachers must be observed and evaluated at least twice in first year of teaching in the school district.
District Evaluation Systems: Optional System Components

- Allows district to establish 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.
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, 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.
Differentiate among 4 levels of performance:
- Highly effective
- Effective
- Needs improvement, or for instructional personnel in first 3 years of employment, Developing
- Unsatisfactory

- Commissioner must consult with experts, instructional personnel, school administrators and education stakeholders in developing the criteria for the performance levels.
- State Board of Education must establish student growth standards for each performance level (no date required).
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%.
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 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 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.
Value-Added Model Development Under Race to the Top

• The Department is contracting with a national expert to develop value-added models to measure student growth on statewide assessments.

• The Department will be 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 for use with other standardized assessments and local assessments.
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
The development of Value-Added models using FCAT to measure student growth is the focus of Year 1 of the grant.

- These models will be developed over the Spring of this year for use in teacher evaluations beginning in 2011–12.

The development of Value-Added models for other statewide assessments (for example, end-of-course assessments and alternate assessment for students with disabilities) will be the focus of Year 2 of the grant.

- Models for other standardized assessments, such as Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, and the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT–10) will be developed beginning in Year 2 of the grant.
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, not the final answer.
## Overview of SGIC Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Webinar</strong></td>
<td>March 24, 2011</td>
<td>Introductions, project and process overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In Person Orlando</strong></td>
<td>April 4–5, 2011</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In Person Orlando</strong></td>
<td>May 19–20, 2011</td>
<td>Present and discuss results of analysis of the eight different models and form preliminary recommendations on final model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Webinar</strong></td>
<td>May 25, 2011</td>
<td>Reach consensus on recommendation for the final model to present to the Commissioner on June 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.
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

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 assessments:

- Student growth must be measured by growth on statewide assessments, or if students do not take statewide assessments, by established learning targets approved by principal.
- The superintendent may assign instructional personnel in an instructional team the growth of the team’s students on statewide assessments.
- These two provisions expire July 1, 2015.
Student Learning Growth

- Requires State Board rules for approval of evaluation systems, standards for performance levels, measurement of student growth, and monitoring processes.
- Includes language that if the growth standard is not met, it will result in an unsatisfactory teacher evaluation rating.
- Student learning growth standard must be met to receive a highly effective or effective rating.
- Allows for a process for instructional personnel to examine their class rosters for accuracy.
Professional Development

• Coming soon to Florida…
One of essential components for improvement of state’s educational system.

“Business as usual” may not be sufficient for the challenges ahead.

The core basis of moving to more effective PD is not new costs but the introduction into schools of deliberate practice – a practice that may require changes in priorities and how time and existing resources are used, more than expenditures of new resources.
Systemic changes as a result of MOU, RTTT, revised FEAPs and Student Success Act – all impacting Professional Development:

- Content and methodology of PD will be upgraded based on contemporary research and new standards for content.
- PD must be aligned with changes in other systemic components such as evaluation systems, data systems, and monitoring data on PD impact.
PD Upcoming Changes...

- Re-developed evaluation systems for instructional and administrative personnel requires training on various levels.
- Evaluation data used to inform professional development.
- District PD System monitored and evaluated annually.
- Common Core State Standards basis for PD in subject content areas.
- Increasing PD on uses of data for instructional improvement.
PD Upcoming Changes...

- Continued emphasis on Lesson Study in all schools, not just DA.
- Initial Teacher/Leader Preparation Programs in colleges and universities address FEAPs and curricular changes.
- District Alternative Certification Programs & Educator Preparation Institutes will undergo processes to align them with the new FEAPs.
- Districts will be expected to use PD to develop candidates for hard-to-staff subjects.
The re-developed evaluation systems for instructional and administrative personnel require training on various levels (Student Success Act):

- Evaluators must be trained in the observation and rating process.
- Evaluator’s proficiency in use of evaluation criteria must be monitored – and growth via PD provided as needed.
- Those being evaluated must be informed of their evaluation criteria and processes – a recurring PD function as new personnel are hired.
Evaluation data will be used to inform professional development for individuals, schools, and districts.

May impact how a district uses its PD resources and how improvement plans and the Master Inservice Plan are developed.

Districts will need to be able to link evaluation data to individual improvement plans (IPDPs, Leadership Development Plans), school and district improvement plans.
Your PD system must be monitored and evaluated annually.

- Districts will need revised process for evaluating professional development in accordance with Protocol Standards.
- PD impact will be evaluated based on student results and changes in classroom/leadership practices. **How will you connect these results to specific PD events?**
- Results on PD impact on staff proficiencies must be reported annually. Monitoring and data systems that enable this will be needed.
Changes ... Common Core State Standards

- Common Core State Standards will increasingly be the basis for professional development on subject matter content:
  - Teachers and administrators will need PD on how the common core state standards differ from previous standards.
  - PD will be needed to develop teacher content knowledge with a focus on the common core state standards, and instructional strategies and methods for implementation of the common core state standards.
Increasing professional development on uses of data for instructional improvement will be needed:

- Local Instructional Improvement System (LIIS) standards identify minimum capacities for district data collection. Data elements on staff development and evaluation proficiencies are part of the LIIS system. Collaboration will be needed between district PD staff & district MIS staff on what data elements will be required.

- Student growth measure data and observation data on instructional practice are data sources districts will need to be able to use.

- Contemporary research on effective instructional strategies reveals proficiency at tracking student progress is one of the highest impact strategies. More PD on this competency will be productive.
Lesson Study will continue to be an emerging area of PD.

- In the MOU/RTTT Lesson Study is focused on DA schools. However, a state model for Lesson Study as a practice for ALL Schools in Florida is under development and will be introduced during 2011–2012.
Initial Teacher Preparation Programs in colleges/universities will undergo processes to align specific programs with the revised FEAPs and the underlying contemporary research on strategies and behaviors that have a causal relationship to student learning.

- FDOE/LSI and FEAPs Implementation Committee to meet July 28–29 with Deans/Directors.
- Institution faculty teams to meet at regional academies in early Fall 2011 to align FEAPs with core curriculum.
Alternative certification programs will undergo processes to align them with the revised FEAPs and the underlying contemporary research on strategies and behaviors that have a causal relationship to student learning.

Associated PD in support of revised district alternative certification programs must be delivered in accordance with Evaluation Protocol.
Changes ... Hard-to-staff areas

- Districts will be expected to use PD to develop candidates for hard-to-staff subject areas.
- Districts will need to implement recruitment and professional development strategies to increase pool of teachers available in the district in these subject areas.
A state level ITN (Invitation to Negotiate) is under development to provide districts national level expertise on how to evaluate PD.

Details on that support, including when and how it will be provided, will be forthcoming in the months ahead.
Professional Development System Evaluation Protocol

- Update on Third Cycle...
Second Cycle Professional Development System Evaluation Protocol Summary Report is now complete and is now being reviewed by Department leadership.

Will be available on FDOE website shortly.

Once released will be sent to all district PD directors.
Initiation of Third Cycle 2010–11.

Four–year cycle (instead of three).

15 of 19 reviews scheduled for 2010–11 completed by end of April.

Four remaining reviews in May.

Process for reviewing draft report with district PD director revised:

• Draft sent in advance of meeting for more targeted discussion of review results.

• 13 reports completed and sent to districts or in final approval process at FDOE.
Leadership Development program review status (Standard 3.1.6).

- **Purpose** – currently review does not affect continued approval of program.
- **Results so far** – many districts are in beginning stages or have not implemented approved plan.
- **Change in leadership standards forthcoming:**
  - Teacher–Leader Preparation Implementation Committee reviewing/making recommendations to State Board Rule on Principal Leadership Standards.
Professional Development System Evaluation Protocol

- Scheduling for 2011–2012 school year:
  - 18 districts selected for review
  - Letters to superintendents in process
  - Draft schedule
    - Used district calendars to schedule reviews – if there is a conflict with other district activities, contact Abigail Letcher to discuss scheduling change.
- Will solicit reviewer participation after dates are confirmed with districts through online EPA system.
Contact Information

Eileen L. McDaniel
Chief, Educator Recruitment, Development and Retention
Eileen.McDaniel@fldoe.org
(850) 245–0562

John Moore
Program Director, Retention/Professional Development
John.Moore@fldoe.org
(850) 245–0546

Abigail Letcher
Program Specialist IV, Retention/Professional Development
Abigail.Letcher@fldoe.org
(850) 245–0548

Denise Scheidler
Program Specialist III, Retention/Professional Development
Denise.Scheidler@fldoe.org
(850) 245–0545