

FLORIDA

**ESEA FLEXIBILITY
REQUEST**

Submitted to:
U.S. Department of Education

November 14, 2011


TABLE OF CONTENTS

Insert page numbers prior to submitting the request, and place the table of contents in front of the SEA’s flexibility request.

CONTENTS	PAGE
Cover Sheet for ESEA Flexibility Request	3
Waivers	4
Assurances	6
Consultation	8
Evaluation	15
Overview of SEA’s ESEA Flexibility Request	16
Principle 1: College- and Career-Ready Expectations for All Students	19
1.A Adopt college- and career-ready standards	19
1.B Transition to college- and career-ready standards	19
1.C Develop and administer annual, statewide, aligned, high-quality assessments that measure student growth	42
Principle 2: State-Developed Differentiated Recognition, Accountability, and Support	44
2.A Develop and implement a State-based system of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support	44
2.B Set ambitious but achievable annual measurable objectives	86
2.C Reward schools	97
2.D Priority schools	98
2.E Focus schools	109
2.F Provide incentives and supports for other Title I schools	118
2.G Build SEA, LEA, and school capacity to improve student learning	119
Principle 3: Supporting Effective Instruction and Leadership	135
3.A Develop and adopt guidelines for local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems	135
3.B Ensure LEAs implement teacher and principal evaluation and support systems	149

LABEL	LIST OF ATTACHMENTS	PAGE
1	Notice to LEAs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. E-mail seeking input on process b. E-mail and survey seeking input on draft proposal 	A-1
2	Comments on request received from LEAs (if applicable)	A-8
3	Notice and information provided to the public regarding the request <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. E-mail seeking input on process b. E-mail and survey seeking input on draft proposal c. Florida Department of Education ESEA website 	A-13
4	Evidence that the State has formally adopted college- and career-ready content standards consistent with the State’s standards adoption process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. State Board of Education Certification and Meeting Minutes b. Standards Activities Alignment Chart 	A-24
5	Memorandum of understanding or letter from a State network of institutions of higher education (IHEs) certifying that meeting the State’s standards corresponds to being college- and career-ready without the need for remedial coursework at the postsecondary level (if applicable)	N/A
6	State’s Race to the Top Assessment Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) (if applicable)	A-39
7	Evidence that the SEA has submitted high-quality assessments and academic achievement standards to the Department for peer review, or a timeline of when the SEA will submit the assessments and academic achievement standards to the Department for peer review (if applicable)	N/A
8	A copy of the average statewide proficiency based on assessments administered in the 2010–2011 school year in reading/language arts and mathematics for the “all students” group and all subgroups (if applicable).	A-69
9	Table 2: Reward, Priority, and Focus Schools	A-71
10	A copy of any guidelines that the SEA has already developed and adopted for local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems (if applicable). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Senate Bill 736 b. Race to the Top Phase II MOU c. Florida Educator Accomplished Practices d. Florida Principal Leadership Standards e. Review and Approval Checklist for Race to the Top Teacher Evaluation Systems f. Communications to LEAs Regarding Revised Evaluation Systems and Value-Added Model 	A-133
11	Evidence that the SEA has adopted one or more guidelines of local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Evidence for Senate Bill 736 b. Evidence for Race to the Top Phase II MOU c. Evidence for Florida Educator Accomplished Practices d. Evidence for Florida Principal Leadership Standards 	A-228
12	Differentiated Accountability Strategies and Support Document	A-238
13	School Improvement Plan Template	A-260

COVER SHEET FOR ESEA FLEXIBILITY REQUEST

<p>Legal Name of Requester: Florida Department of Education Gerard Robinson, Commissioner</p>	<p>Requester's Mailing Address: 325 West Gaines Street Suite 1514 Tallahassee, FL 32399-0400</p>
<p>State Contact for the ESEA Flexibility Request</p> <p>Name: Dr. Michael Grego</p> <p>Position and Office: Senior Advisor to the Commissioner Office of the Commissioner</p> <p>Contact's Mailing Address: 325 West Gaines Street Suite 1514 Tallahassee, FL 32399-0400</p> <p>Telephone: (850) 245-9663</p> <p>Fax: (850) 245-9667</p> <p>Email address: Michael.Grego@fldoe.org</p>	
<p>Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Gerard Robinson</p>	<p>Telephone: (850) 245-9663</p>
<p>Signature of the Chief State School Officer:</p>  <p>X</p>	<p>Date: November 14, 2011</p>
<p>The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to meet all principles of the ESEA Flexibility.</p>	

WAIVERS

By submitting this flexibility request, the SEA requests flexibility through waivers of the ten ESEA requirements listed below and their associated regulatory, administrative, and reporting requirements by checking each of the boxes below. The provisions below represent the general areas of flexibility requested; a chart appended to the document titled *ESEA Flexibility Frequently Asked Questions* enumerates each specific provision of which the SEA requests a waiver, which the SEA incorporates into its request by reference.

- 1. The requirements in ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(E)-(H) that prescribe how an SEA must establish annual measurable objectives (AMOs) for determining adequate yearly progress (AYP) to ensure that all students meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement on the State's assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics no later than the end of the 2013–2014 school year. The SEA requests this waiver to develop new ambitious but achievable AMOs in reading/language arts and mathematics in order to provide meaningful goals that are used to guide support and improvement efforts for the State, LEAs, schools, and student subgroups.
- 2. The requirements in ESEA section 1116(b) for an LEA to identify for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, as appropriate, a Title I school that fails, for two consecutive years or more, to make AYP, and for a school so identified and its LEA to take certain improvement actions. The SEA requests this waiver so that an LEA and its Title I schools need not comply with these requirements.
- 3. The requirements in ESEA section 1116(c) for an SEA to identify for improvement or corrective action, as appropriate, an LEA that, for two consecutive years or more, fails to make AYP, and for an LEA so identified and its SEA to take certain improvement actions. The SEA requests this waiver so that it need not comply with these requirements with respect to its LEAs.
- 4. The requirements in ESEA sections 6213(b) and 6224(e) that limit participation in, and use of funds under the Small, Rural School Achievement (SRSA) and Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) programs based on whether an LEA has made AYP and is complying with the requirements in ESEA section 1116. The SEA requests this waiver so that an LEA that receives SRSA or RLIS funds may use those funds for any authorized purpose regardless of whether the LEA makes AYP.
- 5. The requirement in ESEA section 1114(a)(1) that a school have a poverty percentage of 40 percent or more in order to operate a schoolwide program. The SEA requests this waiver so that an LEA may implement interventions consistent with the turnaround principles or interventions that are based on the needs of the students in the school and designed to enhance the entire educational program in a school in any of its priority and focus schools, as appropriate, even if those schools do not have a poverty percentage of 40 percent or more.
- 6. The requirement in ESEA section 1003(a) for an SEA to distribute funds reserved under that section only to LEAs with schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. The SEA requests this waiver so that it may allocate section 1003(a) funds to its LEAs in order to serve any of the State's priority and focus schools.

- 7. The provision in ESEA section 1117(c)(2)(A) that authorizes an SEA to reserve Title I, Part A funds to reward a Title I school that (1) significantly closed the achievement gap between subgroups in the school; or (2) has exceeded AYP for two or more consecutive years. The SEA requests this waiver so that it may use funds reserved under ESEA section 1117(c)(2)(A) for any of the State's reward schools.
- 8. The requirements in ESEA section 2141(a), (b), and (c) for an LEA and SEA to comply with certain requirements for improvement plans regarding highly qualified teachers. The SEA requests this waiver to allow the SEA and its LEAs to focus on developing and implementing more meaningful evaluation and support systems.
- 9. The limitations in ESEA section 6123 that limit the amount of funds an SEA or LEA may transfer from certain ESEA programs to other ESEA programs. The SEA requests this waiver so that it and its LEAs may transfer up to 100 percent of the funds it receives under the authorized programs among those programs and into Title I, Part A.
- 10. The requirements in ESEA section 1003(g)(4) and the definition of a Tier I school in Section I.A.3 of the School Improvement Grants (SIG) final requirements. The SEA requests this waiver so that it may award SIG funds to an LEA to implement one of the four SIG models in any of the State's priority schools.

Optional Flexibility:

An SEA should check the box below only if it chooses to request a waiver of the following requirements:

- The requirements in ESEA sections 4201(b)(1)(A) and 4204(b)(2)(A) that restrict the activities provided by a community learning center under the Twenty-First Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) program to activities provided only during non-school hours or periods when school is not in session (*i.e.*, before and after school or during summer recess). The SEA requests this waiver so that 21st CCLC funds may be used to support expanded learning time during the school day in addition to activities during non-school hours or periods when school is not in session.

ASSURANCES

By submitting this application, the SEA assures that:

- 1. It requests waivers of the above-referenced requirements based on its agreement to meet Principles 1 through 4 of the flexibility, as described throughout the remainder of this request.
- 2. It will adopt English language proficiency (ELP) standards that correspond to the State's college- and career-ready standards, consistent with the requirement in ESEA section 3113(b)(2), and that reflect the academic language skills necessary to access and meet the new college- and career-ready standards, no later than the 2013–2014 school year. (Principle 1)
- 3. It will develop and administer no later than the 2014–2015 school year alternate assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities that are consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.6(a)(2) and are aligned with the State's college- and career-ready standards. (Principle 1)
- 4. It will develop and administer ELP assessments aligned with the State's ELP standards, consistent with the requirements in ESEA sections 1111(b)(7), 3113(b)(2), and 3122(a)(3)(A)(ii). (Principle 1)
- 5. It will report annually to the public on college-going and college credit-accumulation rates for all students and subgroups of students in each LEA and each public high school in the State. (Principle 1)
- 6. If the SEA includes student achievement on assessments in addition to reading/language arts and mathematics in its differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system and uses achievement on those assessments to identify priority and focus schools, it has technical documentation, which can be made available to the Department upon request, demonstrating that the assessments are administered statewide; include all students, including by providing appropriate accommodations for English Learners and students with disabilities, as well as alternate assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.6(a)(2); and are valid and reliable for use in the SEA's differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system. (Principle 2)
- 7. It will report to the public its lists of reward schools, priority schools, and focus schools at the time the SEA is approved to implement the flexibility, and annually thereafter, it will publicly recognize its reward schools. (Principle 2)
- 8. Prior to submitting this request, it provided student growth data on their current students and the students they taught in the previous year to, at a minimum, teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects in a manner that is timely and informs instructional programs, or it will do so no later the deadline required under the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund. (Principle 3)
- 9. It will evaluate and, based on that evaluation, revise its own administrative requirements to

reduce duplication and unnecessary burden on LEAs and schools. (Principle 4)

- 10. It has consulted with its Committee of Practitioners regarding the information set forth in its request.
- 11. Prior to submitting this request, it provided all LEAs with notice and a reasonable opportunity to comment on the request and has attached a copy of that notice (Attachment 1) as well as copies of any comments it received from LEAs (Attachment 2).
- 12. Prior to submitting this request, it provided notice and information regarding the request to the public in the manner in which the State customarily provides such notice and information to the public (*e.g.*, by publishing a notice in the newspaper; by posting information on its website) and has attached a copy of, or link to, that notice (Attachment 3).
- 13. It will provide to the Department, in a timely manner, all required reports, data, and evidence regarding its progress in implementing the plans contained throughout this request.

If the SEA selects Option A or B in section 3.A of its request, indicating that it has not yet developed and adopted all guidelines for teacher and principal evaluation and support systems, it must also assure that:

- 14. It will submit to the Department for peer review and approval a copy of the guidelines that it will adopt by the end of the 2011–2012 school year. (Principle 3)

CONSULTATION

An SEA must meaningfully engage and solicit input from diverse stakeholders and communities in the development of its request. To demonstrate that an SEA has done so, the SEA must provide an assurance that it has consulted with the State’s Committee of Practitioners regarding the information set forth in the request and provide the following:

1. A description of how the SEA meaningfully engaged and solicited input on its request from teachers and their representatives.

Florida solicited input from stakeholders representing diverse perspectives, experiences, and interests, including those that will be impacted by and implement the policies included in the plan, and has strengthened its request based on this input. Florida developed a “Consultation Action Plan to Engage Stakeholders” that provides a description of how Florida meaningfully engaged and solicited input from groups, including teachers and their representatives. Refer to Florida’s response to Question 2 of the Consultation Section for the specifics of the Action Plan.

Florida’s approach to soliciting feedback and input from teachers and their representatives is ongoing and sincere. Our targeted strategies to engage and encourage teacher participation are described below.

- **Related Committees Involving Teachers.** Florida has a history of engaging teacher stakeholders in major policy decisions with statewide impact. Recent activities related to flexibility principles that involve teachers and teacher union members include the following:

Teacher Contributions to Flexibility Principles

Group	Contribution
Race to the Top Student Growth Implementation Committee (2011-14)	Developed Florida’s Value-Added Model for statewide assessments; work continues for other assessments
Race to the Top Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee (2011-14)	Revising Florida Principal Leadership Standards
Race to the Top District-developed Assessments for Instructional Effectiveness Implementation Committee (2011-14)	Collaborating with the state to establish a support structure and assistance team for LEAs in the development and implementation of summative assessments for the purpose of measuring student learning
Race to the Top Formative and Interim Assessment Design Implementation Committee (2011-14)	Providing input, feedback, and recommendations to the state in the development and implementation of formative and interim assessments for instructional improvement

Group	Contribution
Commissioner's Teacher Advisory Council (2010)*	Revised Florida Educator Accomplished Practices
Assessment Standard Setting Committees (2011)	Recommended cut scores for new FCAT 2.0 and Algebra 1 end-of-course assessments – over 300 educators
Statewide Assessment Development Committees (ongoing)	Participating on reading, writing, mathematics, science, and social studies content advisory committees; item review committees; and rangefinder committees – over 300 educators
Teacher and Principal Evaluation Redesign Teams (2011)	Attended four academies to learn about evaluation systems and redesign their LEA systems in accordance with state law and Race to the Top
Title I Committee of Practitioners (ongoing)	Advising FDOE on state implementation related to federal law
Next Generation Sunshine State Standards Development (2008-2010)	Provided development support and formal input prior to adoption; for example, over 8,000 teachers reviewed the science standards
Common Core State Standards Review (2010)	Provided formal input before adoption; for example, 1,242 teachers rated the mathematics standards

*Comprised of teachers exclusively

Specific to the ESEA Flexibility Process:

- **The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) Website.** The FDOE developed and launched an “Elementary and Secondary Education Act Flexibility Waiver” website on October 12, 2011 (<http://www.fldoe.org/esea/>, Attachment 3c), that provides information about this flexibility, including USDOE and FDOE documents and an e-mail address (eseaflexibility@fldoe.org) for Floridians to send us their comments and suggestions.
- **Commissioner Robinson's Social Media Outreach Efforts.** The Commissioner utilized Facebook, Twitter, blogs, and traditional media avenues to ensure teachers and their representatives were aware of the FDOE's efforts to request this flexibility and to encourage their participation and input throughout the process.
- **Invitation to Participate.** An e-mail invitation was specifically sent to Florida's District Teachers of the Year and 179,462 classroom teachers across Florida on October 13, 2011 (Attachment 3a), including charter and virtual school teachers, to encourage them to visit our website and submit suggestions for FDOE staff to consider while drafting our initial application. The Florida Education Association (*teacher representatives*) was also contacted to submit suggestions and ideas via our website. The e-mail invitation read as follows:

The Florida Department of Education has created a new web page that contains information on our plans to apply for a waiver on No Child Left Behind. This law was established a decade ago to help our nation improve our education system. Although it has helped many students throughout the country, it has also had some limitations that we want to address. As such, the Department plans on applying for a flexibility waiver that will enable us to closely align our state's accountability system with a revised federal plan. Please take a moment to review our new web page and also share this information with your friends, colleagues and anyone you feel would like to participate in this state and national conversation on public education.

You may view the web page here: www.fldoe.org/esea.

We will soon post our draft application and solicit stakeholder feedback.

The FDOE did receive and review numerous e-mails from teachers throughout the state who were encouraged that the flexibility request would be submitted. Some responses provided specific recommendations; all were reviewed and considered.

- **Opportunity to Provide Input on Draft.** Teachers and the teacher representatives were given the opportunity to provide meaningful feedback and input on the draft flexibility request. The draft and a survey regarding the draft were placed on the FDOE website (Attachment 3b). A multi-faceted and multi-media approach was used to again invite and encourage teachers to participate by providing their suggestions, recommendations, and comments on the draft.

2. A description of how the SEA meaningfully engaged and solicited input on its request from other diverse communities, such as students, parents, community-based organizations, civil rights organizations, organizations representing students with disabilities and English Learners, business organizations, and Indian tribes.

Florida engaged a diverse group of stakeholders and communities in the development of the request, including teachers and their representatives, students, parents, community-based organizations, civil rights organizations, organizations representing students with disabilities and English language learners, business organizations, and Indian tribes, and strengthened its request because of their thoughtful input. Florida developed a “Consultation Action Plan to Engage Stakeholders” (see below) that provides a description of how Florida meaningfully engaged and solicited input from these groups.

Consultation Action Plan to Engage Stakeholders
Key Activities/Date/Staff Responsible

Key Activity	Date	Staff Responsible
Post all relevant ESEA Flexibility documents on the FDOE website. Include an invitation on the website for stakeholders to submit comments and ideas regarding Florida's flexibility request via an e-mail address to ensure stakeholder input is sought at the beginning of our process.	10/12/11	Hue Reynolds
Send an e-mail to the ESEA Flexibility Team Leaders with the Proposed Stakeholder groups to request the leaders review the proposed list and add other key stakeholder groups and responsible staff.	10/10/11	Chancellor Costin/ Kim McDougal
Identify a diverse mix of stakeholders to engage at the outset of planning and to elicit feedback on an initial application draft. Develop a list of stakeholders that will be contacted as part of our stakeholder outreach activities.	10/11/11	Consultation Team/ Chancellor Costin
Draft an e-mail to send to our diverse mix of stakeholders about the ESEA flexibility on DOE's website and the survey.	10/10/11	Hue Reynolds
Develop a step-by-step procedure for DOE staff to use to send the e-mail requesting input from our stakeholders. The purpose of this procedure is to ensure DOE staff uses a consistent process to invite and engage stakeholder comments since not all staff are on the ESEA Team or Consultation work group.	10/10/11	Chancellor Costin/ Kim McDougal
Send e-mails to our diverse mix of stakeholders informing them about the information on our website and the opportunity to participate in a survey regarding Florida's application.	10/12/11	Refer to the Consultation Stakeholder list below
Develop an online stakeholder survey to request feedback and input on Florida's first draft of its flexibility request.	10/20/11	Chancellor Costin/ Hue Reynolds/ Holly Edenfield/ Kim McDougal
Draft an e-mail that will be used to direct our stakeholders to provide feedback and input on our draft application by using a survey on our website.	10/20/11	Hue Reynolds
Send e-mails to our diverse mix of stakeholders informing them about the opportunity to participate in a survey regarding Florida's draft application.	11/8/11	Refer to the Consultation Stakeholder list below/ Hue Reynolds

Key Activity	Date	Staff Responsible
Use a multi-media approach to obtain as much stakeholder input and feedback as possible: -Twitter -Facebook -Blog -Video message from Commissioner Robinson -Newsletter inserts -In-person meetings	Ongoing	Hue Reynolds
Provide survey comments to relevant ESEA Flexibility teams to review and incorporate applicable comments into Florida's application	11/8/11- 11/14/11	Hue Reynolds

Below is a list of the 70 stakeholder groups that were contacted about Florida's ESEA flexibility request ("ESEA FLEXIBILITY REQUEST CONSULTATION STAKEHOLDER LIST"). The strategies were the same as described for in the response to Question 1 of the Consultation Section regarding teacher outreach, including website, social and traditional media, and opportunity for input on the proposal development and draft. Additionally, FDOE leadership has conducted the following meetings to get specific input on the flexibility proposal:

- **Commissioner Robinson and Chancellor of Public Schools Leadership Outreach.** Senior FDOE staff conducted in-person meetings or conference calls with many stakeholder groups to obtain input and suggestions. Specifically, the following meetings were held that included the discussion and invitation for recommendations regarding Florida's flexibility request:
 - Assessment and Accountability Advisory Committee (9/26-27/11 and 11/7/11)
 - Florida Association of District School Superintendents (10/3/11)
 - State Board of Education (10/18/11)
 - Title I Committee of Practitioners (10/27/11 and 11/4/11)
 - Leadership Policy and Advisory Committee (Superintendents) (10/24/11)
 - Legislative Staff (9/29/11, 10/25/11, and 11/8/11)
 - Foundation for Excellence in Education (10/25/11)
 - LEA Superintendents (11/1/11 and 11/4/11)
 - Florida School Finance Officers Association (11/9/11)

In short, Florida's consultation efforts demonstrate:

- Florida engaged input from teachers, their representatives, and a broad diverse community of stakeholders.
- Feedback was received from a diverse mix of stakeholders representing various perspectives and interests, including stakeholders from high-need communities.
- During the process of constructing its application Florida modified some aspects of its request based on inputs from teachers, superintendents, and representatives from a diverse group of stakeholders. Revisions included modification of Annual Measurable Objectives, modifications of interventions for Focus/Correct schools, modification of Priority/Intervene entrance and exit criteria to better align with the state's existing accountability system, and addition of a Hybrid Model as a Priority/Intervene turnaround

option.

- Input from the state’s Title I Committee of Practitioners (E-Mail invitation to submit comments (10/13/11); Conference calls (10/27/11 and 11/4/11); Review of and comment on draft proposal).

ESEA FLEXIBILITY REQUEST CONSULTATION STAKEHOLDER LIST

Stakeholder Group	FDOE Staff Responsible for Outreach
Teachers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Florida Teacher of the Year - Florida District Teachers of the Year (2012) - Charter Schools - Virtual Education Teachers - Master Statewide Teacher List <i>(Just for Teachers)</i> 	Kelly Seay Kelly Seay Mike Kooi Kelly Seay Hue Reynolds
Teacher Representatives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Florida Education Association 	Michael Grego
Students <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Florida Future Educators - Career and Technical Student Organizations - Florida Association of Student Councils - Children’s Week Teen Town Hall representatives 	Ian Barker Belinda Chason Mary Lee Kiracofe Hue Reynolds
Parents <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Florida Parent Teacher Association - Parent to Parent of Miami - Central Florida Parent Center - Family Network on Disabilities 	Joe Davis Cathy Bishop Cathy Bishop Cathy Bishop
Superintendents and Assessment and Accountability Directors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Leadership Policy Advisory Committee - Assessment and Accountability Advisory Committee 	Michael Grego Kris Ellington
Community-Based Organizations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Florida Faith-based and Community-based Advisory Council - Governor’s Commission on Volunteerism and Community Service - Voluntary Public School Choice Partners 	Mike Kooi Joe Davis Jean Miller
Civil Rights Organizations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Florida State Conference – NAACP, Florida Chapter - Florida College Access Network 	Nyla Benjamin Hue Reynolds

Stakeholder Group	FDOE Staff Responsible for Outreach
Student with Disabilities Advocates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Florida Developmental Disabilities Council - State Advisory Committee for the Education of Exceptional Students - Disabilities Rights Organization - Family Café - Learning Disabilities Association of Florida - Council for Exceptional Children 	Bambi Lockman Bambi Lockman Bambi Lockman Bambi Lockman Cathy Bishop Bambi Lockman
English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Florida Chapter – League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) 	Lori Rodriguez
Business Organizations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Florida Chamber of Commerce - Florida Council of 100 - Associated Industries of Florida - Enterprise Florida - Workforce Florida, Inc. - Department of Economic Opportunity - Tax Watch: Center for Educational Performance and Accountability 	Chancellor Costin Chancellor Costin Chancellor Costin Chancellor Costin Chancellor Costin Chancellor Costin Michael Grego
Indian Tribes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Florida Governor’s Council in Indian Affairs, Inc. 	Chancellor Costin
Additional Stakeholders	
Executive Office of the Governor	Commissioner Robinson
Florida Senate President/Chairs of Education Committees	Commissioner Robinson/Adam Potts/Tanya Cooper
Speaker of the Florida House of Representatives/Chairs of Education Committees	Commissioner Robinson/Adam Potts/Tanya Cooper
Florida Education Legislative Liaisons	Adam Potts/Tanya Cooper
State Board of Education	Lynn Abbott
Chancellor, State University System	Commissioner Robinson
Chancellor, Florida College System	Commissioner Robinson
Foundation for Excellence in Education	Commissioner Robinson
Florida LEA Superintendents	Michael Grego
Florida Association of District School Superintendents	Michael Grego
Florida School Boards Association	Michael Grego
Florida Charter School Alliance	Mike Kooi
Florida Philanthropic Network	Nyla Benjamin
Florida Education Foundation	Mary Lee Kiracofe
Florida Consortium of Charter Schools	Mike Kooi
Consortium of Education Foundations	Mary Lee Kiracofe

Stakeholder Group	FDOE Staff Responsible for Outreach
Florida Association of School Administrators	Michael Grego
Master Statewide Principal List (<i>Principally Speaking</i>)	Kelly Seay
Heartland Educational Consortium	Michael Grego
Northeast Florida Educational Consortium	Michael Grego
Panhandle Area Educational Consortium	Michael Grego
Title I Committee of Practitioners	La'Trell Edwards
Florida Virtual School	Sally Roberts
Florida After School Network	Joe Davis
Florida After School Alliance	Joe Davis
Supplemental Educational Services Providers	La'Trell Edwards/Melvin Herring
Race to the Top Implementation Committees <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standards Instructional Teacher Tool • Formative and Interim Assessment Design • District-developed Student Assessments for Instructional Effectiveness • Portal, Dashboard, and Reports • Single Sign-on • Local Systems • Student Growth • Teacher and Leader Preparation 	Holly Edenfield

EVALUATION

The Department encourages an SEA that receives approval to implement the flexibility to collaborate with the Department to evaluate at least one program, practice, or strategy the SEA or its LEAs implement under principle 1, 2, or 3. Upon receipt of approval of the flexibility, an interested SEA will need to nominate for evaluation a program, practice, or strategy the SEA or its LEAs will implement under principles 1, 2, or 3. The Department will work with the SEA to determine the feasibility and design of the evaluation and, if it is determined to be feasible and appropriate, will fund and conduct the evaluation in partnership with the SEA, ensuring that the implementation of the chosen program, practice, or strategy is consistent with the evaluation design.

Check here if you are interested in collaborating with the Department in this evaluation, if your request for the flexibility is approved.

OVERVIEW OF SEA'S REQUEST FOR THE ESEA FLEXIBILITY

Provide an overview (about 500 words) of the SEA's request for the flexibility that:

1. explains the SEA's comprehensive approach to implement the waivers and principles and describes the SEA's strategy to ensure this approach is coherent within and across the principles; and
2. describes how the implementation of the waivers and principles will enhance the SEA's and its LEAs' ability to increase the quality of instruction for students and improve student achievement.

Florida's ESEA Flexibility Request is a monumental step forward to significantly advance the state's nationally-recognized and acclaimed accountability system and to further increase the quality of instruction for students and student achievement. Florida has made unprecedented gains over the past decade in levels of student achievement in reading, mathematics, science, and writing; closing the achievement gap between minority and non-minority students; as well as leading the nation in students participating in Advanced Placement college-level courses, especially for low-income and minority students. Florida's consistent increase in graduation rate over the past five years for all subgroups of students continues to be recognized nationally. These ongoing successes are even more impressive when you consider the steady increase of English language learners (currently approximately 10% of student population) and eligibility rate for Free/Reduced-Priced Lunch (currently at 56%). During the 2010-11 school year, Florida's demographics were 43% white, 28% Hispanic, 23% African-American, and 6% other races.

Florida's ESEA Flexibility Request is designed to eliminate the duplication and confusion caused by having two separate accountability systems. Through this application, Florida proposes to move to one accountability system that will be clearly understood by the people of Florida with the primary goal of increasing standards to achieve national and international competitiveness. Florida's School Grades system has consistently succeeded in identifying the most struggling schools and students in need of additional support and rewarding the outstanding performance of high-achieving students and schools.

This proposal serves as a means to establish a comprehensive and coherent approach to align Florida's accountability system, Florida's Race to the Top grant, and Florida's Differentiated Accountability (DA) federal pilot program all currently being implemented. The proposal demonstrates how this flexibility will assist the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) align accountability and improvement initiatives. Florida has already developed and implemented, to various degrees, all four flexibility principles and continues to lead the nation in establishing rigorous standards and assessments, increasing student readiness for college and careers, and developing great teachers and leaders. Florida's past and current practice of consistently establishing higher curriculum and achievement standards clearly demonstrates a total commitment to national and international competitiveness.

Florida's proposal documents meaningful outreach and consultation to ensure successful implementation of the SEA request due to the commitment of stakeholders. All stakeholders, including all teachers, were provided multiple venues to gain a greater understanding of the

proposal and submit suggestions to improve the proposal as it was developed. Such thorough engagement is a positive indicator that this flexibility proposal will be met with tremendous and ongoing success and serve as a model for others.

Florida has proven itself a national leader in developing and adopting rigorous standards by first adopting internationally-benchmarked Next Generation Sunshine State Standards, and then by serving on Common Core State Standards review teams prior to their adoption in this state in 2010. In addition, Florida is conducting an analysis of the linguistic demands to inform the development of the state's English Language Proficiency Standards to ensure English language learners have the opportunity to achieve the Common Core State Standards. Also, the SEA will continue to ensure that all activities related to the Common Core State Standards, such as outreach, dissemination, and professional development clearly and directly address the needs of students with disabilities. To accomplish this, Florida is participating with the National Center and State Collaborative General Supervision Enhance Grant to define college- and career-ready. Florida's support of the national agenda is also demonstrated by being a governing state and fiscal agent for the 24-member Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC).

As part of Florida's Race to the Top grant, LEAs signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that required revised teacher and administrator evaluation systems and professional development based on the principles of Lesson Study and formative assessments that focus on the new Common Core State Standards and includes teachers of all students. One of the three student achievement goals for Florida's Race to the Top grant is to significantly improve student performance specific to college readiness and success by "doubling the percentage of incoming high school freshmen who ultimately graduate from high school, go to college, and achieve at least a year's worth of college credit." Legislation passed in 2008 requires Florida to implement a high school accountability system that measures student access to and performance in rigorous, accelerated coursework as well as college readiness exam performance.

Florida's differentiated recognition, accountability, and support systems will provide the needed levels of support and rewards as well as set ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). The proposal incorporates four AMOs that will ensure a thorough and detailed examination of the most critical measures to advance all students, schools, and LEAs in the state. Briefly, the four AMOs are 1) School Grades, which provides a comprehensive review of the performance of all schools including subgroup achievement and student learning gains; 2) Performance of All Students and Student Subgroups in Reading and Mathematics; 3) Progress of Students in the Lowest-Performing 25% in Reading and Mathematics; 4) Comparison of Florida's Student Performance to the Highest-Performing States and Nations.

The annual achievement results on assessments will continue to be reported for subgroups and all students. Florida's new AMOs will be reported for all schools, LEAs, and the state. Florida has in place and will continue its school recognition program to reward and recognize its highest-performing schools and schools that improve their performance significantly. Florida's most struggling schools will be supported through the DA program, which will be aligned with the state's grading system.

Through Florida's Race to the Top grant and state law each LEA has revised teacher and administrator evaluation systems that include student performance measures and will lead to

increased quality of instruction and improved student achievement due to the emphasis on contemporary research and student growth.

In 2005, Florida convened a Paperwork Reduction Task Force and recommendations were put into law in 2006. Both SEA and LEAs review requirements annually and continually seek ways to ease the paperwork and reporting burden.

Florida is a leader of educational reform and has been working for more than a decade to develop a strong foundation with a system of accountability that builds on state-led efforts. These waivers provide us with the flexibility to further establish rigorous, high-quality accountability systems that truly support schools and LEAs. Florida is confident that with the state laws and guidelines enacted, combined with the Race to the Top resources and strong federal and state technical assistance, we will be highly successful in implementing the four principles presented in this ESEA Flexibility Request.

PRINCIPLE 1: COLLEGE- AND CAREER-READY EXPECTATIONS FOR ALL STUDENTS

1A ADOPT COLLEGE-AND CAREER-READY STANDARDS

Select the option that pertains to the SEA and provide evidence corresponding to the option selected.

Option A

- The State has adopted college- and career-ready standards in at least reading/language arts and mathematics that are common to a significant number of States, consistent with part (1) of the definition of college- and career-ready standards.
- i. Attach evidence that the State has adopted the standards, consistent with the State's standards adoption process. (Attachment 4)

Option B

- The State has adopted college- and career-ready standards in at least reading/language arts and mathematics that have been approved and certified by a State network of institutions of higher education (IHEs), consistent with part (2) of the definition of college- and career-ready standards.
- i. Attach evidence that the State has adopted the standards, consistent with the State's standards adoption process. (Attachment 4)
- ii. Attach a copy of the memorandum of understanding or letter from a State network of IHEs certifying that students who meet these standards will not need remedial coursework at the postsecondary level. (Attachment 5)

1.B TRANSITION TO COLLEGE-AND CAREER-READY STANDARDS

Provide the SEA's plan to transition to and implement no later than the 2013–2014 school year college- and career-ready standards statewide in at least reading/language arts and mathematics for all students and schools and include an explanation of how this transition plan is likely to lead to all students, including English Learners, students with disabilities, and low-achieving students, gaining access to and learning content aligned with such standards. The Department encourages an SEA to include in its plan activities related to each of the italicized questions in the corresponding section of the document titled *ESEA Flexibility Review Guidance*, or to explain why one or more of those activities is not necessary to its plan.

Background Information and Alignment of Current Standards to the Common Core State Standards

Florida has proven itself a national leader in developing and adopting rigorous standards via the internationally-benchmarked Next Generation Sunshine State Standards and Common Core State

Standards. In the 2010 *Education Week* Quality Counts report, Florida's Next Generation Sunshine State Standards received an "A" rating with a perfect score of 100%. In the Fordham Institute report *The State of State Standards – and the Common Core – in 2010*, Florida's Next Generation Sunshine State Standards were rated highly (A for mathematics; B for English/Language Arts).

The first formal analysis of the alignment of Florida's Next Generation Sunshine State Standards and the Common Core State Standards began in April of 2008 when former Florida Governor Charlie Crist announced Florida's participation in Achieve's American Diploma Project Network. The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) worked with Achieve to analyze Florida's Next Generation Sunshine State Standards to identify any gaps in content that all students should know and be able to do to meet the college-and career-ready definition. After analyzing Florida's standards, Achieve's College Ready Standards, and the proposed Common Core State Standards it was determined that the content of Florida's standards was not a barrier to college and career readiness and that that transition to the Common Core State Standards would be less challenging given their similarities.

The 2010 Fordham Institute report, referenced above, also included a comparison of Florida's English/Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics Next Generation Sunshine State Standards to the Common Core State Standards. The result was a rating of "too close to call," finding both sets of standards clear and rigorous. This review provided greater support for the transition to the Common Core State Standards.

Florida's education leaders have been strong advocates in national and state forums historically for the benefits of multi-state work on high-quality, clear, and rigorous standards. The state's full commitment was also demonstrated by the active participation of FDOE staff on Common Core State Standards work groups. Florida was one of three states invited by Council of Chief State School Officers to provide guidance and comments to the writers during national standards development. Additionally, Florida's Next Generation Sunshine State Standards were cited as a resource for the development of the Common Core State Standards.

FDOE continues to analyze the alignment between the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards and the Common Core State Standards. The results from the various activities described above and below continue to inform the state's transition plan and activities.

Adoption of the Common Core State Standards

Florida's activities to garner support for the adoption of the Common Core State Standards began prior to their completion. Florida's former Commissioner of Education Eric Smith was one of the key state leaders in the decision to develop internationally-competitive content standards for states and Florida staff actively participated in the development of the Common Core State Standards. During this process, curriculum leaders throughout the state were invited to review drafts of the Common Core State Standards and provide the FDOE input that was then shared with the Common Core State Standards writing teams. FDOE also partnered with the Florida Parent and Teacher Association (PTA) as one of only four states selected by the National PTA to organize parent support for more uniform academic expectations and adoption of the Common Core State Standards. The President of Florida's PTA spoke in favor of Florida's adoption of the

Common Core State Standards at the June 14, 2010, State Board of Education meeting. Other key stakeholder groups that spoke in support of adoption of the Common Core State Standards included the Florida Chamber of Commerce and *STEMflorida*. The standards were adopted on July 27, 2010 (Attachment 4a, State Board of Education certification and meeting minutes).

The above activities were in addition to those required in Florida law, Section 1003.41(3)(a), Florida Statutes, which requires the Commissioner to submit proposed standards:

- For review and comment by Florida educators, school administrators, representatives of Florida College System institutions and state universities who have expertise in the content knowledge and skills necessary to prepare a student for postsecondary education, and leaders in business and industry.
- For written evaluation by renowned experts on K-12 curricular standards and content after considering any comments and making any revisions to the proposed standards.
- To the Governor, President of the Senate, and Speaker of the House of Representatives at least 21 days before the State Board of Education considers adoption, along with the curricular and content evaluations.


Timelines for Implementation of the Common Core State Standards

Once the Common Core State Standards were adopted, the next step was to determine the timeline for implementation into classrooms. Florida had recently transitioned to assessments aligned to the state's "A"- and "B"-rated Next Generation Sunshine State Standards in mathematics and ELA, which was preceded by the adoption of instructional materials that included lessons to teach these standards. The recent implementation of these rigorous standards prepared all educators and students for a successful transition to the Common Core State Standards. Florida intends to make effective use of the investments made in the preparation of teachers to teach the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards, including instruction of rigorous content followed by rigorous assessments, to support the Common Core State Standards transition.

Common Core State Standards assessments will begin with third grade students in the 2014-2015 school year. Therefore, students entering kindergarten in 2011-2012 are the first cohort to be assessed on the Common Core State Standards and never assessed on the mathematics and ELA Next Generation Sunshine State Standards. It is for this reason that Florida is implementing a transition schedule that begins with kindergarten instruction, based on the Common Core State Standards, this school year (2011-2012), adds first grade in the 2012-2013 school year, and adds grades 2-12 in the 2013-2014 school year. Grades 3-12 will have a blended approach with the primary focus on the Common Core State Standards plus any content still assessed on Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (see chart below). This transition plan provides our youngest students with three years of instruction on the Common Core State Standards and all students with a transition year of instruction prior to the implementation of assessments based on the Common Core State Standards.

What Standards Should Be Taught?

Year/Grade Level	K	1	2	3-8	9-12
2011-2012	CCSS (M+ELA) NGSSS other	NGSSS	NGSSS	NGSSS	NGSSS
2012-2013	CCSS (M+ELA) NGSSS other	CCSS (M+ELA) NGSSS other	NGSSS	NGSSS	NGSSS
2013-2014	CCSS (M+ELA) NGSSS other	CCSS (M+ELA) NGSSS other	CCSS (M+ELA) NGSSS other	CCSS + All NGSSS assessed	CCSS + All NGSSS assessed
2014-2015	CCSS (M+ELA) NGSSS other	CCSS (M+ELA) NGSSS other	CCSS (M+ELA) NGSSS other	CCSS (M+ELA) NGSSS other	CCSS (M+ELA) NGSSS other



M = Mathematics; ELA = English Language Arts and Reading
CCSS – Common Core State Standards; NGSSS – Next Generation Sunshine State Standards

Attachment 4b provides evidence that Florida has thoughtfully planned the alignment and implementation of all standards-related statewide activities across all subject areas, including curriculum, adoption of instructional materials, professional development, statewide assessments, and teacher certification.

Analysis of the Linguistic Demands of the Standards for English Language Learners

Florida is planning to conduct an analysis of the linguistic demands of the Common Core State Standards to inform the development of the state’s English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards and to ensure that English language learners have the opportunity to achieve the Common Core State Standards. The ELP Standards will provide:

- The language domain and broad statement of what an English language learner is expected to understand.
- The minimum academic path necessary to achieve proficiency for each language domain.
- The skill level at which an English language learner can access the core curriculum for each language domain.
- A focused description of what an English language learner is expected to know and be able to do in English at the end of instruction.
- A description of the English language skill level at which an English language learner can access instruction.
- An observable student action used to judge learning.

As the first step in the development of ELP Standards for the Common Core State Standards, Florida signed a Memorandum of Understanding with a consortium of states to apply for an Enhanced Assessment Grant. This was a federal competitive grant for the purpose of enhancing

the quality of assessment instruments and systems used by states for measuring the academic success of elementary and secondary students. Absolute Priority 5 of the grant was about English Language Proficiency Assessment Systems. Although the consortium's application was not funded, Florida is now working with the consortium partner states to begin development of the ELP Standards in 2011-12. In addition, Florida is reviewing the ELP Standards already developed by World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA). WIDA is part of the consortium that was awarded the funding and has a current partnership with 27 states to utilize developed ELP Standards to build an ELP assessment.

Florida's planned development of ELP standards will be prioritized to begin work at the primary grade levels to match timelines for the Common Core State Standards so that all students will be accessing the standards on the same schedule (see below). This work will help ensure that English language learners have the opportunity to achieve the Common Core State Standards.

Florida's English Language Proficiency Standards Implementation Timeline

Transition	Implementation Completed
Consortium of states finalized with a committee to develop the ELP standards	Fall 2011
Committee prepares a plan for the development of the standards	Winter 2012
Standards completed via conference calls and webinars	Spring 2012
ELP Standards approved by the State Board of Education	Summer 2012
Implementation of Common Core ELP Standards in kindergarten and first grade classrooms	Fall 2012
Implementation of Common Core ELP Standards in all grades	Fall 2013

Analysis of the Learning and Accommodation Factors for Students with Disabilities

Florida is continuing its analysis of the learning and accommodation factors necessary to ensure that students with disabilities will have the opportunity to achieve the Common Core State Standards. To accomplish this, FDOE will continue to ensure that all activities related to the Common Core State Standards, such as outreach, dissemination, and professional development, address the needs of students with disabilities. Florida's inclusive approach ensures accessible instructional materials, assistive technology, and classroom accommodations and supports are available so that students with disabilities can access the Common Core State Standards.

Florida also is planning to analyze the learning factors necessary to ensure that students with significant cognitive disabilities have access to the Common Core State Standards at reduced levels of complexity. To accomplish this, Florida is participating with the National Center and State Collaborative General Supervision Enhancement Grant (NCSC GSEG) to define college- and career-ready for this population of students and to identify Core Content Connectors to the Common Core State Standards. Florida is currently a partner with 18 other states and four research centers to develop Core Content Connectors for students with significant cognitive disabilities. Once released, curriculum guides and other materials will be provided that will serve as the foundation for classroom instruction. Again, these activities will begin at primary grade

levels so that all students will be accessing the standards on the same schedule (see below).

Florida's Core Content Connectors for Students with Disabilities Implementation Timeline

Transition	Implementation Completed
Mathematics Core Content Connectors released by NCSC GSEG	Winter 2012
Training provided on mathematics Core Content Connectors and related materials	Summer 2012
ELA Core Content Connectors released by NCSC GSEG	Summer 2012
Training provided on ELA Core Content Connectors and related materials	Fall 2012

Outreach on and Dissemination of Common Core State Standards

Florida's plan for outreach and dissemination of the standards transition is ongoing and includes the following multiple delivery methods:

1. Conference calls and distribution of written materials
 - Monthly conference calls from the Commissioner of Education to LEA superintendents with updates and information regarding implementation activities
 - Bi-monthly conference calls from the Chancellor of Public Schools to LEA curriculum directors where updates, information, and requirements to implement the standards into instruction are reviewed
 - Monthly conference calls from K-12 program lead offices to LEA content and subject area administrators where school-level and content area requirements and opportunities for professional development are reviewed and shared
2. In-person meetings
 - Frequent onsite meetings with LEAs as follow-up to summer professional development services
 - Annual statewide conferences with content area associations (for example, the 2012 Florida Council of Teachers of Mathematics conference theme will be the Common Core State Standards and FDOE staff will provide support and presentations)
 - Bi-annual Florida Organization of Instructional Leaders meetings that are attended by each LEA's lead curriculum administrator (i.e., Assistant Superintendents for Curriculum and Instruction); FDOE staff provides information and leads discussions regarding the state implementation plan for instruction including the Common Core State Standards and their assessment
 - Ad hoc meetings as requested by stakeholders
 - Town Hall Meetings as part of State Board of Education rule development that include implementation of the Common Core State Standards, course descriptions, or assessments
3. Webinars on Race to the Top and the Partnership for the Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC)

4. Websites
 - FDOE
 - Florida's Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction website which includes the standards, course descriptions, and timeline for instructional materials adoption with vendor specifications
 - Florida's Teacher Standards Database website and resources tool
5. Social Media
 - Facebook
 - Twitter
 - Blog
6. Personal Communication – FDOE staff respond to Florida education stakeholders that include parents, teachers, school- and LEA-level personnel, and others who communicate to us with questions and concerns regarding new content course and assessment requirements
 - E-mail
 - One-to-One phone calls
7. Video Messaging
 - *Teacher Talk*
 - Podcasts
 - YouTube
8. E-mail distribution lists for dissemination of information on and updates to the implementation plan based on the key audience
 - *The Core* – electronic newsletter from FDOE
 - Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction Newsletter
 - Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services Newsletter
 - Bureau of Student Achievement through Language Acquisition Newsletter
 - *Just for Teachers/Principally Speaking* communications
 - Statewide Curriculum Organization Newsletters/E-blasts
 - Race to the Top Assessment Office Newsletter
9. Surveys – offices within FDOE send out online surveys to collect information, concerns, opinions, and local needs; for example, Florida mathematics teachers were recently surveyed to ask if having the standards cited in instructional materials where lessons supported the standards was helpful. Over 5,000 teachers responded sharing that 94% were using state adopted materials, 66% agreed having the standard was very helpful, and 31% responded having the standard cited was somewhat helpful
10. Florida Race to the Top Written Correspondence and Meetings
 - LEA Memorandum of Understanding includes requirements to implement professional development on the Common Core State Standards to teachers and principals
 - Stakeholder Advisory Committees for each of the Common Core State Standards-related projects
11. Teacher and LEA professional development provided by FDOE
 - Summer 2011 – Kindergarten teachers – *An In-depth Review of the Common Core State Standards*

- Summer 2012 – Kindergarten through 2nd grade teachers – *An In-depth Review of the Common Core State Standards*
- Summer of 2012 – 3rd through 12th grade teachers – *Introducing a Framework for Blended Curricula*

Additionally, through Race to the Top we will procure, by contract, the services of a postsecondary institution to develop school-level training materials and tutorials for teachers and pre-service programs on accessing teacher resources that support the Common Core State Standards.

Plan for Professional Development for Teachers and Principals to Support Implementation of the Common Core State Standards for All Students

Florida law, Section 1012.98, Florida Statutes, requires FDOE, public postsecondary institutions, LEAs, schools, state education foundations, consortia, and professional organizations to work collaboratively to establish a coordinated system of professional development. The express purpose of this statewide system is to increase student achievement, enhance classroom instructional strategies that promote rigor and relevance throughout the curriculum, and prepare students for college and careers. This system of professional development is required to be aligned to the state-adopted standards and support the framework for standards adopted by the National Staff Development Council. Florida law also specifies the following responsibilities for FDOE, LEAs, and postsecondary institutions:

- FDOE
 - Disseminate to the school community research-based professional development methods and programs that have demonstrated success in meeting identified student needs.
 - Use data on student achievement to identify student needs.
 - Methods of dissemination must include a web-based statewide performance support system, including a database of exemplary professional development activities, a listing of available professional development resources, training programs, and available assistance.
- LEA
 - Develop a professional development system in consultation with teachers, teacher-educators of Florida College System institutions and state universities, business and community representatives, local education foundations, consortia, and professional organizations. The professional development system must:
 - Be approved by FDOE.
 - Be based on analyses of student achievement data and instructional strategies and methods that support rigorous, relevant, and challenging curricula for all students.
 - Provide inservice activities coupled with follow-up support appropriate to accomplish LEA- and school-level improvement goals and standards.
 - Include a master plan for inservice activities, pursuant to rules of the State Board of Education, for all LEA employees from all fund sources. The master plan must be updated annually by September 1, based on input

from teachers and LEA and school instructional leaders, and must use the latest available student achievement data and research to enhance rigor and relevance in the classroom. Each LEA inservice plan must be aligned to and support the school-based inservice plans and school improvement plans. LEA plans must be approved by the LEA school board annually. LEA school boards must submit verification of their approval to the Commissioner of Education no later than October 1, annually.

- Require each school principal to establish and maintain an individual professional development plan for each instructional employee assigned to the school.
- Include inservice activities for school administrative personnel that address updated skills necessary for instructional leadership and effective school management.
- Provide for systematic consultation with regional and state personnel designated to provide technical assistance and evaluation of local professional development programs.
- Provide for delivery of professional development by distance learning and other technology-based delivery systems to reach more educators at lower costs.
- Provide for the continuous evaluation of the quality and effectiveness of professional development programs in order to eliminate ineffective programs and strategies and to expand effective ones.

To carry out the FDOE's responsibilities, as stated above, and to support the LEAs' implementation of these professional development requirements, Florida's Race to the Top projects include activities and products related to the adoption and implementation of the Common Core State Standards. All of the projects below include a professional development component for teachers and school administrators.

- Development of mathematics and ELA (including English language acquisition) formative assessments to improve day-to-day individualized standards instruction.
- Development of school-level professional development Lesson Study toolkits for mathematics formative assessments, ELA formative assessments, and instructional use of student data.
- Development of mathematics and ELA interim assessments for classroom, school, and LEA use to periodically monitor individual student, classroom-level, and school-level student success in mastering the Common Core State Standards.
- Development and launching of the Teacher Standards Instructional Tool where teachers can access the standards, link to related resources, and access model lessons as well as the developed formative assessments, toolkits, and interim assessments.
- Development of, piloting, and implementing school-level training materials and "Help" tutorials for teachers on accessing the resources and assessments available on the Teacher Standards Instructional Tool by a postsecondary institution.

The 65 Race to the Top participating LEAs signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that includes:

- Ensuring that professional development programs in all schools focus on the new Common Core State Standards, including assisting students with learning challenges to meet those standards (such as through accommodations and assistive technology). Such professional development will employ formative assessment and the principles of Lesson Study.
- Evaluating the fidelity of Lesson Study and formative assessment implementation that is tied to interim and summative student assessments.

Also as noted above, LEA professional development systems must be approved by the FDOE. In 2009, Florida revised its state Standards for High Quality Professional Development to include specific standards related to delivery of professional development at the LEA, school, and teacher/principal level on the revised curriculum standards. The state's Standards for High Quality Professional Development and the annual report on LEA professional development systems may be found online at <http://www.teachinflorida.com/ProfessionalDevelopment/ProtocolStandards/tabid/66/Default.aspx>.

Additionally, FDOE's Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction, in partnership with the Just Read, Florida! Office, developed and is implementing a series of summer workshops with follow-up aligned to the Common Core State Standards implementation timeline.

Plan to Provide High-Quality Instructional Materials Aligned with the Common Core Standards to Support Teaching and Learning

In preparation for the implementation of the Common Core State Standards in kindergarten and first grade in 2011-2012 and 2012-2013, FDOE provided the following resources aligned to the Common Core State Standards:

- FloridaStandards.org – a web portal where teachers can access the standards and teaching resources aligned to each standard.
- Florida's Virtual Curriculum Marketplace – a web portal where teachers, schools, and LEAs can access free or for-purchase standards-based digital curriculum.
- Mathematics Formative Assessment Tasks – examples of these tasks were provided to teachers during the summer workshops described above and are also available via Floridastandards.org.

FDOE, as part of its Race to the Top grant, is also developing a Student Standards Tutorial. This is an online system that will include adaptive student tutorial lessons, teacher mini-assessments, and parent information resources.

As referenced previously, Attachment 4b provides evidence of Florida's alignment of instructional materials with the Common Core Standards. Florida is one of the only large states with a statewide K-12 instructional materials adoption process that ensures the provision of high-quality instructional materials aligned to the Common Core State Standards to support teaching and

learning for all students. Florida’s published specifications require that instructional materials submitted must:

- Be aligned with the Common Core State Standards.
- Reflect the demands of reading, writing, listening, and speaking that are specific to the content area.
- Include vocabulary development, cognitive reasoning, and reading acquisition skills specific to literacy in the content area.
- Include strategies within teacher and student resources that support the unique literacy demands of the content area.
- Include assessment tools for assessing student learning and information for instructional decision making.
- Include a professional development plan for use with the materials.
- Include strategies, materials, and activities that consider and address the needs of students with disabilities (universal design for curriculum access).
- Include teacher and student resources for English language learners that support both the content and academic vocabulary of the content area.

The instructional materials adoption process includes a review of all submitted materials by content experts followed by a review by all LEAs for usability and appropriateness. Florida is the first in the nation to utilize a completely digital review process that guarantees public access to reviewers’ comments for all adopted materials. Florida LEAs must utilize a minimum of 50% of their state-appropriated instructional materials funding to purchase materials on the state-adopted list.

Florida’s five-year adoption cycle (see below) ensures the statewide adoption of ELA and mathematics materials prior to the 2014-2015 school year when statewide assessments on the Common Core State Standards will be fully implemented.

**Florida Instructional Materials Adoption Schedule
For Adoption Years 2010-11 through 2016-17**

Adoption Year ¹	Subject Area	Specifications & Criteria Available	State Adoption Process ²	Effective Date Of Contract April 1 - March 31
2010-2011	Science <i>K-12</i>	2009	2010	2011-2017
2011-2012	Social Studies <i>K-12</i>	2010	2011	2012-2018
2012-2013	Reading, including ESOL and Access Courses ³ <i>K-5</i>	2011	2012	2013-2019
	Language Arts and Literature, including ESOL and Access Courses <i>K-5</i>			
	Mathematics, including Access Courses <i>K-5</i>			
2013-2014	Reading, including ESOL and Access Courses <i>6-12</i>	2012	2013	2014-2020
	Language Arts & Literature, including ESOL and Access Courses <i>6-12</i>			
	Mathematics, including Access Courses <i>6-12</i>			
2014-2015	World Languages <i>K-12</i> (Spanish Only)	2013	2014	2015-2021
	Career and Technical Education/ Agriculture			
	Physical Education/ Health (HOPE course only)			
2015-2016	Science, including Access Courses <i>K-12</i>	2014	2015	2016-2022
2016-2017	Social Studies <i>K-12</i>	2015	2016	2017-2023

¹Adoption Years 2012-2013, 2013-2014, 2014-2015, 2015-2016, and 2016-2017 are tentatively scheduled and all adoptions are dependent on adequate funding.

²State Adoption Process:

- Deadline for Intent To Bid – February
- Deadline for Bids – May
- State Expert Member Training – May & June
- State Expert Meeting – Fall

³Access Courses are for students with significant cognitive disabilities that receive instruction on Next Generation Sunshine State Standards Access Points.

Expansion of Accelerated Learning Opportunities

In February of 2008, the Go Higher, Florida! Task Force, made up of K-12 and postsecondary education leaders in Florida, released a committee report that included the following recommendations:

- The State Board of Education, which oversees K-12 and the Florida College System, and

the Board of Governors, which oversees the public universities, should adopt a common definition of “college and career readiness” for Florida.

- Develop/adopt high school/postsecondary assessment(s) which are clear in purpose and function, i.e., assessing skills in core courses for high school graduation and/or assessing postsecondary readiness in core courses.
- Require all high school students to take rigorous and relevant courses that prepare them for life after graduation.

Responding to the Task Force’s recommendations, Florida began working toward a common definition of college readiness that would include specific expectations of what students need to know and be able to do to succeed in their first college-level English and mathematics classes. Florida’s definition of readiness states, “*Students are considered college ready when they have the knowledge, skills, and academic preparation needed to enroll and succeed in introductory college-level courses without the need for remediation in mathematics or English.*”

In September 2008, as an initial step in aligning high school exit and college entry expectations and developing an assessment that measured college readiness, the FDOE Division of Florida Colleges organized a faculty workshop comprised of over 70 cross-sector ELA and mathematics faculty, including high school teachers, Florida College System, and state university faculty. Faculty was grouped into subject areas and reviewed the American Diploma Project college- and career-ready benchmarks to identify Postsecondary Readiness Competencies. In April 2010, in preparation for the adoption of the Common Core State Standards, FDOE began revising the Postsecondary Readiness Competencies to better align with the Common Core State Standards. These revised Postsecondary Readiness Competencies were then used to begin test item development for Florida’s new Postsecondary Education Readiness Test (P.E.R.T.). In June 2010, Florida’s colleges administered over 10,000 P.E.R.T. pilot exams in Florida high schools and state colleges. In October 2010, FDOE fully administered one of the first customized college placement tests developed from a blueprint created by a team of K-12, college, and university faculty.

Consistent with the above activity are the three goals in Florida’s Race to the Top application related to improved student performance. The goal specific to student college readiness and success states, “Double the percentage of incoming high school freshmen who ultimately graduate from high school, go on to college, and achieve at least a year’s worth of college credit.” To accomplish this, Florida continues to expand student access to college-level courses through five initiatives:

- College placement testing and enrollment in 12th grade postsecondary preparatory courses for identified students
- High school accountability
- College Board partnership
- Student performance-based funding
- Dual Enrollment

College Placement Testing and Postsecondary Preparatory Instruction

In response to the number of Florida high school graduates that enter the Florida College System and require remediation in mathematics, reading, or writing, Florida legislation passed in 2010 (Section 1008.30, Florida Statutes) requires high schools in Florida to evaluate the college readiness of each 11th grade student who scores at identified levels on Florida's statewide reading and mathematics grade 10 assessments. High schools must perform this evaluation using results from the state-funded, identified college placement assessment. As a result of this legislation, beginning in 2011-2012 all identified 11th grade students will be tested on Florida's new P.E.R.T. assessment or an approved college readiness assessment such as the ACT or the SAT. This student testing has been fully funded through legislative appropriations. Students who demonstrate readiness by achieving the minimum test scores established for P.E.R.T. and enroll in a Florida College System institution within two years of meeting or exceeding such scores shall not be required to retest or enroll in remediation when admitted to any Florida College System institution. Students with identified deficiencies as evidenced by scores below the statewide cut score will be required to complete postsecondary preparatory instruction prior to high school graduation. Postsecondary preparation courses in mathematics, reading, and writing (*College Ready* and *College Success*) were developed by Florida K-12 content experts, working with Florida College System mathematics and ELA faculty. These courses have been approved by the State Board of Education and are now a part of Florida's Course Code Directory to be included in all high school course offerings. All 11th grade students with identified deficiencies will be enrolled in these courses in 2012-2013 and at completion will have another opportunity to take the P.E.R.T. If successful, these students are eligible to enter the Florida College System without required remediation and are considered college ready.

High School Accountability

Legislation passed in 2008 (Section 1008.34, Florida Statutes) required Florida to move to a high school accountability system that, in addition to the focus on academic performance and performance gains measured by student achievement on statewide assessments, provided an equal focus on:

- Student access to and performance in rigorous, accelerated coursework including Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), Advanced International Certificate of Education (AICE), Dual Enrollment (DE), and Industry Certification (IC). Performance is measured by exam scores (AP, IB, AICE), course grades (DE), or completion of certification requirements (IC).
- Student measures of college readiness determined by identified SAT, ACT, or P.E.R.T. exam scores.
- Graduation rates for all students, providing an additional graduation rate for academically at-risk students.

In conjunction with implementation of this new high school accountability system, Florida has seen a ramping up of student participation in AP, IB, and AICE courses and program areas, as well as increased Dual Enrollment course offerings and rising enrollment in Industry Certification programs. Likewise, Florida student participation in ACT, SAT, and college placement examinations has continued to rise, especially for the state's minority populations. With broad expansion of participation in advanced curricula and college entrance exams, Florida's largest minority groups have also shown increased performance on AP examinations and notable reductions in achievement gaps. Florida's graduation rates have also continued to rise in recent

years, with some of the greatest sustained increases occurring among the state's minority populations.

The college readiness measures in Florida's School Grades system provide an additional incentive to schools and LEAs to prepare all graduates to be college ready. Each high school receives points in the school grading formula for the percentage of its graduates that are ready for college based on SAT, ACT, or other college placement tests. The administrative rule governing school grades (Rule 6A-1.09981, Florida Administrative Code) also includes changes to this measure to increase its rigor and apply it to all on-time graduates. Including this measure in the school grading system raises the profile of college readiness and increases awareness of the importance of helping all students become ready for college and careers. The following links provide information about how school grades, including the acceleration and college readiness measures, are calculated:

<http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/pdf/1011/Guidesheet2011SchoolGrades.pdf> and
<http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/pdf/1011/SchoolGradesTAP2011.pdf>.

College Board Partnership

Consistent with the requirements of Florida law (Section 1007.35, Florida Statutes), each year the FDOE works with the College Board to identify schools in need of support to develop a college-going culture. This partnership utilizes a systematic approach with specified programs and services prioritized to support underperforming LEAs. Between 1999 and 2010, 10th grade PSAT/NMSQT test-taking numbers increased nearly 287 percent for the general population and increased by more than 460 percent for minority test-takers. The increase is largely attributable to state funding proposed by the Governor and provided by the State Legislature to cover the cost of the test for all 10th grade students. Minority students are also taking AP exams in greater numbers than ever before. The partnership implemented greater incentives and efforts to increase minority student enrollment in AP courses and participation in AP examinations resulting in more than a 491 percent increase in the number of exams taken by minority students and a 330 percent increase in the number of AP exams taken by minority students receiving scores of three or higher, thus generating college course credit. In addition to teacher professional development for readiness to teach AP courses, the partnership also supports implementation of the Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) program in partnership schools with an emphasis on teaching college-ready skills and preparation for success in rigorous coursework.

Student Performance-Based Funding

Florida law (Section 1011.62(1)(l)(m)-(n), Florida Statutes) provides incentive funds for schools and teachers based on the number of students who take and score at or above identified scores on AP, IB, and AICE exams. Specifically, an additional value of 0.16 full-time equivalent (FTE) is reported by LEAs for:

- Each student enrolled in an AP class who earns a score of three or higher on an AP exam, provided they have been taught in an AP class in the prior year.
- Each student enrolled in an IB course who receives a score of four or higher on the subject exam.
- An AICE student if he or she receives a score of "E" on a full-credit subject exam or an additional 0.08 FTE if he or she is enrolled in a half-credit class and earns a score of "E" or higher on the subject exam.

- Each student who receives an IB or AICE diploma.

From the funding generated by the bonus FTE of these programs, Florida law (Sections 1011.62(1)(l), (m), and (n), Florida Statutes), requires LEAs to distribute bonuses to certain classroom teachers as follows:

- International Baccalaureate – A bonus of \$50 is earned by an IB teacher for each student in each IB course who receives a score of four or higher on the IB exam. An additional bonus of \$500 is earned by the IB teacher in a school designated with a performance grade category “D” or “F” who has at least one student scoring four or higher on the IB subject exam. Bonuses awarded to a teacher may not exceed \$2,000 per school year.
- Advanced International Certificate of Education – A teacher earns a \$50 bonus for each student in the full-credit AICE course who receives a score of “E” or higher on the subject exam and a \$25 bonus for each student in each half-credit AICE course who receives a score of “E” or higher on the subject exam. Additional bonuses of \$500 and \$250 for full-credit and half-credit courses, respectively, shall be awarded to AICE teachers in a school designated with a performance grade category “D” or “F” who have at least one student passing the subject exam in that class. The maximum additional bonus in a given school year is \$500 for those teachers who teach half-credit courses and \$2,000 for those teachers who teach full-credit courses.
- Advanced Placement – A \$50 bonus is earned by an AP teacher for each student in each AP course who receives a score of three or higher on the AP examination. An additional bonus of \$500 is earned by the AP teacher in a school designated with a performance grade category “D” or “F” who has at least one student scoring three or higher on an AP exam. Bonuses awarded to a teacher may not exceed \$2,000 per school year.


Florida law (Section 1011.62(1)(o), Florida Statutes) also provides incentives for students who complete an industry-certified career or professional academy program and who is issued the highest level of Industry Certification and a high school diploma. For these students, an additional value of 0.1, 0.2, or 0.3 FTE student membership is added.

It is estimated that a total of \$86,171,014 was allocated to LEAs in 2011-12 for the above incentives.

Dual Enrollment

Florida law (Section 1007.271, Florida Statutes) defines Dual Enrollment as the enrollment of an eligible secondary student or home education student in a postsecondary course at a public or eligible nonpublic Florida College System institution, university, or career center. Through Dual Enrollment, students earn both high school and postsecondary credit. Tuition and fees for Dual Enrollment courses are waived for students who attend a Florida public institution. As illustrated by the chart below, the number of students enrolled and the number of students earning postsecondary credit continues to increase.

**Dual Enrollment Continues to Increase in Florida
Number of Students Enrolled in Dual Enrollment
and Earning Credit in Dual Enrollment through
Florida Colleges**



Florida will continue to implement the above strategies to expand access to accelerated learning opportunities and increase the number of participating students.

FDOE Works with Institutions of Higher Education State-Approved Programs that Prepare Teachers and School Leaders

Florida has designed and begun implementation of a plan that will result in its approved teacher preparation programs producing candidates to teach the Common Core State Standards by the 2013-14 school year. This plan begins with the revision of Florida Teacher Certification Examinations (FTCE) in all grades and subjects that include Common Core State Standards, as well as Florida's Next Generation Sunshine State Standards in STEM areas (science, technology, mathematics, and engineering). Florida requires that all candidates in approved 'traditional' initial teacher preparation programs pass all portions of the FTCE prior to graduation, which includes a basic skills entrance examination, as well as Professional Education and Subject Area tests (Rule 6A-5.066(1)(c)2.e., Florida Administrative Code). The Subject Area tests in STEM and Common Core State Standards content have begun a timeline for revision as seen in the chart below. The Competencies and Skills that are referred to on the timeline are the essential content for these examinations and form the basis for the Uniform Core Curriculum required by Section 1004.04, Florida Statutes. The other major portion of the Uniform Core Curriculum is the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices, which are assessed by the Professional Education test. Institutions receive continued approval of their programs based in large part on whether they are assessing their candidates on their performance of the Uniform Core Curriculum as described in these Competencies and Skills (see Florida Standards for Initial and Continued Program Approval at <http://www.fldoe.org/profdev/pdf/2008sidebyside.pdf> and the Guidelines for Implementation of the Standards at <http://info.fldoe.org/docushare/dsweb/Get/Document-5450/dps-2009-134b.pdf>). The revision of the Competencies and Skills for certification will focus teacher preparation programs on the Common Core State Standards, and as such are a key strategy in improving Florida teachers' ability to implement these rigorous standards in our schools.

Postsecondary Projects and Timelines – All FTCE/FELE¹ Projects (2010-2014) – Race to the Top and FTCE

Subject Area Exam	Year Last Developed	Next Scheduled for Full Development	Standards	New Standards Adoption	Proposed State Board of Education Rule Adoptions ²	New Forms Administered	Date of Last Standard Setting
Math 6-12	2007	2011	CC	2010	September 2011 & 2012	January 2013	1989-90
Middle Grades Math 5-9	2007	2011	CC	2010	September 2011 & 2012	January 2013	1989-90
PK-3 Math, Science, Reading, Social Science	2008	2011	NGSSS/CC	2010	September 2011 & 2012	January 2013	1993-95
English 6-12	2007	2013	CC	2010	September 2013 & 2014	December 2014	1989-90
Middle Grades English 5-9	2007	2013	CC	2010	September 2013 & 2014	December 2014	1989-91
Elementary K-6 Math, Science, English Language Skills, Social Science	2008	2013	NGSSS/CC	2010	September 2013 & 2014	December 2014	2009
Professional Education	2005	2011	FEAPs	2010	September 2011 & 2012	January 2013	2003-05
ESOL	2007	2011	ESOL	2010	September 2011 & 2012	January 2013	1992-95
FELE	2007	2011	William C. Golden	TBD	N/A	January 2013	2008
Standard Setting							
Biology, Chemistry, Earth/Space, Middle Grades General Science, Physics	2008	2011	NGSSS	TBD	September 2012	January 2013	1988-91

¹Florida Educational Leadership Examination

²Two State Board of Education rule adoptions for each subject area exam; the first date is for Competencies and Skills only. The second date is the adoption of updated cut scores.

Institution teams have already received training from FDOE on how to incorporate the state's newly adopted Standards for teachers in English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), reading, and Florida Educator Accomplished Practices into their preparation programs. Training for institution teams will continue during the 2011-2013 school years, as the Competencies and Skills are adopted for the specified Subject Area tests.

The state's complete plan under Race to the Top includes the subsequent revision of the Uniform Core Curriculum and Continued Approval Standards as shown below.

Teacher and School Leader Plan for Transition to New Standards

Race to the Top Timeline

2010-11	2011-12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Job-embedded program grant applications begin (September 2011) • Principal program grant applications begin (September 2011) • Student Growth Implementation Committee recommends a new state student growth model and program evaluation begins based on new model • Baseline data provided to existing programs (Spring 2012) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Job-embedded grants awarded and recipients admit first new program teacher candidates (Spring/Summer Semester 2012) • Principal program grants awarded • 1st reporting through electronic Institution Program Evaluation Plan (eIPEP) system for Initial Teacher Preparation Programs using new performance measure categories for continued program approval (reported in Institution Program Evaluation Plan (IPEP)/Annual Program Evaluation Plan (APEP) submitted Fall 2012) • Improvements to eIPEP system made based on initial study and review and feedback from institutions (November 2011)
2012-13	2013-14
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEAs hire first job-embedded teacher preparation program candidates • 1st principal program cohort begins • Reporting continues through eIPEP • Preliminary ratings of teacher preparation programs published (preliminary ratings will not be used to make program approval decisions) • Continued improvements to eIPEP system made based on initial study and review and feedback from institutions (project continues 2012-14) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First completers of STEM teacher education programs and principals employed in LEAs • 1st candidates in job-embedded programs completed • Data from partner programs used to revise initial program approval requirements and establish performance measures for continued program and School Leadership approval requirements • Student growth results from common LEA assessments introduced into teacher preparation performance measures

Updates to Uniform Core Curriculum & Leadership Standards: Supporting Activities and Milestones

	2009-10	2010-11
Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New FEAPs approved (December 2010)
Florida Teacher Standards for ESOL Endorsement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New performance standards for ESOL Endorsement approved (March 2010) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Input received from ESOL faculty at Teacher Preparation Programs on implementation of new ESOL standards (Summer 2010)
Florida Competencies for Reading Endorsement		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anticipate amended Reading Endorsement competencies approved (September 2011)
School Leadership programs		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convene leadership group via a research discussion with William Cecil Golden partners (Spring 2011) • Revisions to leadership standards

**Updates to Uniform Core Curriculum & Leadership Standards:
Supporting Activities and Milestones (continued)**

	2011-2012	2012-2013
Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training Academies for Teacher Preparation Programs provided by Learning Sciences International (Summer 2011) • Subcommittee of Race to the Top Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee works with Teacher Preparation Programs to develop a plan for implementation of new FEAPs (Fall 2011) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to Teacher Preparation programs required for implementation of new FEAPs completed and implemented (Fall 2012; implementation Fall 2013 or before) • Teacher Preparation Programs' Program Evaluation Plan (IPEP/APEP) must include a revised FEAPs matrix reflecting the courses/modules in which new FEAPs are taught and assessed (Submit November 2012)
Florida Teacher Standards for ESOL Endorsement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training provided by Bureau of Educator Recruitment, Development, and Retention staff (Fall 2011; coincide with Reading training) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to Teacher Preparation Programs required for implementation of new ESOL Standards (Fall 2012; implementation Fall 2013 or before) • Teacher Preparation Programs' Program Evaluation Plan (IPEP) must include a revised ESOL matrix reflecting the courses/modules in which the new ESOL Standards are taught and assessed Fall 2012 (Submit November 2012)
Florida Competencies for Reading Endorsement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gather input from reading faculty at Teacher Preparation Programs on implementation of amended competencies (Fall 2011) • Training provided by Bureau of Educator Recruitment, Development, and Retention staff (Fall 2011; coincide with ESOL training) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to Teacher Preparation Programs required for implementation of amended Reading Endorsement competencies (August 1, 2012; per proposed State Board of Education rule) • Teacher Preparation Programs' Program Evaluation Plan (IPEP/APEP) to include a revised Reading matrix reflecting the courses/modules in which the amended Reading competencies are taught (Submit November 2012)
School Leadership programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rule Development to amend 6A-5.080, F.A.C. (August 2011); Rule Workshops for Leadership Standards (September 2011) • New revisions to Rule 6A-5.080, F.A.C., taken before SBE to be approved (November 2011) • Rule Development to amend Rule 6A-5.081, F.A.C., and continued approval standards (Spring/Summer 2012) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New revisions to Rule 6A-5.081, F.A.C., taken before SBE to be approved (Fall 2012) • Training provided by Bureau of Educator Recruitment, Development, and Retention staff (Fall 2012/Spring 2013) • Changes to Leadership Preparation programs required for implementation of new Leadership Standards (Fall 2013)

The Florida Educator Accomplished Practices are set forth in rule as Florida's core standards for effective educators (Rule 6A-5.065, Florida Administrative Code, Attachment 10c). Florida universities were represented on the state committee development teams who drafted these practices and a work group of university professors are now working with the FDOE to develop tools to help faculty in teacher preparation programs to align their curriculum with these practices and to develop assessment instruments to assess student teachers in their demonstration of them. FDOE has provided training to teacher educators on the new Accomplished Practices and is providing ongoing training during the 2011-12 school year in a toolkit specifically to assist preparation programs with high-quality integration of the Accomplished Practices with the state's teacher competencies in reading and in English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL). The Common Language Project is a combined effort by curriculum, school improvement, and teacher preparation experts through a common language of instruction, by identifying and promoting a clear understanding of like terminology among the groups and for all educators. Through the Common Language Project, FDOE is modeling for LEAs and institutions how they can align their curriculum and student learning progress monitoring and support systems with new

personnel evaluation systems and candidate assessment systems, and provide timely and consistent feedback provided to teachers.

Ensuring that teachers are well-equipped to teach to the Common Core State Standards is paramount. Under Race to the Top, Florida has two competitive grant programs for institutions with approved teacher preparation programs regarding Common Core State Standards and Next Generation Sunshine State Standards in STEM and other core content areas through the redesign of the institutions' teacher preparation programs. The programs resulting from these grants will incorporate a new curriculum of standards-based content and new delivery systems that are a more clinical model, and as such will serve as model programs for other institutions to emulate. FDOE is also working through the Race to the Top Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee to revise the state's standards for continued approval of teacher and leadership preparation programs, based on the design principles and content addressed above.

The Florida Principal Leadership Standards (Rule 6A-5.065, Florida Administrative Code, Attachment 10d) define Florida's core expectations for effective school administrators, and include emphasizing the principal's role in effectively implementing a standards-based learning environment that focuses on student learning results. The Standards are based on contemporary research on multi-dimensional school leadership, and represent skills sets and knowledge bases needed for effective schools. Standards define the role of the principal in leading schools focused on the achievement of all students on the state-adopted curriculum standards through standards-based instruction.

Florida universities were represented on the state committee development teams who drafted these leadership standards and are now partnering with LEAs in the development and implementation of local principal preparation programs that lead to state principal certification. Additionally, state universities infuse online leadership development modules based on the leadership standards into their university coursework on educational leadership. In January 2012, the FDOE will bring together LEA redesign teams on school leader evaluation systems and university professors of Educational Leadership to work together on a continuum of leadership development, support, and evaluation based on the Florida Principal Leadership Standards that spans teacher leadership, administrator preparation programs, certification, evaluation systems, and professional development.

Evaluating Current Statewide Assessments, Increasing the Rigor of Those Assessments, and Aligning Them to College- and Career-Ready Standards

Florida is a leading state in the 24-member Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) consortium. PARCC is creating a common assessment system that will help states dramatically increase the number of students who graduate from high school ready for college and careers and provide students, parents, teachers, and policymakers with the tools they need to help students – from 3rd grade through high school – stay on track and graduate prepared. Florida serves as the fiscal agent for PARCC, but more importantly, Florida is taking an active leadership role to ensure that the assessments are closely aligned to the Common Core State Standards, are rigorous, and are of high quality. State, LEA, and higher education staff have played key roles in guiding each step of the process thus far. FDOE staff has been working to inform educators across the state of the high expectations associated with the Common Core

State Standards and the nature of PARCC assessments. Also, Florida educators have provided important feedback to inform the development of the assessment and the tools to assist in the transition to these new standards. Plans are in place to ensure that this broad educator engagement will continue over the coming years. In 2014-2015, Florida will begin administering the common assessments that will assess whether students are meeting these college- and career-ready standards.

The FDOE is working with educators, LEAs, and business and community leaders to establish Achievement Level standards for new statewide assessments. This increase in standards will help raise student expectations prior to Florida's implementation of the common assessments developed through PARCC in 2014-2015. This year, Florida is setting new, higher standards on FCAT 2.0 and the Algebra 1 end-of-course exam. In order to be considered performing at grade level, students will be expected to demonstrate a higher degree of mastery of the standards than on the previous FCAT assessments. Both the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics and the FCAT 2.0 Reading assessments are designed to measure attainment of the more rigorous content of the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards. For example, in reading, students are asked more often to:

- Use reasonable prior knowledge, such as grade-appropriate vocabulary.
- Make reasonable inferences that are not explicitly text-based.
- Analyze information across a pair of texts, such as making comparisons of main ideas.

FCAT 2.0 also will more often require students to use information learned in an earlier grade and apply it to a current problem. On the prior FCAT, for example, students responded to items related to mean, median, and mode at several consecutive grades. On FCAT 2.0, this concept is assessed primarily in grade 6, but may be incorporated in test items assessing other benchmarks at grades 7 and 8. Before on FCAT, students at a certain grade level were asked to make conversions within a measurement system such as converting feet to inches. Now, students will be asked to make conversions across measurement systems such as converting feet to meters.

Examples of the types of questions found on the FCAT 2.0 can be seen at the following websites:

http://fcat.fldoe.org/fcat2/pdf/sample/1112/reading/FL530617_Gr10_Rdg_TB_WT_r2g.pdf
and

http://fcat.fldoe.org/fcat2/pdf/sample/1112/math/FL530629_Gr8_Math_TB_WT_r5g.pdf.

Florida law (Section 1008.22 (3)(c)7., Florida Statutes) requires that each end-of-course assessment have both college-ready cut scores and passing cut scores. This highlights how Florida is focusing on helping students become college- and career-ready. The college-ready cut scores are to be set at a level that would indicate that “the student is high achieving and has the potential to meet college readiness standards by the time the student graduates from high school.” The State Board of Education will approve new passing and college-ready cut scores in December 2011.

Florida is implementing new Achievement Level cut scores that increase expectations for students and teachers. To set these cut scores, Florida implemented a rigorous process involving almost 300 educators as well as policy-level reactors from education, business, and the community to provide feedback to the Commissioner and the State Board of Education. Florida is using this process to set cut scores for the FCAT 2.0 in Reading and Mathematics and the Algebra 1 end-of-course assessment. The committee of educators made their recommendations after four days of iterative rounds of review. Committee members evaluated what students should know related to each question and determined the percentage of “just barely” prepared students at each

Achievement Level that should get each item correct. After the committee of educators made their recommendations they were presented to a Reactor Panel made up of Florida LEA superintendents and business/community leaders. The Reactor Panel then made Achievement Level cut score recommendations based on the recommendations of the educator committees as well as external assessment information such as NAEP, ACT, PLAN, and PSAT; impact data, and consistency across grade levels and between subjects. The Commissioner reviewed both committees' recommendations and analyzed them for consistency and impact across grade levels. The Commissioner's recommended Achievement Level cut scores reflect both committees' recommendations.

The result of this process is recommended Achievement Level cut scores that increase expectations for students. Based on students' performance in 2011, it is likely that a smaller proportion of students at most grade levels will score at Achievement Level 3 and above with the new cut scores. For example, in 5th grade reading, 69% of students scored at Achievement Level 3 or above in 2011; however, with the new cut scores proposed in the draft rule only 56% of those students would have scored at level 3 or above. The chart below shows the impact of the proposed cut scores on the number and percentage of Florida students scoring at each Achievement Level in reading, mathematics, and Algebra 1. The following link provides information about the standard setting process for Florida's new assessments:

<http://fcats.fldoe.org/fcats2/>.

Florida Is Raising Expectations – A Smaller Proportion of Students Likely to Score at Achievement Level 3 and Above in 2012

Effect of Proposed Standards for FCAT 2.0 and Algebra 1 End-of-Course Assessment Based Upon 2011 Student Performance

Grade	Reading Percentage of Students Scoring Level 3 and Above		Mathematics Percentage of Students Scoring Level 3 and Above	
	Reported in 2011	Draft Rule	Reported in 2011	Draft Rule
3	72%	57%	78%	56%
4	71%	59%	74%	58%
5	69%	58%	63%	56%
6	67%	58%	57%	53%
7	68%	58%	62%	56%
8	55%	55%	68%	56%
9	48%	55%		
10	39%	56%		
Algebra 1				55%

Principle 1 Conclusion

Florida is implementing a comprehensive plan to transition to and implement the Common Core State Standards beginning in 2011-12. The plan:

- Includes comprehensive activities related to Florida’s outreach on and dissemination of the Common Core State Standards.
- Provides a systematic transition to the Common Core State Standards for all grade levels by 2013-2014.
- Addresses the needs of all students, including English language learners, students with disabilities, and low-achieving students.
- Includes the alignment of the state’s adopted instructional materials.
- Supports professional development activities for both teachers and principals.
- Includes activities with Institutions of Higher Education that will result in their approved teacher and principal preparation programs producing candidates equipped to teach and support the Common Core State Standards.
- Builds upon the state’s success in expanding access to college-level courses and accelerated learning opportunities.
- Complements Florida’s Race to the Top activities.

1.C DEVELOP AND ADMINISTER ANNUAL, STATEWIDE, ALIGNED, HIGH-QUALITY ASSESSMENTS THAT MEASURE STUDENT GROWTH

Select the option that pertains to the SEA and provide evidence corresponding to the option selected.

<p>Option A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The SEA is participating in one of the two State consortia that received a grant under the Race to the Top Assessment competition.</p> <p>i. Attach the State’s Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) under that competition. (Attachment 6)</p>	<p>Option B <input type="checkbox"/> The SEA is not participating in either one of the two State consortia that received a grant under the Race to the Top Assessment competition, and has not yet developed or administered statewide aligned, high-quality assessments that measure student growth in reading/language arts and in mathematics in at least grades 3-8 and at least once in high school in all LEAs.</p> <p>i. Provide the SEA’s plan to develop and administer annually, beginning no later than</p>	<p>Option C <input type="checkbox"/> The SEA has developed and begun annually administering statewide aligned, high-quality assessments that measure student growth in reading/language arts and in mathematics in at least grades 3-8 and at least once in high school in all LEAs.</p> <p>i. Attach evidence that the SEA has submitted these assessments and academic achievement standards to the Department for peer review or attach a timeline of when the SEA will submit the</p>
--	--	---

	<p>the 2014–2015 school year, statewide aligned, high-quality assessments that measure student growth in reading/language arts and in mathematics in at least grades 3-8 and at least once in high school in all LEAs, as well as set academic achievement standards for those assessments.</p>	<p>assessments and academic achievement standards to the Department for peer review. (Attachment 7)</p>
--	---	---

For Option B, insert plan here.

PRINCIPLE 2: STATE-DEVELOPED DIFFERENTIATED RECOGNITION, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND SUPPORT

2.A DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT A STATE-BASED SYSTEM OF DIFFERENTIATED RECOGNITION, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND SUPPORT

- 2.A.i Provide a description of the SEA’s differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system that includes all the components listed in Principle 2, the SEA’s plan for implementation of the differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system no later than the 2012–2013 school year, and an explanation of how the SEA’s differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system is designed to improve student achievement and school performance, close achievement gaps, and increase the quality of instruction for students.


Florida's ESEA Flexibility Request is designed to eliminate the duplication and confusion caused by having two separate accountability systems and to focus schools, LEAs, communities, and the state on raising the achievement of all students. We see this effort as an opportunity to strengthen accountability and support and put in place the right conditions for schools and teachers to do their jobs most effectively.

This uniform system of accountability includes:

- Recognition of and rewards for its highest-performing and improving schools.
- Increasing levels of LEA and state support to close the achievement gap for all subgroups of students, including English language learners and students with disabilities.

Florida's accountability environment is characterized by ongoing increases in standards which have led to continuing increases in student performance across all subgroups. Florida's assessment, accountability, and teacher evaluation systems foster progress and are designed to accelerate academic improvement. Together these systems shine a bright light on the achievement gap, increase accountability for high-need students, set high academic standards, recognize and reward growth in student learning, and recognize the most effective teachers. Florida has implemented forward-looking reforms designed to raise student achievement. Each time Florida has raised its accountability standards Florida students have responded by increasing their performance to meet the challenge.

**Florida Students and Schools Increased Performance Each Time Standards Were Raised
The Number of Lower-Performing Schools Has Decreased**



Key for "Raising the Bar" arrows:

- 1st arrow: Florida implemented learning gains components in reading and mathematics after expanding the FCAT from three grades tested in reading and mathematics to all grades tested from grade 3 through grade 10.
- 2nd arrow: Florida expanded the included student population to incorporate scores for students with disabilities and English language learners on the FCAT, and increased the writing standard for proficiency from 3.0 to 3.5.
- 3rd arrow: Florida added FCAT Science to school grade performance measures and added learning gains for the lowest-performing 25% of students in mathematics.
- 4th arrow: Florida expanded its high school grading measures to include the overall and at-risk graduation rates, accelerated coursework, and readiness for college and careers.

Having two separate accountability systems, one federal and one state, has caused confusion among communities and stakeholders and resulted in mixed messages to schools and LEAs. This has sometimes sidetracked the hard work of moving student achievement forward by diluting schools' and LEAs' focus. Through this application, Florida proposes to move to one accountability system, an enhanced School Grades system, which will focus all accountability resources and attention on one system to move all students forward to attain college- and career-ready standards. In addition, the School Grades system will identify struggling schools in need of additional support through Florida's Differentiated Accountability (DA) system. The DA system will provide different levels of support to schools and LEAs depending on their needs. This strategy will reduce the disconnect between the federal and the state accountability systems and help communities embrace accountability for their schools in a way that is designed to provide support and raise the

achievement of all students to meet college and career expectations.

Florida's ESEA Flexibility Request will move Florida forward in strengthening and enhancing its accountability system. At the same time Florida is pursuing this flexibility with USDOE, it will pursue statutory changes with the State Legislature. Florida's Legislature has demonstrated strong support for high standards and school accountability over time. When statutory changes are made during the 2012 session, we will use this new model beginning with the 2012 school grades and use those school grades to identify Priority/Intervene and Focus/Correct schools for the 2012-13 school year.

Planned System Enhancements: Focus on Florida's Successful School Grading Approach

Florida proposes to use its School Grades system of education accountability, which has regularly increased standards and expectations since its implementation in 1999, as the consolidated and sole measure for classifying and evaluating the progress of schools in Florida's DA system of school improvement. Florida's School Grades system has effectively provided the incentives needed to significantly increase student achievement for all students, including struggling subgroups. This will simplify and strengthen (through greater stakeholder buy-in and public support) the current Florida DA classification criteria, which are described in the Florida DA matrix document posted online at http://flbsi.org/pdf/Final_2011-2012_DA_Matrix.pdf. As Florida implements the new system outlined in this proposal it will use letter grades to refer to the categories of schools needing supports and the schools to receive recognition. Ultimately the state will not use the terms Prevent, Focus/Correct and Priority/Intervene, but simply "C," "D," and "F."

School Grade	ESEA Category	DA Category
A	Reward	
Schools that increase their grade	Reward	
B		
C		Prevent
D	Focus	Correct
F	Priority	Intervene

Key Features of Florida's School Grades System

- Components based on assessments aligned with state curriculum standards.
- Progressively increasing rigor in the assessments themselves (with both comprehensive subject area examinations and end-of-course assessments set to newly operational Next Generation Sunshine State Standards) and in the application of criteria for school grading.
- Legislative support: school grading requirements codified (Section 1008.34, Florida Statutes, and Rule 6A-1.09981, Florida Administrative Code).

- A balance between student performance and student learning gains (growth).
- Points-based system that allows for a tiered (literally, graded) group of ratings (rather than a conjunctive system such as Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), for which any missed target results in a "No progress" or "Not adequate progress" outcome for the school).
- Criterion-based system for the assessments used in determining student achievement and progress as well as for the points scale for assigning school grades, including additional requirements for participation in testing ("percent-tested" criterion) and progress of the lowest-performing students.
- Provides an incentive for schools to focus on improving the lowest-performing 25% of students.
- Florida's School Grades system is applied to all schools including charter schools.
- Documented significant improvement in student performance following raised standards over time.

Assessment-Based Components

For elementary and middle school grades through 2010-11, the school grade has been based solely on students' performance and progress measured by the statewide Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT). For Florida's high school grading system, the state assessment-based components are weighted at 50% of the high school grade, while the other 50% of the available school grade points are weighted toward component areas that directly measure, or are otherwise essential to, career and college readiness: on-time graduation, participation and performance in advanced curricula (including Industry Certifications), and postsecondary readiness in reading and mathematics. These additional components for measuring high school performance were implemented beginning in 2009-10 to provide a more comprehensive measure of high schools' effectiveness in preparing students for success at the next level after graduation.

**Florida School Grades Overview –
Assessment Components**

READING	MATH	WRITING	SCIENCE
Performance	Performance	Performance	Performance
Learning Gains (Progress)	Learning Gains (Progress)	Total Available Points = 800 100 for each component 400 for performance 400 for learning gains	
Learning Gains of Lowest 25%	Learning Gains of Lowest 25%		

- Achievement on statewide assessments – Comprises 50% of the assessment component:
 - The percent of all students scoring 3 or above on FCAT reading, mathematics, writing, and science.
 - Points earned = percent of students meeting standards in each subject.
 - Performance at or above grade level in reading, mathematics, and science (level 3 or higher

on a range of 1 to 5); and writing performance at or above a score of 4 on a range of 1 to 6.

- Progress/Learning Gains on statewide assessments – Comprises the second 50% of the assessment component:
 - The percent of students learning a year’s worth of knowledge in reading and mathematics, regardless of whether they are on grade level.
 - The percent of the lowest-performing 25% of students who are making a year’s worth of progress in reading and mathematics.
 - Three ways to make learning gains for all students and the lowest-performing 25% of students:
 - Move up by one or more Achievement Levels.
 - Maintain an Achievement Level (remain at level 3, 4, or 5).
 - Increase performance within levels 1 and 2 to move the student toward satisfactory performance (i.e., more than a year’s growth).
 - Florida’s lowest-performing 25% of students contains an over representation of the subgroups that are historically low-performing (see page 92). Using the lowest-performing 25% solves one of the main difficulties of using the performance of individual subgroups in accountability systems. When looking at individual subgroups many schools do not have enough students in each subgroup for each subgroup’s performance to count in the accountability system. This may lead schools to focus on those subgroups that do make a difference to their accountability rating instead of all students that are performing at low levels. By bringing the subgroups together into the lowest-performing 25%, Florida schools and LEAs will focus on the students most in need of assistance.

The following charts illustrate how points are assigned in the School Grades calculation and the proportion of the total points that each cell represents.

Current Elementary and Middle School Grades Model			
Reading	Mathematics	Writing	Science
Performance			
FCAT 2.0 (100) 12.5%	FCAT 2.0 (100) 12.5%	FCAT (100) 12.5%	FCAT (100) 12.5%
Learning Gains: All Students			
FCAT 2.0 (100) 12.5%	FCAT 2.0 (100) 12.5%		
Lowest-Performing 25% Learning Gains			
FCAT 2.0 (100) 12.5%	FCAT 2.0 (100) 12.5%		
(300) 37.5%	(300) 37.5%	(100) 12.5%	(100) 12.5%

Current High School Grades Model

Reading	Mathematics	Writing	Science	Acceleration	Graduation Rate	College Readiness
Performance (100) 6.25%	Performance (100) 6.25%	Performance (100) 6.25%	Performance (100) 6.25%	Participation (175) 10.94%	Overall (200) 12.5%	Reading (100) 6.25%
Learning Gains (100) 6.25%	Learning Gains (100) 6.25%			Performance (125) 7.18%	At-Risk (100) 6.25%	Math (100) 6.25%
Lowest-performing 25% Gains (100) 6.25%	Lowest-performing 25% Gains (100) 6.25%					
300 points 18.75%	300 points 18.75%	100 points 6.25%	100 points 6.25%	300 points 18.75%	300 points 18.75%	200 points 12.5%

Increasing Rigor of Assessments

In addition to increasing the rigor of its own subject area assessments, Florida proposes to provide LEAs with the flexibility to count in performance, learning gains, and participation calculations the assessment results of students tested on accelerated exams (for instance, a grade 8 student who tests on the Algebra 1 end-of-course exam in mathematics) and to give LEAs the opportunity to waive the requirement to test students on both examinations if the student tests on an exam that is more rigorous than the comprehensive examination (FCAT 2.0).


This flexibility would apply to the following types of state or national examinations:

- Algebra 1 end-of-course exam vs. FCAT 2.0 Mathematics at grade levels 6, 7, or 8.
- Biology 1 end-of-course exam vs. FCAT 2.0 Science at grade 8.
- AP Biology credit (for scores of 3 and above) could be used to meet the passing score requirement on the Biology 1 end-of-course exam as graduation requirement.

Additional Requirements

- Adequate Progress Requirement for lowest-performing 25% of students in reading and mathematics.
 - At least 50% of the low performers must show FCAT-measured learning gains in reading and mathematics, or the school must show required annual improvement in that percentage. If the school does not meet this requirement the school's grade is reduced by one letter grade. Please see the illustration below.

Learning Gains for the Lowest-Performing 25% of Students



- “Percent Tested” Requirement.
 - 90% of students must be tested in order for the school to receive a regular grade in lieu of an “Incomplete.”
 - 95% must be tested for a school to be eligible for an “A.”

School Grade Scale and Requirements

	A	B	C	D	F
School Grade Points*	525 or more	495-524	435-494	395-434	Less than 395
Percent of Eligible Students Tested	At least 95%	At least 90%	At least 90%	At least 90%	Less than 90%
Required Learning Gains with Lowest-Performing Students in Reading and Math	In the current year	In the current year or between the prior and current year	In the current year or between the prior and current year		

** Beginning in 2011-12, if at least 75% of elementary, middle, or high schools statewide earn an “A” or “B,” the school grade point scale will increase by 5% for that school type statewide in the following year increasing the rigor of the system.*

Florida's High School Grades Also Include Components Related to Students' Ability to Progress on to Postsecondary Education

Starting in 2010, Florida’s high school grades calculation includes other factors in addition to student performance and learning gains. These other factors are related to a student’s ability to be successful in college including the following measures:

- Graduation rates for all students.
- Graduation rates for “at-risk” students. “At-risk” students are those who entered high school below grade level in reading and mathematics (based on Grade 8 FCAT results).
- Accelerated curricula (both performance and participation), which includes AP, IB, AICE, Dual Enrollment, and Industry Certification exams and courses.
- College readiness rates based upon SAT, ACT, or common placement test results.

Florida's high school grading system is required by state law to evenly balance the weighting on state-based assessment measures with measures relating to on-time graduation, accelerated curricula, and readiness for college (see Section 2.A.ii.).

Florida’s High School Grades Evenly Weight Assessment and Other Factors

Florida High School Grades

50% Based on Statewide Assessments	50% Based on Other Factors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance in reading, mathematics, science, and writing • Learning gains for all students in reading and mathematics • Learning gains for the lowest 25% in reading and mathematics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall graduation rate • At-risk graduation rate • Participation and performance in accelerated courses • College readiness in reading and mathematics • Growth or decline of these measures

Upcoming Changes to School Grades

Florida is in the process of making revisions to its School Grades system to address statutorily required changes, include new more rigorous assessment standards, and improve the school grading methodology. These changes will again raise the bar for Florida’s students, teachers, and schools and are being pursued with advice and recommendations from LEA assessment and accountability directors as well as superintendents.

- Florida’s middle school grading formula will be modified to include points for students that participate in and pass high school end-of-course assessments while in middle school, including Algebra 1, Geometry, and Biology.
- The methodology will change at the high school level to include student performance and learning gains for end-of-course assessments.
- Florida is also pursuing changes to the school grading formula to improve the methodology.
- Once new cut scores have been set and other changes to school grading has been finalized, Florida will review its current school grading scale to see if it needs revision.

School Grades Information Resources


- Florida School Grades downloadable files for most recent school year and information resources: <http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/>.
- School Grades overview (quick reference guide): <http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/pdf/1011/Guidesheet2011SchoolGrades.pdf>.
- School Grades technical guide: <http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/pdf/1011/SchoolGradesTAP2011.pdf>.
- School Grades files and resources archive: <http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/reports/index.asp>.

Florida School Grades' Impact on Educational Achievement


Florida's School Grades system has been successful in providing incentives for students, teachers, schools, and LEAs to work diligently to meet higher standards and improve student achievement and learning gains. This is illustrated both through increases in the performance of all students and specifically, increases in the performance of Florida's subgroups. Florida's FCAT results demonstrate how Florida's students have significantly increased their performance on state standards both overall and for individual subgroups. In addition, Florida's National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) results highlight Florida's success in closing achievement gaps. Significantly more students are scoring at levels 3 and above now on FCAT than when school grading began. In addition to student achievement, Florida's high school grading formula also provides an emphasis on increasing the percentage of on-time graduates and the students who take rigorous college-level courses, and both of those rates have increased over time.

This section provides charts that depict Florida's increasing student achievement over time. The first charts show how the School Grades system has provided incentives to increase the performance of all of Florida's students over time. Then, the NAEP charts illustrate how Florida's subgroups have been successful at narrowing achievement. Next, the charts will provide information on how Florida's subgroups have increased performance over time on the FCAT which measures students' attainment of the state curriculum standards. Finally, we provide charts that show how Florida's students are taking more rigorous college-level courses and are also increasing the rate at which they graduate on-time. Florida's School Grades system has provided incentives for this improvement and has provided the means for LEAs and communities to work together toward increased achievement for their students. The percentage of students scoring at satisfactory levels and above has increased significantly while the percentage of students scoring at the lowest Achievement Level has decreased steadily in both reading and mathematics.

**Percentage of Students Scoring on Grade Level Has Increased
FCAT Reading Scores, Grades 3-10, All Florida Students**





**Percentage of Students Scoring on Grade Level Has Increased
FCAT Mathematics Grades 3-10, All Florida Students**




Florida's historical NAEP results support the effectiveness of Florida's School Grades system for elementary and middle school grades in reading and mathematics, with notable success in reducing achievement gaps for Florida's minority students.

Florida has Reduced the Black-White and Hispanic-White Achievement Gaps




Florida has Outpaced the Nation in Mathematics Achievement

Average NAEP 4th Grade Math Scores, Florida and National Average 1992-2009




Florida has Increased Reading Scores


Average NAEP 8th Grade Reading Scores, Florida and National Average 1998-2009




**Average NAEP 8th Grade Math Scores,
Florida and National Average 1992-2009**




**Florida has the Highest Nationally Combined Gains for
All Four Major NAEP Exams for Free and Reduced
Lunch Eligible Children, 2003-2009**




Florida has the Third Highest Combined Gains on All Four NAEP Exams, All Students, 2003-2009




Florida has the Highest Combined NAEP Gains for Children with Disabilities, 2003-2009



Florida has One of the Highest Combined Gains on the Four Major NAEP Exams for Hispanic Students, 2003-09




Florida has the Highest Combined NAEP Gains on the Four Major NAEP Tests for Black Students, 2003-2009




In addition, Florida's state accountability system provides incentives to increase the performance of the lowest-performing 25% of students, thus reducing subgroup achievement gaps. Florida has significantly reduced the percentage of students performing at the lowest Achievement Level, level 1. Florida's FCAT performance also shows that it has significantly reduced the achievement gap among subgroups.


**Percentage of Students Scoring on Grade Level Has Increased for Subgroups
FCAT Reading, Percent Scoring at Level 3 and Above, Grades 3-10**




**Closing the Gap for Subgroups
FCAT Reading
Achievement Level 1 - Grades 3, 4, and 5**




**Closing the Gap for Subgroups
FCAT Reading
Achievement Level 1 - Grades 6, 7, and 8**




**Closing the Gap for Subgroups
FCAT Reading
Achievement Level 1 - Grades 9 and 10**




**Percentage of Students Scoring on Grade Level Has Increased for Subgroups
FCAT Mathematics, Percent Scoring at Level 3 or Above, Grades 3-10**




**Closing the Gap for Subgroups
FCAT Mathematics
Achievement Level 1 - Grades 3, 4, and 5**



Closing the Gap for Subgroups
FCAT Mathematics
Achievement Level 1
Grades 6, 7, and 8



Closing the Gap for Subgroups
FCAT Mathematics
Achievement Level 1
Grades 9 and 10




Improved Achievement for English Language Learners (ELLs), Students with Disabilities, and Students Receiving Free or Reduced Price Lunch


Florida's accountability system focuses schools and LEAs on working with students who perform in the bottom quartile and helps to ensure that these students are moving toward levels 3 and above. The bottom quartile includes a higher proportion of English language learners, students with disabilities, and students who receive free or reduced price lunch. As illustrated in the following charts, performance has improved significantly for such students. In addition, the state has other strategies focused on increasing the performance of these subgroups.

- The SEA's State Performance Plan (SPP), as required by the federal Office of Special Education Programs, is one way that the SEA tracks LEA performance across key indicators related to outcomes for students with disabilities. Based on LEA performance, technical assistance is provided through the Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services (BEESS). Discretionary projects funded by BEESS provide professional development and support to LEAs and schools linked to the SPP indicators and LEA performance.
- All primary Language Arts teachers, including ESE teachers, must become ESOL endorsed, which requires completion of 300 ESOL inservice training hours.
- Every LEA has a plan outlining strategies and interventions available for English language learners (ELLs) and students with disabilities. Additionally, each ELL student has an ELL student plan.
- ELL committees, composed of a student's ESOL teacher(s), home language teacher (if any), administrator or designee, plus guidance counselors, social workers, school psychologists, or other educators as appropriate, are formed to support ELL students. Parents must be invited to attend any committee meetings.
- All ELLs, including those with disabilities, are required to be assessed annually with the Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA), which measures progress of ELL proficiency in English. Accommodations are based upon Individual Educational Plan documentation.
- When a student is approved to exit ESOL, they are monitored at regular intervals for up to two years, per State Board of Education rule.


English Language Learners Have Increased Their Performance
FCAT Reading
Grades 3-10 by Achievement Level




Students with Disabilities Have Increased Their Performance
FCAT Reading
Grades 3-10 by Achievement Level




**Students Receiving Free or Reduced Price Lunch
Have Increased Their Performance
FCAT Reading Grades 3-10 by Achievement Level**




**Students with Disabilities Have Increased Their Performance
FCAT Mathematics
Grades 3-10 by Achievement Level**



English Language Learners Have Increased Their Performance
FCAT Mathematics
by Achievement Level Grades 3-10




Students Receiving Free or Reduced Price Lunch
Have Increased Their Performance
FCAT Mathematics
by Achievement Level Grades 3-10



Successful College Readiness Outcomes for Florida's High School Grading System


Florida's high school grading system provides incentives for high schools to graduate students that are college and career ready. Florida has increased its participation rates on the SAT and ACT, its participation and performance on AP exams, its performance of subgroups, and its graduation rates. Florida provides funding for all students to take the PSAT or PLAN in 10th grade which helps students think about college readiness early in their high school career.



- **College Preparation – SAT (2010 Florida Highlights):**


- 78,985 Florida public school seniors took the SAT in 2010, an increase of 9.8% over the previous year.

Florida Increased the Number of Seniors Taking the SAT in 2010




- The percentage of Florida's standard diploma graduates who took the SAT increased from 48.7% in the previous year to 54.2%.
- Florida's African-American students showed an annual 10.4% increase in SAT test takers in 2010 versus a 7.1% increase nationwide.
- Florida's African-American public school test takers outscored their counterparts nationwide on all three SAT subsections by a margin (mean scale score) of 8 points in reading, 5 points in mathematics, and 3 points in writing.

**Florida's African-American Students Scored Higher than National Counterparts
Difference in Scores**




- There was a 15.9% increase in the number of Hispanic test takers in Florida's public schools, compared to a 7.7% increase nationwide.
- Florida's Hispanic students outperformed their counterparts nationwide on all three subsections by a margin of 28 points in reading, 16 points in mathematics, and 19 points in writing.

Florida's Hispanic Students Scored Higher than National Counterparts



- ### College Preparation – ACT (2010 Florida Highlights):


- A total of 113,480 of Florida's 2010 public and nonpublic graduating seniors took the ACT at some point during their high school career, an increase of 8,183 (8%) over 2009. This compares with a 6% increase nationwide.
 - Approximately 53% of Florida's ACT test takers are minority students, compared to 32% nationwide.
 - Florida has considerably larger percentages of African-American and Hispanic students taking the ACT than the nation. In 2010, African-American students represented 26% of Florida test takers, compared to 15% for the nation. Hispanic students represented 24% of Florida test takers, compared to 11% for the nation.
 - Over the past five years, Florida has experienced substantial growth in the number of minority students taking the ACT test. African-American test takers have increased by 114%, Hispanics by 140%, American Indians by 77%, Asians by 73%, and Whites by 56%.



- **Advanced Curricula**


- Florida has greatly increased the number and percentage of students taking AP courses and exams. This increase has been greatest among Florida's African-American and Hispanic populations.
- The following charts illustrate the strides Florida's students are making:

By 2010, Florida Led the Nation in the Percentage of High School Graduates Taking AP Exams



Narrowing the Achievement Gap


In Florida, African-Americans had the highest percent increase in AP participation among 12th graders during the last five years.



Source: 7th Annual AP Report to the Nation (Feb. 2011), State Supplement, Florida. Figure 5.

Florida Advanced Course Enrollments Increasing (Including AP, IB, AICE, and Dual Enrollment)


**Unduplicated Count of Florida High School Students Enrolled
in AP, IB, AICE, and/or Dual Enrollment Courses During
2008-09 and 2009-10**



- Florida is one of 14 states that have eliminated the Hispanic achievement gap on AP exams.
- In 2010 23.1% of Florida's high school graduates were Hispanic.
- 27.9% of the 2010 graduating class's successful AP exam takers were Hispanic.

Florida Has Also Seen Increased AP Participation and Performance Among Low-Income Students


**Florida's Low-Income High School Seniors:
AP Participation and Performance**



- Graduation Rates

- As with other measures of student achievement, such as assessment scores, Florida has seen continuing increases in the percentage of on-time graduates in recent years.
- The overall graduation rate improved to 79% in 2009-10, up from 76.3% in 2008-09.
- The graduation rate of African-American students improved by 3.5 percentage points this year, and by 13.1 points over the last five years.
- The graduation rate of Hispanic students improved by 3.2 percentage points this year, and by 13.3 points over the last five years.
- Both African-American and Hispanic students have closed the gap with white students by 5 percentage points during the period from 2006 to 2010.

Florida's High School Graduation Rate has Increased Significantly Over the Last Five Years



Differentiated Accountability will be Aligned with School Grades to Improve Clarity, Create Incentives, and Provide Support to Close Achievement Gaps for All Students

Florida proposes to combine its successful School Grades and DA systems to eliminate confusion while continuing to provide the supports needed by struggling schools and recognizing high-performing schools and schools that increase performance through its school reward/recognition programs. Florida will use the proven School Grades system to categorize those schools that are struggling and need support. Providing the appropriate educational opportunities for students at the lowest-performing schools requires the support not only of state-level leaders but of local communities and LEA leaders, and a factor in garnering that support is the clarity of our message. Currently the DA system uses a combination of federal and state criteria to identify struggling schools but this model has resulted in massive confusion among communities and stakeholders and has sent mixed messages to schools and LEAs about the progress of all schools. Mixed messages

from the federal and state accountability systems reduce Florida's ability to focus all stakeholders on moving struggling schools forward. Ultimately, the state will not use the terms Prevent, Focus/Correct, and Priority/Intervene, but simply "C," "D," and "F."

**Use School Grades to Categorize Schools
in Differentiated Accountability (DA)**

School Grade	ESEA Category	DA Category
A	Reward	
Schools that increase their grade	Reward	
B		
C		Prevent
D	Focus	Correct
F	Priority	Intervene

In 2008, the U.S. Department of Education selected Florida as one of only six states initially approved to participate in the DA pilot initiative. Through DA the state is allowed greater flexibility in providing essential technical assistance and interventions to the schools with greatest need. Currently, Florida's DA model directs increasing school-wide interventions and school and LEA accountability based on inputs from two systems for evaluating school performance: (1) AYP and (2) the state-assigned school grade. This has caused confusion and a lack of focus when the two systems provide mixed messages about a school's performance. In some cases, it has undermined the ability of LEAs to undertake some of the more difficult strategies involved in DA, such as reconstitution under alternative governance.

The proposed DA statewide approach for struggling schools is critical to Florida's path to increase the excellence of education for all students. The support and assistance provided to each school in Florida's model is individualized depending on the needs of that school. Through DA, schools are categorized based on the school's achievement. The lowest-performing schools receive the most support, and are required (through measures codified in state statute and governing rule) to implement the most robust interventions that will help lead to successful school improvement. In order to provide direct support to schools, Florida has created a regional system of support for schools and LEAs. The regional system of support provides educators who work with and support schools and LEAs around the state that fail to meet state educational performance standards. As Florida continues to raise expectations for student performance during our transition to increasingly ambitious standards and more rigorous assessments, we are also working harder across the state to lift the performance of our schools that have had the greatest struggles to improve academic performance. The supports provided are detailed more specifically later in Section 2. More information on the regional system of support system is available at <http://flbsi.org/DA/regional.htm>.

Florida also has in place and will continue its school recognition program to reward and recognize

its highest-performing schools (“A” schools) and schools that improve their school grade one or more grade levels and sustain it the following year.

In this flexibility request, Florida proposes to change the way it identifies struggling schools that will receive support through the DA program. Florida will align DA with the state’s school grading system. This will increase clarity for stakeholders while holding schools accountable for the progress of all students and providing schools and LEAs the support they need to increase student achievement. In addition to clarifying the entry criteria for schools, Florida will also propose high standards for exit criteria for schools in the lowest-performing category, Priority/Intervene schools. This will better differentiate schools that are making progress (and that should continue applying existing turnaround strategies) from those that are not providing adequate instruction and opportunity for their students.

Differentiated Recognition, Accountability, and Support Systems for Reward, Prevent, Focus/Correct, and Priority/Intervene Schools

Listed below is a summary of the proposed recognition, accountability, and support systems for the four categories of schools. These systems are designed to create incentives and supports to close achievement gaps for all subgroups of students.

- Reward Schools – “A” schools and schools that improve one or more letter grade.
Schools assigned a grade of “A” and schools that improve one or more letter grade would be classified as Reward schools. Reward schools would be eligible to receive funding appropriated by the State Legislature through the Florida School Recognition Program. Additional information on Florida's School Recognition Program is provided in Section 2.C of this document.
- Prevent Schools – “C” schools.
Schools assigned a grade of “C” would be classified in Prevent status. Schools in Prevent status will prepare a school improvement plan and implement appropriate interventions, with LEA monitoring and support designed to improve student performance.
- Focus/Correct Schools – “D” schools.
Schools assigned a grade of “D” would be classified in Focus/Correct status. Additional information is provided in Section 2.E of this document. School improvement measures for Focus/Correct schools include the following:
 - The school implements interventions
 - The LEA directs interventions
 - The LEA monitors progress
 - The state provides support through regional teams
- Priority/Intervene Schools – “F” schools.
Schools assigned a grade of “F” would be classified in Priority/Intervene status. Additional information is provided in Section 2.E of this document. Florida schools in Priority/Intervene status are subject to more intensive intervention efforts required by FDOE and managed

(initially) by the LEA.

- The state provides support through regional teams.
- The LEA chooses and begins planning for implementation of the selected school turnaround option.
- During a school's first year in Priority/Intervene status the LEA must submit an Intervene Option Plan outlining the school turnaround option it has selected and how that option will be implemented. If a school does not exit Priority/Intervene status during the first year, the LEA must implement the turnaround option it has selected from the options below. The LEA may choose from the following State Turnaround Models:
 - Reopen as a district-managed turnaround school (transformation/turnaround)
 - Reassign students and monitor progress (closure)
 - Close and reopen as a charter school (restart)
 - Contract with a private entity to run the school (restart)
 - Hybrid Model (proposal in this flexibility request)

The chart below provides a crosswalk for the above referenced State Turnaround Models.

Federal Turnaround Models Designation	State Turnaround Model Designation	Characteristics
Transformation/ Turnaround	District-Managed Turnaround	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Replace Principal/Administration ● Replace Staff ● New Curriculum Focus ● Altered Governance/Autonomy
Closure	Closure	School closes and students are redistributed to higher-performing schools; the LEA must monitor and report on the students' progress for a period of three years
Restart	Convert to a Charter or Employ a Management Company	Must engage a high-performing charter or education management company with a proven track record of success
Hybrid Model (proposal in this flexibility request)	New proposed flexibility option that may blend both LEA control with governance and autonomy found in external provider	Design must be as rigorous as other turnaround options

- After two years, if the school turnaround option implemented does not result in the school exiting Priority/Intervene status the LEA must choose a different school turnaround option to implement, unless they are making progress that would make allow them to exit Priority/Intervene or enter a hold status.
- To exit Priority/Intervene status a school must meet the following criteria:
 - Improve the school grade to a "C" or higher.
 - Improve achievement in reading and mathematics to meet criteria that will be established by the State Board of Education.
- If the school meets at least one of the exit criteria while the LEA is implementing the turnaround option, the school will be placed in a hold status for up to two years to

continue implementation. The hold status is designed to allow schools that are making progress to continue implementing their current strategy.

Under the proposal for an enhanced DA system, Priority/Intervene schools could implement one of the turnaround models in the chart above for four years. The school would automatically have two years to implement a model and could have another two years, in a hold status, if the school improved to a grade of “D” or improved enough to meet achievement targets in mathematics and reading. After that, the LEA is required to choose a new option from those in law and submit a new Intervene Option Plan. Beyond the four years to implement an option, an LEA could continue the option and interventions if they demonstrated to the State Board of Education that the school is likely to improve enough to exit the Priority/Intervene category with more time (this is currently a provision in Section 1008.33(5)(b), Florida Statutes).

System of Support for Schools in Florida's Differentiated Accountability Classifications to Close Achievement Gaps for All Students

Florida's proposed DA plan, as outlined above, directs school-wide and subgroup interventions at the school and LEA level. This will allow FDOE to operate a tiered approach to work directly with schools and LEAs that are truly the lowest-performing schools to increase student achievement. The support and assistance provided to each school is individualized depending on the needs of that LEA and school. The lowest-performing schools receive the most support, and under the proposed DA plan, these schools are required to implement the most robust interventions that will help lead to successfully raising student achievement. Florida's system of providing support and assistance to struggling schools as seen in the charts in Section 2.G. The chart below illustrates the increasing levels of LEA and state support, monitoring, and oversight based on a school's status in the proposed DA system.

School Status/ Differentiated Accountability Support	C Schools Prevent Schools	D Schools Focus/ Correct Schools	F Schools Priority/ Intervene Schools
School Improvement			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Creation of LEA-based leadership team 2. Creation of Literacy Leadership Team 3. Development of District Improvement and Assistance Plan (DIAP) 4. Completion of Mid-year Analysis of Progress 5. Review and monitoring of implementation of School Improvement Plan by the school advisory team and the LEA 		X	X
6. Review of budget allocations and alignment of resources by FDOE		X	X
7. Review and monitoring of implementation of School Improvement Plan by FDOE			X
Leadership			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. LEA reviews members of the school leadership team and replaces them as necessary based upon overall school performance 2. LEA includes student achievement in the evaluation process of LEA administrators who supervise persistently lowest-achieving schools and provides performance pay for raising student achievement 	X	X	X
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Principal and assistant principal have a record of increasing student achievement (principal must have a record of turning around a similar school) 4. LEA and FDOE review members of the school leadership team and replace them as necessary based upon overall school performance 5. LEA provides school-based administrators and instructional coaches with performance pay 		X	X
Educator Quality			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers must be highly qualified and certified in-field 2. All paraprofessionals must be highly qualified 3. School is fully staffed by the first day of school 4. LEA ensures that performance appraisals of instructional personnel are primarily based on student achievement 5. LEA ensures that performance appraisals of the administrative team include student achievement, as measured by the FCAT, as well as goals related to targeted subgroups and school-wide improvement 6. LEA trains staff on performance appraisal instruments and ensures that the performance appraisal process is implemented 7. LEA provides teachers with performance pay for raising student achievement 8. LEA develops plan to encourage teachers and instructional coaches to remain or transfer to lower-performing schools based on increasing learning gains 9. LEA provides a reading coach, mathematics coach, and science coach to develop and model effective lessons, to lead Lesson Study, to analyze data, and provide professional development on the Common Core State Standards/Next Generation Sunshine State Standards. 	X	X	X

School Status/ Differentiated Accountability Support	C Schools Prevent Schools	D Schools Focus/ Correct Schools	F Schools Priority/ Intervene Schools
Educator Quality (cont.)			
10. Instructional coaches maintain a daily log of activities; school and LEA leadership teams monitor 11. LEA, with assistance from FDOE, reviews and replaces teachers who have not contributed to increased learning gains or those teachers who did not contribute to improving the school's performance 12. FDOE oversees the staffing of the school prior to the start of school 13. LEA implements a differentiated pay policy that includes differentiation based on LEA-determined factors including, but not limited to additional job responsibilities, school demographics, critical shortage areas, and level of job performance difficulties 14. LEA ensures that mid-year vacancies are filled		X	X
Professional Development			
1. School ensures that Individual Professional Development Plans (IPDPs) for teachers of targeted subgroups include professional development targeting the needs of subgroups	X		
2. LEA ensures that leadership professional development targets the needs of subgroups 3. LEA provides professional development opportunities for school administrators that target the specific needs of subgroups 4. LEA provides principals and assistant principals with professional development on monitoring classroom instruction and guiding/supporting/monitoring the activities of instructional coaches 5. LEA provides professional development on Florida's Continuous Improvement Model, Common Core State Standards/Next Generation Sunshine State Standards, Response to Intervention, Lesson Study, and School Grade and AMO calculations	X	X	X
6. LEA ensures that IPDPs for teachers of targeted subgroups include professional development that targets the needs of subgroups 7. LEA participates in a sample of IPDP meetings 8. LEA ensures that appropriate resources are provided to redesign the master schedule to allow for common planning time for data-based decision making within the problem-solving process, job-embedded professional development on the Common Core State Standards/Next Generation Sunshine State Standards, and Lesson Study 9. Common planning time is established within the master schedule to allow grade level meetings to occur daily in elementary schools and by subject area at the secondary level; all grade level and subject area teachers participate at the same time and include Lesson Study; if the master schedule prevents this from occurring, the LEA establishes weekly Lesson Study implementation after school for a minimum of one hour a week on the same day		X	X

School Status/ Differentiated Accountability Support	C Schools Prevent Schools	D Schools Focus/ Correct Schools	F Schools Priority/ Intervene Schools
Professional Development (cont.)			
10. LEA creates and maintains a pool of highly-qualified reading, mathematics, and science teachers and instructional coaches to serve in DA schools.		X	X
11. LEA offers a summer professional development academy that is developed in conjunction with FDOE to school administrators, teachers, and instructional coaches; LEA partners with the regional team to encourage school administrators, teachers, and instructional coaches to participate in the DA Summer Academies		X	X
12. LEA or school develops instructional pacing guides that are aligned to the Common Core State Standards/Next Generation Sunshine State Standards in reading, writing, mathematics, and science 13. School ensures that students are properly placed in rigorous coursework 14. LEA and school implement the LEA K-12 Reading Plan	X	X	X
15. FDOE reviews instructional pacing guide aligned to the Common Core State Standards/Next Generation Sunshine State Standards 16. LEA reviews data to determine the effectiveness of all instructional programs and class offerings 17. FDOE reviews data to determine the effectiveness of all instructional programs and class offerings 18. LEA extends the learning day		X	X
Florida's Continuous Improvement Model			
1. School implements Florida's Response to Intervention model 2. LEA implements Florida's Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) 3. School develops and implements a comprehensive FCIM model which includes an FCIM calendar, FCIM focus lessons (mini-lessons on tested benchmarks), curriculum pacing guide, and progress monitoring data collection/analysis schedule 4. LEA monitors implementation of FCIM 5. LEA ensures real-time access to student achievement data 6. LEA prescribes interim (benchmark baseline, mid-year, and mini-) assessments in reading, writing, mathematics, and science for level 1-3 students 7. LEA administration ensures that data chats are conducted between LEA administration and school administration, school administration and teachers, and teachers and students following baseline, mini-, and mid-year assessments	X	X	X
8. LEA uses the Problem Solving/Response to Intervention process to analyze progress monitoring data in reading, writing, mathematics, and science through interim assessments to inform instruction		X	X
9. LEA participates in the Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR) for level 1-3 students		X	X

School Status/ Differentiated Accountability Support	C Schools Prevent Schools	D Schools Focus/ Correct Schools	F Schools Priority/ Intervene Schools
Monitoring Processes and Plans			
1. School provides quarterly updates on the implementation of the School Improvement Plan to the School Advisory Council and makes updates to the School Improvement Plan 2. School leadership team monitors implementation of the School Improvement Plan 3. School participates in a comprehensive instructional monitoring process 4. LEA develops a comprehensive instructional monitoring process and follow-up that includes classroom, school leadership team, and school-wide monitoring	X	X	X
5. LEA ensures that schools demonstrating the greatest need, based on data analysis, receive the highest percentage of resources. 6. FDOE reports progress bi-monthly to the State Board of Education 7. Monthly LEA meetings with the Regional Executive Director (RED) and LEA department leaders held to coordinate strategies and resources to assist lowest-performing schools 8. LEA dedicates a position to lead the turnaround effort at the LEA level; the selected employee will report directly to the superintendent and directly supervise principals at the lowest-performing schools		X	X

In its DA system, Florida focuses on providing supports to struggling schools and LEAs; however, there are consequences if schools/LEAs do not act within the terms of the state's DA plan. LEAs must submit an assurance of compliance with requirements outlined in Florida's DA plan and Priority/Intervene schools must submit an Intervention Option Plan to reconstitute the school should it not improve. For all LEAs and schools, non-compliance with any of the required interventions and supports may lead to:

- State Board of Education intervention in operations
- State funds withheld
- Report of non-compliance to the State Legislature with recommended legislative action
- Conditions placed on Title I or Title II grant awards
- Redirection of Title II, Part A funds
- Movement to a more severe category

Regional System of Support

In order to provide direct support to schools, Florida has created a regional system of support. There are five regional teams throughout the state with each team consisting of a Regional Executive Director; Instructional Specialists for reading, mathematics, science, Career and Technical Education, and using data; reading and STEM coordinators; and Response to Intervention Specialists. Response to Intervention Specialists work with schools to develop data systems to identify and then provide supports to students with academic and behavioral problems. The regional system of support provides LEAs and schools with access to change agents who possess a proven record of increasing student achievement in low-performing schools. These regional teams work

directly with schools and LEAs in the areas of curriculum and instruction, school and LEA leadership, school improvement planning, professional development, teacher quality, and data analysis.

Rationale and Supporting Information for Selecting Florida's School Grades System to Classify Schools in Differentiated Accountability

The selection of Florida's School Grades system as the key input for determining schools' DA status is based on several factors:

- Florida's "A" through "F" School Grades system provides understandable measures of school achievement for all stakeholders and drives incentive for improving student achievement.
- School grading has a history of success (more than a decade) in improving critical areas of academic performance for Florida's student populations, including all subgroups, spanning elementary, middle, and high school levels of instruction.
- School grading is founded on measurable student achievement in core academic areas, including test results measuring student performance as well as student progress.
- Florida's high school grading system includes additional measures of achievement for evaluating on-time graduation, advanced curriculum participation and performance (including at least one measure for career readiness), and college readiness.
- Florida's School Grades system is based on the idea that raised expectations are a vital part of success in implementing accountability to improve opportunities for all of Florida's students, and that continuing to raise expectations and standards is essential for moving Florida where we want to be within the next five years, when the state will apply national common assessments to provide both national and international comparative measures for evaluating Florida students' progress and achievement.
- Our School Grades system works to most effectively identify successful schools, reward success, and enable improvement.
- Florida's School Grades system is designed to accommodate progressive improvements in its own structure over time.
- The current accountability process has led to the public's inability to reconcile the school grade with the DA timeline for the implementation of rigorous turnaround requirements in the persistently lowest-achieving schools and, as a result, undermined the ability of LEAs to implement turnaround strategies.

2.A.ii Select the option that pertains to the SEA and provide the corresponding information, if any.

<p>Option A</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The SEA only includes student achievement on reading/language arts and mathematics assessments in its differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system and to identify reward, priority, and focus schools.</p>	<p>Option B</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If the SEA includes student achievement on assessments in addition to reading/language arts and mathematics in its differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system and to identify reward, priority, and focus schools, it must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. provide the percentage of students in the “all students” group that performed at the proficient level on the State’s most recent administration of each assessment for all grades assessed; and b. include an explanation of how the included assessments will be weighted in a manner that will result in holding schools accountable for ensuring all students achieve college- and career-ready standards.
--	---

Each year the Florida School Grades system uses assessments in four subject areas to measure the current-year performance of students: reading, mathematics, writing, and science. More detailed state-level reporting of student performance in these subject areas is provided in Florida's School Public Accountability Reports (SPARs), which are designed to meet requirements for annual state, LEA, and school reports in compliance with ESEA. The SPARs are posted online at <http://doeweb-prd.doe.state.fl.us/eds/nclbpar/index.cfm>.

The table below provides the percentage of students in the "all students" group that performed at level 3 or higher on the state's 2011 administration of each assessment for all grades assessed. Florida is in the process of raising standards for all of its assessments so the percentage of students scoring level 3 or higher will likely be different in the future.

Subject Area Proficiency on the FCAT, School Grades

	Percent Proficient 2010 Statewide School Averages			
School Type	Reading	Math	Writing	Science
Elementary	76	76	84	52
Middle	68	67	90	46
High	49	76	87	42
Combination	68	69	84	49

For all schools, the assessment components of the school grading methodology are based entirely on student performance and progress measured in core academic subjects (reading, mathematics, writing, and science for performance; reading and mathematics for learning gains [progress]). Florida's current elementary and middle school grading formulas weight student performance on the above four assessments as 50% of the grade with the other 50% comprised of points for student learning gains. The weighting of points for assessment-based components in the school grading system for Florida's elementary and middle schools are addressed more specifically in Section 2.A.i of this document.

For Florida's high school grading system, the state assessment-based components are weighted at 50% of the high school grade, while the other 50% of the available school grade points are weighted toward component areas that directly measure, or are otherwise essential to, career and college readiness: on-time graduation, participation and performance in advanced curricula (including Industry Certifications), and postsecondary readiness in reading and mathematics. These additional components for measuring high school performance were implemented beginning in 2009-10 to provide a more comprehensive measure of high schools' effectiveness in preparing students for success at the next level after graduation.

Florida High School Grades

50% Based on Statewide Assessments	50% Based on Other Factors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance in reading, mathematics, science, and writing • Learning gains for all students in reading and mathematics • Learning gains for the lowest-performing 25% in reading and mathematics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall graduation rate • At-risk graduation rate • Participation and performance in accelerated courses • College readiness in reading and mathematics • Growth and decline of these measures

Current High School Grades Model

Reading	Mathematics	Writing	Science	Acceleration	Graduation Rate	College Readiness
Proficiency (100) 6.25%	Proficiency (100) 6.25%	Proficiency (100) 6.25%	Proficiency (100) 6.25%	Participation (175) 10.94%	Overall (200) 12.5%	Reading (100) 6.25%
Learning Gains (100) 6.25%	Learning Gains (100) 6.25%			Performance (125) 7.81%	At-Risk (100) 6.25%	Math (100) 6.25%
Low 25% Gains (100) 6.25%	Low 25% Gains (100) 6.25%					
300 points 18.75%	300 points 18.75%	100 pts. 6.25%	100 pts. 6.25%	300 points 18.75%	300 points 18.75%	200 points 12.5%

Because these components constitute the points that determine schools' assigned school grades and because school grades are key to providing rewards for successful schools and determining required steps of improvement for schools performing at lower levels, these measures provide direct incentives for schools to expand advanced course offerings, increase the quality of instruction, and focus on preparing all students for the future.

Florida's subject area assessments measure the extent to which students have mastered the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards. Florida increased its standards when it implemented the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards and also increased the rigor of the FCAT 2.0 for which Florida is currently setting cut scores. Florida is now working toward implementing the Common Core State Standards adopted by the State Board of Education. Beginning in 2014-15 Florida will assess

student performance using the common assessments developed through the PARCC consortium. School grade components (measured by state assessments) for elementary and middle schools focus on the same general subject areas that, later in students' education careers (toward high school graduation), are also measured by college placement examinations to determine the readiness of students for admission to degree-seeking postsecondary coursework. The content measured on reading and mathematics assessments is particularly relevant in this regard, as success in these areas also determines a student's ability to master content in career education fields.

2.B SET AMBITIOUS BUT ACHIEVABLE ANNUAL MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES

Select the method the SEA will use to set new ambitious but achievable annual measurable objectives (AMOs) in at least reading/language arts and mathematics for the State and all LEAs, schools, and subgroups that provide meaningful goals and are used to guide support and improvement efforts. If the SEA sets AMOs that differ by LEA, school, or subgroup, the AMOs for LEAs, schools, or subgroups that are further behind must require greater rates of annual progress.

<p>Option A</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Set AMOs in annual equal increments toward a goal of reducing by half the percentage of students in the “all students” group and in each subgroup who are not proficient within six years. The SEA must use current proficiency rates based on assessments administered in the 2010–2011 school year as the starting point for setting its AMOs.</p> <p>i. Provide the new AMOs and an explanation of the method used to set these AMOs.</p>	<p>Option B</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Set AMOs that increase in annual equal increments and result in 100 percent of students achieving proficiency no later than the end of the 2019–2020 school year. The SEA must use the average statewide proficiency based on assessments administered in the 2010–2011 school year as the starting point for setting its AMOs.</p> <p>i. Provide the new AMOs and an explanation of the method used to set these AMOs.</p>	<p>Option C</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Use another method that is educationally sound and results in ambitious but achievable AMOs for all LEAs, schools, and subgroups.</p> <p>i. Provide the new AMOs and an explanation of the method used to set these AMOs.</p> <p>ii. Provide an educationally sound rationale for the pattern of academic progress reflected in the new AMOs in the text box below.</p> <p>iii. Provide a link to the State’s report card or attach a copy of the average statewide proficiency based on assessments administered in the 2010–2011 school year in reading/language arts and mathematics for the “all students” group and all subgroups. (Attachment 8)</p>
--	--	--

Overview

Florida's most compelling reasons for selecting the following Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) is that they are consistent with the state's long-term approach to school accountability based on measuring individual student performance. This accountability system has a clear record of tremendous success in raising student achievement for all students and all subgroups spanning more than a decade. Success in raising student achievement in Florida is clearly illustrated in graphs (Section 2.A.i) that address Florida's historic School Grades distribution, student achievement on NAEP examinations to reduce achievement gaps, trends in student achievement on the FCAT, including trends in achievement gap reduction for students with disabilities and English language learners, and graduation rate trends. For example, Florida has the highest combined NAEP gains in the nation for students with disabilities, African-American students, and students receiving free and reduced lunch, and one of the highest combined NAEP gains for Hispanic students. In addition, Florida has increased achievement for all students and reduced the achievement gap in mathematics and reading for subgroups. Florida has led the nation in college- and career-ready metrics. For example, Florida leads the nation in the percentage of graduates taking AP examinations and has implemented programs that provide students the access to earn national industry certifications to demonstrate career readiness.

Florida has derived the following AMOs from the state's School Grades system including measures focusing on the most struggling students, measures of student performance, and a measure designed to benchmark Florida's performance against the highest-performing states and nations through NAEP, Trends International Math and Science Study (TIMSS), Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS), and Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA).

Florida's AMOs include:

- School Grades, which provide a comprehensive overview of the performance of the school including subgroup achievement and student learning gains.
- School's annual target for learning gains in mathematics and reading for the lowest-performing 25% of students. This group includes over representation of specific subgroups that are historically low-performing and focuses schools on raising their achievement and reducing achievement gaps.
- School's annual target for increasing the performance of all students and all subgroups. These targets will drive increases in performance to reduce the proportion of students scoring at levels 1 and 2 and increase the proportion of students scoring at levels 3 and above.
- Florida's student performance on NAEP, TIMSS, PIRLS, and PISA compared to the highest-performing states and nations. This AMO is designed to keep Florida moving forward toward national and international competitiveness. Florida will compare its NAEP scores to the top five states and its TIMSS, PIRLS, and PISA scores to the ten top-performing nations. This will make sure that Florida is benchmarking its progress not only within the state but externally to achieve high levels of performance.

School, LEA, and state achievement of the new AMOs will be reported on the state's annual report cards (Florida's School Public Accountability Reports [SPARs]), which are posted at

<http://doeweb-prd.doe.state.fl.us/eds/nclbspar/index.cfm>. Florida's AMOs will be reported in a separate table for progress on AMOs on these annual reports (the SPARs).

Current AMO Schedule for AYP Reporting

Florida's current AMO schedules for reading and mathematics assessment performance are available on pages 95 and 96 of the state's federally approved accountability workbook at <http://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/stateplans03/flcsa.doc>. These AMOs, which Florida will replace via the current flexibility request, are copied below for ease of reference:

Annual Proficiency Targets for Subgroups (AYP Percent-Proficient Targets)		
School Year	Reading Target	Mathematics Target
2001-02	31%	38%
2002-03	31%	38%
2003-04	31%	38%
2004-05	37%	44%
2005-06	44%	50%
2006-07	51%	56%
2007-08	58%	62%
2008-09	65%	68%
2009-10	72%	74%
2010-11	79%	80%
2011-12	86%	86%
2012-13	93%	93%
2013-14	100%	100%

Under the current AYP structure for 2010-11, 90% of Florida's schools did not make AYP, but we know that to characterize 90 percent of Florida's schools as failing schools in 2010-11 would provide a very misleading assessment of the condition of public education in Florida.

Florida's New AMOs are Ambitious, Meaningful Measures of School and Student Progress

One of the reasons that Florida is proposing new AMOs is to incorporate annual performance objectives that are both ambitious and achievable. Further, Florida's AMOs streamline the federal and state accountability systems into one rigorous, cohesive system that increases standards and holds schools, LEAs, and the state accountable for the achievement of all students including those that are struggling the most. Because Florida's AMOs are part of the School Grades system classifications that determine financial rewards and what actions schools and LEAs must take to improve student achievement, the new AMOs will be more meaningful and consistent measures of academic progress for Florida's schools and students.

Florida's School Grades system has been driving large increases in student success for over a

decade, while continuing to evolve into an even more rigorous system over time. Florida is currently poised to increase the rigor of the system yet again in 2012. Florida's school grading system focuses 50% of its assessment components on student performance and 50% on student learning gains. In addition, to the student assessment components, the high school grading system also includes measures that focus on ensuring that students are ready for college or careers. Florida's grading system also ensures that schools focus their efforts on achieving learning gains for the most struggling students. Learning gains for the most struggling students are captured in multiple measures so these students become very important to Florida schools and LEAs in the School Grades model. Florida's School Grades system is described in more detail in Section 2.A.i of this request.

We are proposing four AMOs to provide a more robust and comprehensive picture of student performance within the school, LEA, and state. As achievement targets, the new AMOs will be reported as parts of a comprehensive, compensatory accountability system for evaluating a school's academic status and progress; the new AMOs will not have the same "all or nothing" impact on the overall school performance outcome as with the prior AMOs used in AYP reporting. Outcomes on the new AMOs will be reported on the annual state/LEA/school report cards.


Definition of New AMOs

- **AMO-1, School Performance Grade Target.** Each school in Florida strives to achieve an "A" school grade. A school grade of "A" brings financial rewards and flexibilities to the school. School grades are also important metrics that local communities and business leaders focus on. LEAs and schools work diligently to improve their school grades.

The school grade is selected as the first AMO in order to provide a comprehensive overview of the performance of the school that includes the student performance and progress of all students including subgroups. A school cannot achieve an "A" school grade, even if it has high levels of students performing on grade level, unless it focuses on learning gains for its most struggling students. School grades are assigned to each Florida school to meet the public reporting requirements of Section 1008.34, Florida Statutes. A description of school grading components is provided online at <http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/pdf/1011/Guidesheet2011SchoolGrades.pdf>.

- **AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target.** This AMO sets targets for each school and subgroup in Florida to increase the proportion of students scoring at level 3 and above and reduce the proportion of students scoring at levels 1 and 2 by 50%. All schools and subgroups within the school will be evaluated to determine whether they meet their individual annual targets for performance in reading and math. AMO targets will be established separately for each subgroup and all students, and will be calculated at the school, LEA, and state levels. The AMO targets will be used to determine whether the subgroups (as well as the "all students" group) are making progress in the current year to be on track to reduce the percentage of level 1 and level 2 students by half by 2016-17 (using 2010-11 as the baseline year). The graph below provides an example of the "all students" subgroup target that would be established for a school that had 64% of its students scoring at levels 3 and higher. In addition to the performance target,

eligible subgroups would be able to meet the criteria through the current Safe Harbor provision.



Example, Performance Target Calculation

- Sample Elementary School: 2010-11 percent scoring at level 3 or higher in mathematics = 64% (All Students)
- 50 percent of students scoring levels 1 and 2 = $36\% \times \frac{1}{2} = 18\%$
- Target for 2016-17 = $64\% + 18\% = 82\%$

Sample Elementary School

In 2010-11, 64% scored at level 3 or higher in mathematics

Target: Increase level 3 and higher rate to 82% in 2016-17

Target for 2011-12	$67\% = 64\% + [(18\% \div 6) \times 1]$
Target for 2012-13	$70\% = 64\% + [(18\% \div 6) \times 2]$
Target for 2013-14	$73\% = 64\% + [(18\% \div 6) \times 3]$
Target for 2014-15	$76\% = 64\% + [(18\% \div 6) \times 4]$
Target for 2015-16	$79\% = 64\% + [(18\% \div 6) \times 5]$
Target for 2016-17	$82\% = 64\% + 18\%$


Schools and subgroups that have 95% of students scoring at level 3 or higher will meet the state's high-performing target, which meets Florida's AMO requirement without the requirement for annual improvement. This allows high-performing schools and subgroups to meet the AMO requirement without having to show improvement over

the prior year.

Florida will report for each subgroup at the school whether the target was met, whether the school has improved but has not met the target, or whether the subgroup's performance has maintained or declined. Subgroups categorized as improving have increased the percentage of students scoring level 3 or higher while the subgroups categorized as maintained/declined have not increased the proportion of students scoring level 3 or higher.

- **AMO-3, Target for Progress of Students in the Lowest-Performing 25%.** This target is calculated separately for both reading and mathematics and is based on the percentage of students in the lowest-performing quartile who made learning gains in the assessed subject areas. Students are counted as making learning gains if they increase their Achievement Level, maintain a level of 3 or higher, or for students in levels 1 and 2, if they make more than a year's worth of learning gains. Schools must show that 50% of students in the lowest-performing group (lowest 25%) have made learning gains. If a school falls short of this target in either subject area, the school can still meet the requirement by showing improvement in the learning gains percentage from one year to the next (see exhibit below).

Florida's Learning Gains Target for the Lowest-Performing 25% of Students



In addition to using this target as an AMO, it also has consequences for a school's grade. Schools that would otherwise be graded "C" or higher that do not meet this requirement are assigned a final school grade that is one letter grade lower than the school would have received based on the school grade points earned. This provides schools an added incentive to focus efforts on helping the most struggling students improve their academic performance.

Several factors heavily influenced the selection of this measure as a new AMO:

- Florida's most populous minority subgroups, students with disabilities, and its economically disadvantaged subgroup are heavily represented in the lowest-performing 25% grouping of the state's school grading calculations.
- The state's School Grades system, as required in governing statute and rule, must place additional emphasis on academic achievement of the lowest-performing students. This additional emphasis is quantified in the form of school grading points for learning gains of students in the lowest-performing 25% and in the progress target for the lowest-performing 25%.
- Using the lowest-performing 25% solves one of the main difficulties of using the

performance of individual subgroups in accountability systems. When looking at individual subgroups many schools do not have enough students in each subgroup for each subgroup's performance to count in the accountability system. This may lead schools to focus on those subgroups that do make a difference to their accountability rating instead of all students that are performing at low levels. By bringing the subgroups together into the lowest-performing 25%, Florida schools and LEAs will focus on the students most in need of assistance.

The focus on the lowest-performing 25% is at its foundation a way of addressing the concern that students from certain subgroups are more likely than others to be lower performers, and that instructional efforts should always be appropriately directed toward students in most need of assistance and improvement. AMO-2 supports this aim by providing a real incentive in the school grading formula for aligning instructional resources to focus on low performers, and in so doing rewards schools and LEAs that are successful in reducing achievement gaps. The table below shows that the subgroups with the lowest achievement are over represented in the lowest-performing 25% subgroup.

2010-11 Subgroup Representation in Overall Student Population vs. Lowest-Performing 25%

Subgroup	Mathematics		Reading	
	Percent of Lowest-Performing 25%	Percent of the Rest of the Students	Percent of Lowest-Performing 25%	Percent of the Rest of the Students
All Students	100%	100%	100%	100%
Asian	≤ 5%	≤ 5%	≤ 5%	≤ 5%
African-American	31%	22%	29%	22%
Hispanic	31%	28%	31%	28%
American Indian	≤ 5%	≤ 5%	≤ 5%	≤ 5%
White	34%	44%	35%	44%
Students with Disabilities	27%	12%	28%	12%
English Language Learners	15%	11%	16%	11%
Economically Disadvantaged	70%	57%	69%	57%

Sources: Florida School Grades compiled records for 2010-11 and October Membership data reported on the 2010-11 School Public Accountability Reports, Florida Department of Education.

2010-11 Subgroup Composition of the Lowest-Performing 25% of Students

Subgroup	Mathematics		Reading	
	Percent of Lowest-performing 25%, Math	Percent of Lowest-performing 25% Making Gains	Percent of Lowest-performing 25%, Reading	Percent of Lowest-performing 25% Making Gains
All Students	100%	67%	100%	60%
Asian	≤5%	76%	≤ 5%	66%
African-American	31%	65%	29%	56%
Hispanic	31%	68%	31	61%
American Indian	≤ 5%	65%	≤ 5%	59%
White	34%	68%	5%	63%
Students with Disabilities	27%	61%	28%	53%
English Language Learners	15%	9%	1□ %	60%
Economically Disadvantaged	70%	16%	□ 9%	58%

Note: Students are counted as making learning gains if they increase their Achievement Level, maintain a level 3 or higher, or for students in levels 1 and 2, if they make more than a year's worth of learning gains.

Source: Florida School Grades compiled records for 2010-11, Florida Department of Education.


- AMO-4, Benchmark Florida's Student Performance to the Highest-Performing States and Nations.** This is a statewide target that compares Florida's student performance (% proficient) on NAEP, TIMSS, PIRLS, and PISA compared to the highest-performing states and nations. Florida's target is to attain the same achievement levels as the top five states on NAEP and the top ten nations on TIMSS, PIRLS, and PISA. This AMO is designed to keep Florida moving forward toward national and international competitiveness. This will make sure that Florida is benchmarking its progress not only within the state but externally to achieve the highest levels of performance and increase Florida's competitiveness nationally and internationally.

Florida's Rationale for Selecting These AMOs

Florida selected its AMOs to ensure that its strong, successful, statewide accountability system drives student achievement in the future, eliminating the confusion caused by having more than one accountability system for schools. This selection of AMOs and Florida's enhanced School Grades system provides for a more cohesive and more rigorous system to identify high-performing and significantly improving schools as well as schools that are struggling and need support. Florida has a history of raising the bar in its accountability system and intends to continue that track record. Florida is committed to continuous monitoring of student achievement for all students and subgroups to ensure that all struggling students increase their performance and that high-achieving students also increase their performance. Florida will continually assess its accountability system in light of student achievement of all students and subgroups to determine whether changes need to occur to ensure that all students are moving forward. Florida is working to raise the bar for all students and subgroups across the spectrum to ensure that students are working to meet and attain rigorous college- and career-ready

standards and the school accountability system is a strong tool to help Florida students reach those goals.

Students, Teachers, and Schools Responded with Increased Performance Each Time Florida “Raised the Bar”



School Grades Distribution for High- and Low-Performing Schools

Key for “Raising the Bar” arrows:

- 1st arrow: Florida implemented learning gains components in reading and mathematics after expanding the FCAT from three grades tested in reading and mathematics to all grades tested from grade 3 through grade 10.
- 2nd arrow: Florida expanded the included student population to incorporate scores for students with disabilities and English language learners on the FCAT, and increased the writing standard for proficiency from 3.0 to 3.5.
- 3rd arrow: Florida added FCAT Science to school grade performance measures and added learning gains for the lowest-performing 25% in mathematics.
- 4th arrow: Florida expanded its high school grading measures to include overall and at-risk graduation rates, accelerated coursework, and readiness for college and careers.

Reporting New AMOs on Annual State Reports (Examples of Tables)

The following sets of tables show how the new AMOs will be reported on the annual state/LEA reports (Florida's School Public Accountability Reports [SPARs]) in compliance with the ESEA. Each AMO will be reported for all students and individually for each subgroup. The chart indicates whether the school met the target and the percentage of students that made the required progress or achievement. Florida will use these reports to monitor the progress of all students and each subgroup to identify areas that may need more focus. The following tables show an example school-level table, an LEA-level table, and a statewide table.

Progress Toward AMOs (School-Level Report):

Progress Toward Annual Measurable Objectives													
Sample High School													
	School Grade	Performance Progress Reading					Performance Progress Math					Did the School Meet Target for Low 25%, Target for Reading? (Y/N)	Did the School Meet Target for Low 25%, Target for Math? (Y/N)
		Percent Scoring Level 3 or Higher	Target	Met target	Improving	Maintaining or declining	Percent Scoring Level 3 or Higher	Target	Met target	Improving	Maintaining or declining		
All Students													
American Indian or Alaska Native													
Asian													
Black or African-American													
Hispanic													
White													
Students with Disabilities													
Economically Disadvantaged													
English Language Learners													

Progress Toward AMOs (LEA/District-Level Report)

Progress Toward Annual Measurable Objectives Sample LEA												
	District Grade	Performance Progress Reading				Performance Progress Math				Did the District Meet Target for Low 25%, Target for Reading? (Y/N)	Did the District Meet Target for Low 25%, Target for Math? (Y/N)	
		Percent Scoring Level 3 or Higher	Target	Met target	Improving Maintaining or declining	Percent Scoring Level 3 or Higher	Target	Met target	Improving Maintaining or declining			
All Students												
American Indian or Alaska Native												
Asian												
Black or African- American												
Hispanic												
White												
Students with Disabilities												
Economically Disadvantaged												
English Language Learners												

Progress Toward AMOs (State-Level Results, by School Type)

Progress Toward Annual Measurable Objectives Sample Middle School State Level Report													
	Performance Progress Reading					Performance Progress Math					Did the State Meet Target for Low 25%, Target for Reading ? (Y/N)	Did the State Meet Target for Low 25%, Target for Math? (Y/N)	Did the State Meet the Performance Target of the Highest Performing States and Nations?
	Percent Scoring Level 3 or Higher	Target	Met target	Improving	Maintaining or declining	Percent Scoring Level 3 or Higher	Target	Met target	Improving	Maintaining or declining			
All Students													
American Indian or Alaska Native													
Asian													
Black or African- American													
Hispanic													
White													
Students with Disabilities													
Economically Disadvantaged													
English Language Learners													

Florida's School Public Accountability Reports (SPARs) fulfill requirements for reporting all elements in the state, LEA, and school annual report cards under provisions of ESEA. The SPARs are available at <http://doeweb-prd.doe.state.fl.us/eds/nclbpar/index.cfm>.

2.C REWARD SCHOOLS

2.C.i Describe the SEA's methodology for identifying highest-performing and high-progress schools as reward schools.

Florida proposes to use the established Florida School Recognition Program, described below, to identify high-performing schools and schools that have demonstrated improved student performance by at least one grade. Reward schools comprise all schools graded "A" and schools that improve one or more grade levels over the prior year. The state has different school grades release timelines for elementary/middle schools and high schools due to lagged measures for high schools. For the purpose of this calculation the state used the 2010-11 school grades for Elementary/middle schools and the 2009-10 school grades data for high schools. Using this data the state has identified 1,975 schools that meet the Reward criteria.

Florida School Recognition Program

Florida has long acknowledged the need to recognize schools that are high-performing and have demonstrated significant improvement. To this end, in 1999 the State Legislature established the Florida School Recognition Program to reward high and improved school performance based on school grading. As authorized by Florida law (Section 1008.36, Florida Statutes) the Florida School Recognition Program provides greater autonomy and financial awards to schools that demonstrate sustained or significantly improved student performance. Schools that receive an “A” grade and/or schools that improve at least one performance grade category are eligible for school recognition funds. Funds for the Florida School Recognition Program are appropriated annually by the State Legislature. In 2010-11, the amount distributed was \$119,858,088; equivalent to \$75 per full-time equivalent (FTE) for each qualifying school. The staff and School Advisory Council at each recognized school jointly decide how to use the financial award. As specified in law, schools must use their awards for one or any combination of the following:

- Nonrecurring faculty and staff bonuses
- Nonrecurring expenditures for educational equipment and materials
- Temporary personnel to assist in maintaining or improving student performance

Additional information on the Florida School Recognition Program is available online at <http://www.fldoe.org/evaluation/schrmain.asp>.

2.C.ii Provide the SEA’s list of reward schools in Table 2.

2.C.iii Describe how the SEA will publicly recognize and, if possible, reward highest-performing and high-progress schools.

In addition to the financial rewards described above for the Florida School Recognition Program, additional public recognition of these schools includes, but is not limited to, posting on the FDOE’s website; press releases by the Governor, Commissioner of Education, and/or school superintendent; and recognition by the State Board of Education, local school boards, and/or the local Chamber of Commerce.

2.D PRIORITY SCHOOLS

2.D.i Describe the SEA’s methodology for identifying a number of lowest-performing schools equal to at least five percent of the State’s Title I schools as priority schools.

F Schools = Priority/Intervene Schools

Florida proposes that schools that receive a school grade of “F” will be assigned to the Priority/Intervene status. Florida schools in Priority/Intervene status are subject to more intensive intervention efforts required by the FDOE and managed (initially) by the LEA. Schools that receive a grade of “F” are the schools that need the most support to improve student achievement and student learning gains for all students and students within each subgroup.

Most Recent School Grades to Identify Schools in Table 2

Florida has two distinct timelines for the release of schools grades. Elementary and middle school grades are released in July of each year. High school grades are released in December due to the inclusion of other lagged measures including Advanced Placement, Dual Enrollment, and graduation rate. As a result of the timelines the FDOE used the most recent complete school grade data available to populate Table 2 (Attachment 9). For elementary and middle schools the school grade data reflects performance during the 2010-11 school year. However, high school grade data reflects the 2009-10 School Grades.

Based upon this information, there are 35 schools that would qualify for the Priority/Intervene school designation. This number reflects 2% of the state's Title I schools.

2010-2011 School Grades

Florida is currently in the process of revising its school grading calculations. The state's simulation using the proposed FCAT 2.0 cut scores indicates that the Priority/Intervene schools category would include 112 schools, reflecting 6% of all Title I schools in the state's current accountability system if these results had been used to recalculate Florida's 2010-2011 School Grades. See page 117 for a summary by school type.

2.D.ii Provide the SEA's list of priority schools in Table 2.

2.D.iii Describe the meaningful interventions aligned with the turnaround principles that an LEA with priority schools will implement.

The state's DA process establishes criteria for ensuring that LEAs/schools comply with the turnaround principles. Specifically, the regional teams, as part of their instructional monitoring process, currently use the District and School Compliance Checklists as well as the Strategies and Support Document (Attachment 12) to ensure that these principles are being followed (these documents will be revised to reflect the provisions described below). These principles are outlined in Section 2.G.

In order to maximize the ability of a school assigned to Priority/Intervene status to make dramatic, systematic change, the interventions themselves must be appropriate, implementation must be faithful, and oversight strong and fair. Florida can demonstrate its history with each of these components. Florida has five Regional Executive Directors assigned to assist and oversee turnaround implementation by LEAs and schools. LEAs that have a number of Priority/Intervene schools must also have a dedicated turnaround director. The State Board of Education reviews and approves or disapproves LEA plans for Priority/Intervene schools. The focus on Priority/Intervene schools in Florida is such that during the 2011 calendar year, in six of the eight State Board of Education meetings, Priority/Intervene schools were on the agenda for review.

The interventions for Priority/Intervene schools are found in Section 1008.33, Florida Statutes, and Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code.

As described below, LEAs that have a Priority/Intervene school are required to conduct a diagnostic needs assessment and submit a plan for review and approval by the State Board of

Education. This plan must demonstrate that it will result in systematic change and includes seven areas: school improvement planning, leadership quality improvement, educator quality improvement, professional development, curriculum alignment and pacing, the Florida Continuous Improvement Model, and monitoring plans and processes (Rule 6A-1.099811(5), Florida Administrative Code).

In order to assist the USDOE peer reviewer, the elements of the plan as well as other interventions aimed at achieving systematic change are set forth below in the sequence found in the review guidance. FDOE anticipates that if this flexibility is granted, interventions and support addressing each of the areas listed below will remain in place; however, the support strategies themselves may evolve to better serve struggling schools and LEAs.

School Leadership

An LEA with a Priority/Intervene school is required to replace the principal, all assistant principals and coaches unless assigned to the school for less than one year where the school is a district-managed turnaround school. If the school is managed by an outside entity or as a charter school, the principal must have experience in turning around a low-performing school and the principal, assistant principals, and coaches from the Priority/Intervene school may not be hired at the school unless assigned to the school for less than one year and the school's failure to improve cannot be attributed in whole or in part, to the individual (Rule 6A-1.099811(8), Florida Administrative Code). Additionally, as part of the support and interventions provided to LEAs with a Priority/Intervene school, the LEA is required to submit a plan to FDOE for approval. That plan must include the following elements on school leadership:

1. The school's principal and assistant principals must have a record of increasing student achievement. The principal must have a record of turning around a similar school. The SEA has developed a leadership preparation program. The primary objective of this program is to create a pool of promising candidates to lead the chronically low achieving schools. This is described in Section 2.G.
2. The LEA must review members of the school leadership team and replace them as necessary based upon overall school performance. The review and replacement process must be fair, consistent, transparent, and reliable.
3. The LEA, with FDOE assistance, will review the school leadership team. FDOE will make recommendations to the LEA with respect to replacing members of the leadership team. The review and replacement process must be fair, consistent, transparent, and reliable.

Operating Flexibility

An LEA's plan for Priority/Intervene schools must:

1. Give the school sufficient operating flexibility, such as staffing decisions, calendars/time, and budgeting to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates.
2. Provide ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization, such as a school turnaround organization or Education Management Organization (EMO). The plan must identify the partner(s) and provide the qualifications of each in providing support to low-performing schools.
3. Adopt a new governance structure, which may include, but is not limited to:

- Requiring the school to report to a new “turnaround office” in the LEA or SEA.
- Appointing a “turnaround leader” that the principal reports to and who reports directly to the superintendent.
- Entering into a multi-year contract with the LEA or SEA to obtain added flexibility in exchange for greater accountability.

Florida’s interventions provide flexibility in scheduling, staffing, curriculum, and budget once the Priority/Intervene school is turned over to a charter entity. One of the key purposes of charter schools is to encourage the use of innovation. In order to allow for innovation and flexibility, charter schools are exempted in law from most of the statutes and rules that apply to other schools. Except for laws that address student assessment; school grading; the provision of services to students with disabilities; and health, safety, welfare, and civil rights, charter schools are not bound by the requirements the educational code (Section 1002.33(16), Florida Statutes). Therefore, not only is the principal given operational flexibility, the entire school is provided a wide degree of flexibility in order to affect systematic change.

Effective Teachers

In order to ensure that teachers in Priority/Intervene schools are able to improve instruction, when the Priority/Intervene school is district-managed, the LEA is required to employ a reliable system to reassign or replace the majority of the instructional staff whose students’ failure to improve can be attributed to the faculty. Reading and mathematics teachers may not be rehired at the school unless they are highly qualified and effective instructors under Section 1012.05, Florida Statutes, and as evidenced by 65% or more of their students achieving learning gains in reading and mathematics for elementary teachers and the appropriate content area for middle and high school teachers. These same requirements apply when the Priority/Intervene school is managed as a charter school or by an outside educational entity (Rule 6A-1.099811(8), Florida Administrative Code). Further, the LEA plan for Priority/Intervene school must include the following related to teacher quality and school staffing:

1. The LEA may not employ teachers for the school who are designated less than satisfactory by the teacher evaluation instrument. Florida has several Race to the Top projects that focus on developing quality teachers.
2. The LEA must develop a plan to encourage teachers and instructional coaches to remain or transfer to lower-performing schools based on increasing learning gains by 65% or greater in reading and mathematics. The plan must be fair, consistent, transparent, and reliable.
3. The LEA must provide a reading coach, mathematics coach, and science coach to develop and model effective lessons, to lead Lesson Study, to analyze data, and provide professional development on the Common Core State Standards/Next Generation Sunshine State Standards.
4. The LEA must ensure that performance appraisals of instructional personnel are primarily based on student achievement. The appraisals must be fair, consistent, transparent, and reliable.
5. The LEA must ensure that performance appraisals of the administrative team include student achievement, as measured by the FCAT, as well as goals related to targeted subgroups and school-wide improvement.
6. The LEA must train staff on performance appraisal instruments and ensure that the performance appraisal process is implemented.

7. The LEA must provide teachers with performance pay for raising student achievement. The performance pay system must be fair, consistent, transparent, and reliable.
8. The LEA, with assistance from FDOE, must review and replace teachers who have not contributed to increased learning gains of 65% or greater in reading and mathematics or those teachers who did not contribute to improving the school's performance. The review and replacement process must be fair, consistent, transparent, and reliable.
9. The LEA must implement a differentiated pay policy that includes differentiation based on LEA-determined factors, including but not limited to additional job responsibilities, school demographics, critical shortage areas, and level of job performance difficulties. The policy must be fair, consistent, transparent, and reliable.
10. The LEA must ensure that mid-year vacancies are filled.

In order to ensure that job-embedded professional development occurs and that the development is tied to teacher and student needs, an LEA's plan for a Priority/Intervene school must include the following:

1. The LEA must ensure that Individual Professional Development Plans for teachers of targeted subgroups include professional development that targets the needs of subgroups.
2. The LEA must participate in a sample of meetings where Individual Professional Development Plans are developed.
3. The LEA must ensure that leadership professional development opportunities target the needs of subgroups.
4. The LEA must provide professional development opportunities for school administrators that target the specific needs of subgroups.
5. The LEA must ensure that appropriate resources are provided to redesign the master schedule to allow for common planning time for data-based decision making within the problem-solving process, job-embedded professional development on the Common Core State Standards/Next Generation Sunshine State Standards, and Lesson Study. The LEA must ensure that appropriate resources are allocated to redesign the master schedule. The LEA will ensure that more time for teachers to collaborate, plan, and engage in professional development within and across grades and subjects. Common planning time must be established within the master schedule to allow grade level meetings to occur daily in elementary schools and by subject area at the secondary level. It must be scheduled so that all grade level and subject area teachers participate at the same time and include Lesson Study. If the master schedule prevents this from occurring, the LEA must establish a weekly Lesson Study after school for a minimum of one hour a week on the same day.
6. The LEA must provide principals and assistant principals with professional development on monitoring classroom instruction and guiding/supporting/monitoring the activities of instructional coaches.
7. The LEA must provide professional development on Florida's Continuous Improvement Model, Common Core State Standards/Next Generation Sunshine State Standards, Response to Intervention, Lesson Study, and School Grade and AMO Calculations.
8. The LEA must create and maintain a pool of highly-qualified reading, mathematics, and science teachers and instructional coaches to serve in DA schools.
9. The LEA must offer a summer professional development academy that is developed in conjunction with FDOE to school administrators, teachers, and instructional coaches. The LEA is also required to partner with the regional team to encourage school administrators, teachers, and instructional coaches to participate in the DA Summer Academies.

Additional Time for Learning and Collaboration

Florida strongly believes in extending the instructional day, week, and year as a strategy to increase student achievement. Florida provides Supplemental Academic Intervention (SAI) funding initially based on the number of students needing an extended school year program. These funds are provided to all LEAs prior to the beginning of each school year allowing schools to establish academic intervention programs at the moment students begin to struggle with subject content. This system of addressing the needs of students immediately, rather than waiting until students fail a course and take it again during an abbreviated summer session, has proven to be highly effective in reducing students below grade level. In addition to SAI funds, schools have access to School Improvement and Title I funds to extend the instructional time. Lastly, School Improvement Grant (SIG) funds are provided to the lowest-performing 5% of schools in the state and each school is required to develop and have approved a detailed improvement plan that must include the extension of the instruction day and common teacher planning time. All LEAs are required to offer summer reading camps for struggling 3rd grade readers who have scored below level 3 on grade 3 FCAT reading. With the use these funds, Florida's lowest-performing schools conduct intensive summer programs to reduce or eliminate the regression of student learning that takes place over the summer, especially for students who live in poverty. There is also a strong commitment to extend the instructional day through the use of instructional technology at the family's home. This strategy has proven effective, especially for English language learners. Florida is highly committed to providing increased instructional time and practice to all struggling students.

In order to provide additional time for student learning, a Priority/Intervene school must extend the learning day. Additionally, the LEA must ensure that its master schedule is redesigned to allow for common planning time for teachers.

Instructional Programs are Based Upon Student Needs and Aligned with Common Core State Standards

The LEA plan for Priority/Intervene schools requires the following:

1. The LEA or school must develop instructional pacing guides that are aligned to the Common Core State Standards/Next Generation Sunshine State Standards in reading, writing, mathematics, and science.
2. The LEA must develop and implement a comprehensive research-based K-12 reading plan funded by the state. The plan must be updated annually based on Section 1011.62, Florida Statutes.
3. The LEA must review data to determine the effectiveness of all instructional programs and class offerings.
4. The LEA must extend the learning day.
5. The LEA, through the District Improvement Assistance Plan (DIAP), must clearly demonstrate how it is aligning its initiatives and resources based upon its school needs.
6. The LEA must identify the new or revised instructional program for reading, mathematics, science, and writing; the research base that shows it to be effective with high-poverty, at-risk students; and how it is different from the previous instructional program.
7. The LEA must provide the decision-making process for determining the new or revised instructional program.
8. The LEA must provide the rationale, including data, which supports retaining the current

instructional program for reading, mathematics, science, and writing, respectively; or revising or adopting a new program.

Data Informs Instruction

The LEA plan for Priority/Intervene schools must include the following elements:

1. The LEA must monitor implementation of Florida's Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM).
2. The LEA must ensure real-time access to student achievement data.
3. The LEA must prescribe interim (benchmark baseline, mid-year, and mini-) assessments in reading, writing, mathematics, and science for level 1-3 students.
4. The LEA will use the Problem Solving/Response to Intervention process to analyze progress monitoring data in reading, writing, mathematics, and science through interim assessments to inform instruction. In the area of reading, this requirement maybe fulfilled through the use of the Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading.
5. The LEA must participate in the Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading for level 1-3 students.
6. The LEA administration must ensure that data chats are conducted between LEA administration and school administration, school administration and teachers, and teachers and students following baseline, mini-, and mid-year assessments.
7. Promote the continuous use of student data to meet the academic needs of individual students through implementation of the FCIM to:
 - Inform instruction – describe the interim and summative assessments that will be used, the frequency of such assessments, how the data will be analyzed, and how changes in instruction will be monitored.
 - Differentiate instruction – describe how instruction will be differentiated to meet the individual needs of students and how such differentiation will be monitored and supported. Include strategies for push-in, pull-out, or individual instructional opportunities.
 - Describe the specific training and follow-up that will be provided to support the implementation of the FCIM.

Non-Academic Factors Affecting Student Achievement

In order to sustain a school that supports positive student performance outcomes a school must first create an atmosphere that is safe and conducive to teaching and learning. DA incorporates into its improvement processes non-academic factors that are known to impede the development of a positive school culture.

The integrated statewide Problem-solving/Response to Intervention (PS/RtI) and Florida's Positive Behavior Support: RtI for Behavior (FLPBS:RtIB) programs collaborate to provide direct support to LEAs via the District Action Planning and Problem-solving Process. This process consolidates LEA leadership team efforts to use multiple data sources in the systematic planning and problem-solving process to implement a Multi-tiered System of Support for the various initiatives for which there is evidence that student learning is impacted. The Multi-tiered System of Support features timely and comprehensive monitoring of, and technical assistance for, LEA implementation of interventions in

Priority/Intervene and Focus/Correct schools, including:

- Alignment of teacher and school leader evaluation data (on instructional and leadership practices) with professional development.
- Development of state minimum standards for local LEA data systems related to curriculum, instructional practice, assessment, and professional learning.
- Revision (in progress) of the state's principal leadership standards to focus on student results and research-based instructional leadership practices.
- Ongoing revisions of State Board of Education rules to align with federal support for a multi-tiered, data-driven system of identification and service to students with disabilities in need of specially designed instruction.
- Integrated technical assistance in the form of regional trainings, monthly calls, technical assistance papers, web-based tools, and a guidance manual for meaningfully compliant implementation of State Board of Education rules that require use of a data-based problem-solving process (see <http://www.fldoe.org/e/se/sldr.asp> for more information).
- Formal technical assistance products that include an online Introductory RtI Course (taken by over 8,000 educators and other stakeholders), a statewide implementation plan for a PS/RtI implementation over a three-year period, mathematics and science model lesson videos that integrate PS/RtI with standards-based instruction, parent videos and presentations, brochures to address specific needs related to using data-based problem-solving within the Multi-tiered System of Support, and many others that can be accessed at the statewide web site: <http://florida-rti.org/>.
- Multi-year, ongoing FDOE-funded and supported collaborative training and technical assistance projects and their websites, including PS/RtI at <http://floridarti.usf.edu/>, which provides supportive research and resources such as the Evaluation Tool Technical Assistance Manual and newsletters, and FLPBS:RtIB at <http://flpbs.fmhi.usf.edu/>, which provides training modules and Florida's Model PBS Schools and has generated over 6,000,000 hits.
- Development of *Guiding Tools for Instructional Problem-solving (GTIPS)*, a manual used by LEAs and schools to establish and support implementation of data-based planning and problem-solving for instructional decision making, available at <http://florida-rti.org/docs/GTIPS.pdf>.

The DIAP and School Improvement Plans must incorporate non-academic factors including:

- Retention rates/Acceleration programs
- Discipline rates (in-school and out-of-school suspension rates by incident type)
- Drop-out prevention
- PS/RtI team member identification and meeting schedules
- Attendance rates
- Implementation of PBS system

Family and Community Engagement

As part of improvement planning, the LEA is required to recruit representatives of the community to establish a Community Assessment Team (CAT) to review school performance data, determine the cause for low performance for each Priority/Intervene school, and advise the LEA on its District Improvement and Assistance Plan. To enhance the mechanisms for engagement, FDOE Regional Executive Directors are required to participate in CAT meetings. Additionally, the school is required to offer a flexible number of meetings for parents and in order to improve engagement, these meetings must be held at convenient times for parents. Schools are required to document all such meetings and maintain a log of parental involvement in order to demonstrate their efforts to engage the community of stakeholders. For Priority/Intervene school, the state requires that the LEA demonstrate ongoing community involvement in the review of the school's performance and in the selection of the turnaround option.

Oversight and Monitoring

In order to ensure that the interventions are sustained and result in systematic change in Priority/Intervene schools, significant school improvement planning and monitoring occurs at the LEA level and monitoring occurs at the state level. Included in the LEA plan for these schools are the following school improvement planning activities:

1. The LEA must create a LEA-based leadership team that includes the superintendent, associate superintendent(s) of curriculum, general and special education leaders, curriculum specialists, behavior specialists, student services personnel, human resources and professional development leaders, and specialists in other areas relevant to the school's circumstances, such as assessment, English language learners, and gifted learners.
2. The LEA team shall develop, support, and facilitate the implementation of policies and procedures that guide school-based teams with direct support systems for each school.
3. The LEA team must establish systems for PS/RtI through LEA-wide consensus building, infrastructure development, and implementation.
4. The LEA-based leadership team must monitor the implementation of the school improvement plan.
5. The LEA is required to recruit representatives of the community to establish a Community Assessment Team (CAT) to review school performance data, determine the cause for low performance for each school in the Priority/Intervene category, and advise the LEA on its District Improvement and Assistance Plan. The FDOE's Regional Executive Directors shall participate in CAT meetings.
6. The LEA must develop and implement a District Improvement and Assistance Plan.

The LEA's monitoring responsibilities include the following:

1. The LEA must develop a comprehensive instructional monitoring process and follow-up that includes classroom, school leadership team, and school-wide monitoring.
2. The LEA must ensure that schools demonstrating the greatest need, based on data analysis, receive the highest percentage of resources.
3. Monthly LEA meetings with the Regional Executive Director and LEA department leaders are held to coordinate strategies and resources to assist lowest-performing schools.
4. The LEA must establish a position to lead the turnaround effort at the LEA level. The selected employee will report directly to the superintendent and directly supervise principals

at the lowest-performing schools.

The monitoring and reporting that occurs at the state level includes monthly progress monitoring meetings between the DA regional team, LEA, and schools. Additionally, the Regional Executive Director provides a summary of the status of both the school and LEA compliance checklists for areas where there is failure to adequately meet the compliance requirements. In instances where either the school or LEA fails to comply with a required component the LEA and/or school will be required to submit an action plan, in time for the next State Board of Education meeting, detailing the steps it will take in order to meet the required elements. Should the school and/or LEA fail to adequately address the deficiency the State Board of Education may require the superintendent to outline their barriers and revised actions steps at a subsequent State Board of Education meeting.

The FDOE also requires the submission of the selected Intervene Option Plan from the four turnaround models in state law for approval by the State Board of Education. Once approved the LEA will submit a second plan detailing the actual steps toward implementation of their approved plan. This plan includes specific deliverables to ensure that the LEA is working toward implementation of their approved plan. Deliverables include, but are not limited to, evidence of stakeholder engagement during the intervention model selection process, identification of possible external partners, research on selected programs/partnerships, copies of correspondence, and a timeline for transition. Finally, in August of each year, the LEA must submit a final plan that reflects the actual implementation of their approved plan.

The interventions noted in this section are currently in place. While they may evolve to better serve students and LEAs, interventions and support addressing each area will remain in place, should Florida's flexibility request be granted.

The practices that are currently being implemented to improve the quality of instruction and the effectiveness of leadership and teaching in Priority/Intervene schools are found above.

Under the proposal for an enhanced DA system, Priority/Intervene schools could implement interventions for four years. The school would automatically have two years to implement intervention strategies and could have another two years, in a hold status, if the school improved to a grade of "D" or improved enough to meet achievement targets in mathematics and reading. After that, the LEA is required to choose a new option from those in law and submit a new Intervene Option Plan. Beyond the four years to implement an option, an LEA could continue the option and interventions if they demonstrated to the State Board of Education that the school is likely to improve enough to exit the Priority/Intervene category with more time (this is currently a provision in Section 1008.33(5)(b), Florida Statutes).

If a Priority/Intervene school improves enough to earn a "C" grade, neither the existing DA system nor the proposal would require a school to continue interventions. Continuing the interventions when a school has attained a "C" grade, while other schools with the same or even lower grades are not required to implement interventions, undermines the entire system in Florida and diverts limited resources away from the students and schools that are in most need of assistance. The system is less understandable and vulnerable to attack by the community and parents. For the DA system to work in Florida, and for LEAs to implement some of the difficult strategies at the local level, it is essential that the community and parents understand and trust in the DA system.

- 2.D.iv Provide the timeline the SEA will use to ensure that its LEAs that have one or more priority schools implement meaningful interventions aligned with the turnaround principles in each priority school no later than the 2014–2015 school year and provide a justification for the SEA’s choice of timeline.

The timeline below was developed to align required turnaround principles with the availability of student performance data and give the LEA/school adequate time to identify target needs and strategies and allocate resources.

Sample Intervention Timeline for Elementary and Middle Schools (School Year 2011-2012)

- School Grades released July 2011
- Schools are placed in the appropriate DA category and the list is released August 2011
- Review of District Compliance Checklist by Regional Executive Director September/October 2011
- Review of compliance with Strategies and Support Document by the Regional Executive Director September/October 2011
- Submission of compliance summary to State Board of Education (three times annually)
- Intervene Option Plan (Option Selection) Submission November 1, 2011
- State Board of Education Approval November-December 2011
- Intervene Option Plan (Alignment of Strategies and Resources) Submission January-February 2012
 - LEA submission of deliverables, including:
 - Evidence of stakeholder engagement
 - Evidence of communication with an Education Management Organization or Charter
 - Planning timeline toward implementation
- Intervene Option Plan (Implementation) Submission August 1, 2012

As can be seen from the timeline above, under the existing DA system an option (district-managed turnaround or alternative governance through a charter or outside entity) and the accompanying interventions are already in place for many schools. Under the enhanced DA proposal, there would be no delay in implementation of the interventions required for improvement. Further, there would be no concentration of schools in later years because schools would enter, and would have the opportunity to exit, with the release of School Grades yearly. With the release of elementary and middle school grades in July and the release of high school grades in December, the school would have twelve or eight months, respectively, to plan for implementation in August. The proposal allows Priority/Intervene schools to implement an option and accompanying interventions for a two-year period and permits additional time to implement interventions if the school demonstrates improvement in the school grade or in reading and mathematics scores. However, if the school improves enough so that it is no longer categorized as a Priority/Intervene school, it would not be required to continue to implement the interventions required for these low-performing schools. Approval of this request would require modification of state law.

2.D.v Provide the criteria the SEA will use to determine when a school that is making significant progress in improving student achievement exits priority status and a justification for the criteria selected.

Because of the need for intervention efforts in Priority/Intervene schools to establish long-lasting (rather than temporary) improvements, Florida's enhanced DA system substantiated by approval of this ESEA Flexibility Request will place additional exit requirements on Priority/Intervene schools beyond simple improvement of the school grade. In order to exit Priority/Intervene status, Florida schools will be required to meet all of the following criteria:

- Improve the school grade to a “C” or higher.
- Improve achievement in reading and mathematics to meet criteria established by Florida's State Board of Education.

Schools in Priority/Intervene status that meet one of the criteria for exiting Priority/Intervene status will be able to enter a hold status in their DA category for up to two years in order to allow for continuing improvement efforts to raise student achievement sufficiently to merit exit from Priority/Intervene status. Schools improving a letter grade from an “F” to a “D” will retain their Priority/Intervene designation. The school may qualify for a hold status allowing additional time in their current intervention model based upon improving the school grade. However, the school must meet the Priority/Intervene exit criteria by the end of the second year or move to implement an Intervene Option Plan. Currently, the options are closure, district-managed turnaround, charter, or an external management organization. In order to provide LEAs the flexibility to make sustained improvement, Florida is requesting the authority to offer LEAs the ability to implement a fifth option. This option may be a Hybrid Model of the other options (such as a district-operated charter school) or another option altogether as long as an LEA demonstrates that the option is as, or more likely, to turn around the school in the same, or in less, time than the current four options.

2.E FOCUS SCHOOLS

2.E.i Describe the SEA’s methodology for identifying a number of low-performing schools equal to at least 10 percent of the State’s Title I schools as “focus schools.”

D Schools = Focus/Correct Schools

Florida proposes to use the school grade system to identify Focus/Correct schools as those receiving a grade of “D.”

Most Recent School Grades Used to Identify Schools for Table 2

Florida has two distinct timelines for the release of schools grades. Elementary and middle school grades are released in July of each year. High school grades are released in December due to the inclusion of other grade components including Advanced Placement, Dual Enrollment, and graduation rate. As a result, FDOE used the most recent school grades data to populate Table 2 (Attachment 9). FDOE based the identification of Focus/Correct schools using 2010-11 School Grades data for its elementary and middle schools and 2009-10 School Grades data for its high schools. Based upon this calculation, there are 174 schools that would qualify for the Focus/Correct school designation. This number reflects 9% of the state’s Title I schools.

2010-2011 School Grades

Florida is currently in the process of revising its school grading calculations. The state’s simulation using the proposed Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT 2.0) changes indicates that the Focus/Correct category would include 299 schools, reflecting 16% of all Title I schools in the state’s current accountability system. See page 117 for a summary by school type.

Florida’s Focus/Correct and Priority/Intervene Schools Include Schools with the Largest Achievement Gaps

The achievement gap results shown in the tables below indicate that Florida's proposed model for identifying Focus/Correct and Priority/Intervene schools target those schools that have the largest achievement gaps to overcome. The supports that will be directed to these schools through DA will help focus resources to close these achievement gaps. The “gap” is the percentage points by which students in the category trail the state’s overall percentage of students (the “all students” group) who score level 3 or higher in the applicable subject (reading or mathematics).

The gaps presented were calculated using the following formula:

Percentage point gap = the percentage of students scoring level 3 or higher in the state’s “all students” group minus the average school percent scoring level 3 or higher for students in the applicable subgroup

These results are based on publicly reported outcomes for Florida schools (see files under “Measuring Adequate Yearly Progress [AYP] available in Excel format” at <http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/>). A negative number indicates that students in the category exceed the percent proficient outcome for all students statewide (that is, with a negative number there is no gap). “Non Focus/Priority” schools are all Florida schools with outcomes other than those designated as Focus/Correct and Priority/Intervene schools in Florida’s ESEA Flexibility Request.

**The Percentage Point Gap Between All Students and Subgroups
was Greatest at Focus and Priority Schools**

	Economically Disadvantaged			Students with Disabilities		
	“D” Schools	“F” Schools	Non Focus/Priority Schools	“D” Schools	“F” Schools	Non Focus/Priority Schools
Avg. Gap Reading	17%	23%	3%	37%	39%	25%
Avg. Gap Mathematics	17%	24%	4%	36%	41%	25%

	English Language Learners			African-American		
	“D” Schools	“F” Schools	Non Focus/Priority Schools	“D” Schools	“F” Schools	Non Focus/Priority Schools
Avg. Gap Reading	25%	24%	13%	22%	25%	12%
Avg. Gap Mathematics	22%	21%	10%	23%	26%	12%

	Hispanic			Total (“All Students” Subgroup)		
	“D” Schools	“F” Schools	Non Focus/Priority Schools	“D” Schools	“F” Schools	Non Focus/Priority Schools
Avg. Gap Reading	16%	18%	-1%	14%	21%	-3%
Avg. Gap Mathematics	16%	19%	-1%	15%	23%	0%

2.E.ii Provide the SEA’s list of focus schools in Table 2.

2.E.iii Describe the process and timeline the SEA will use to ensure that its LEAs that have one or more focus schools will identify the specific needs of the SEA’s focus schools and their students and provide examples of and justifications for the interventions focus schools will be required to implement to improve the performance of students who are the furthest behind.

Florida’s accountability process begins each year in June/July with the release of Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) performance scores and school grades. FDOE uses the resulting school performance data to place schools within the DA matrix. Focus/Correct schools

will be those with a school grade of “D.” Once the Focus/Correct schools have been identified, FDOE notifies the LEA and subsequently publishes the DA schools list by category on its website. A sample of this report for 2011 can be found at http://flbsi.org/xls/DA_2011_01JUL11.xls. LEAs receive technical assistance annually through face-to-face meetings, webinars, and online technical assistance papers (<http://flbsi.org/schoolimprove/index.htm>). The FDOE also provides a detailed school improvement reporting timeline for the LEAs (<http://flbsi.org/SIP/>). The timeline and its components serve to ensure that the LEA and schools are clearly defining the needs, aligning resources, and identifying support strategies to ensure positive school improvement outcomes. The overall process consists of four components that are aligned to nationally-recognized turnaround principles:

- School Improvement Plan (SIP)
- District Improvement Assistance Plan (DIAP)
- Compliance Checklists
- Progress Monitoring

These mechanisms will continue to apply to Focus/Correct Schools under Florida’s flexibility proposal.

School Improvement Plan (SIP)

Section 1001.42(18)(a), Florida Statutes, requires that LEAs “annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation school improvement plan for each school in the district.” Each plan must address student achievement goals and strategies based on state and LEA achievement standards. The plan must also explicitly detail the supports, strategies, and interventions to be used throughout the year to ensure improved performance outcomes for all student subgroups. The SIP serves as a blueprint of the actions and processes needed to produce school improvement. Florida’s continuous school improvement planning process is the course of action employed to coordinate and prioritize all the work of the school in the context of student achievement. A SIP is the plan that coordinates and prioritizes this process. The components of the SIP are aligned to proven turnaround principles and include:

- Student Achievement Data
- Part I: School Information
 - Highly Qualified Staff
 - Administrators
 - Coaches
 - Teacher
 - Staff Demographics
 - Teacher Mentoring Program
 - Coordination and Integration of federal, state, and local services/programs
 - Response to Intervention
 - Literacy Leadership Team
 - Public School Choice

- Part II: Expected Improvements
 - Reading, writing, mathematics, science goals
 - Students achieving level 3
 - Students achieving above level 3
 - Percentage of students making learning gains
 - Percentage of students in the lowest-performing 25% making learning gains
 - Student subgroups not meeting the AMOs
 - Professional Development/Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)
 - Budget allocation/funding sources
 - Attendance, Suspension, Dropout Prevention, Parental Involvement, and Additional Goals
 - Professional Development/PLCs
 - Budget allocation/funding sources
 - Differentiated Accountability Compliance
 - School Advisory Council

For Focus/Correct Schools, the SIP process begins with the LEA, school, and regional team convening to review the prior year's school performance data by content area, grade level, and subgroup. The resulting disaggregated data are used as the basis for the development of a comprehensive SIP. The school, LEA, and regional teams work collaboratively to identify barriers, new strategies, actions steps, responsibilities, timelines, and resource allocation essential in supporting their improvement efforts. An effective school improvement planning process allows Florida schools to develop a strategic and continuous plan that focuses on quality education and high levels of student achievement. It also ensures that there is a specific focus on students by subgroup and those in the lowest quartile in each tested area.

The SIP is reviewed monthly to evaluate the effectiveness of the plan's implementation or need for revision based upon newly identified needs and relevant data. In this manner, the FDOE ensures that the SIP remains a living document that serves as the template for substantive school reform.

District Improvement Assistance Plan (DIAP)

The DIAP acts in tandem with the SIP to ensure that the LEA works to align resources, support, and strategies to assist its students and schools. The DIAP is due in September of each year allowing adequate time for LEAs to review pertinent data, collaborate with schools in the development of their SIP plans, and work with stakeholders to finalize the plan. The current DIAP template can be viewed at <http://flbsi.org/DIAP/>. The components of the DIAP include:

- For the use of Title I funds
 - Parental involvement in the plan's development
 - AMO data review, identification of deficiencies, and target setting
 - Identification of specific needs of low-achieving students, instructional needs for each subgroup, and plan for how they will be addressed
 - List of research-based reading, mathematics, science, and writing programs to be used at each school level (elementary, middle, high)
 - Identification of extended learning opportunities
 - Assurance that a certain percentage of Title I, Part A funds are committed to

- professional development
 - Parental involvement plan
- For the use of Title III funds
 - Identification of factors that prevented the LEA from achieving AMOs in the following:
 - English language learners
 - Reading
 - Mathematics
 - Identification of research-based professional development strategies and activities
 - Description for parental involvement and outreach strategies
 - Identification of changes to the Title III program

Compliance Checklists

As referenced in Section 2.D.iii, FDOE uses both school- and LEA-level compliance checklists that are aligned to national turnaround principles known to lead to successful improvement in low-achieving schools. The checklists outline specific deliverables that must be submitted as a means to ensure compliance and as a baseline for the FDOE and LEA monitoring of the school's initiatives throughout the year for the following areas:

- School Improvement Planning
- Leadership
- Educator Quality
- Professional Development
- Alignment and Pacing of Curriculum
- Florida's Continuous Improvement Model
- Monitoring Processes and Plans

In addition to the verification of improvements in the areas above, FDOE uses interim assessment data to establish a baseline for student achievement. LEAs/schools must submit their approved baseline data reflecting student achievement in reading, mathematics, science, and writing by October of each year. This baseline data serves as a checkpoint for schools in the review of their existing SIP and is used to:

- Compare the most recent performance to the needs previously identified in the SIP. The SIP can then be modified based upon the new data with additions and/or deletions of activities.
- Develop their Florida Continuous Improvement Model focus calendars and lessons based upon newly identified benchmark deficiencies.
- Modify intervention processes to ensure that it reflects the newly identified needs of the students.
- Provide a means to monitor the effectiveness of existing programs, strategies, and action steps when the mid-year assessment data is reported in January of each year.

Through this continual process of evaluating student achievement and growth over time, schools are better able to adapt to the changing needs of their students.

The timeline below will ensure that an LEA with one or more Focus/Correct schools will identify the specific needs of the schools and their students.

Proposed Timeline to Identify Needs of Focus/Correct Schools

June - July 2012	Regional Executive Directors meet with LEA superintendents to review LEA compliance with DA
September 2012	District Improvement and Assistance Plans due
October 2012	School Interim Baseline Data due
October 2012	School Improvement Plans submitted to FDOE
January 2013	School Mid-Year Data Reports due
February 2013	School Mid-Year Narrative Reports due comparing the overall performance by grade, content area, and subgroup to the baseline measure

The requirements and responsibilities for schools assigned to the Focus/Correct category are also adopted by the State Board of Education (Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code) and are described in Section 2.D.iii of this document. The interventions selected are based upon school transformation principles that have a proven track record of success that are both substantive and sustainable over time.

2.E.iv Provide the criteria the SEA will use to determine when a school that is making significant progress in improving student achievement and narrowing achievement gaps exits focus status and a justification for the criteria selected.

When a school reaches a school grade of “C” they will exit Focus/Correct status. In order to prevent schools from persisting in the Focus/Correct category, schools must exit within two years following the first year of classification as a Focus/Correct school. A third consecutive “D” grade requires implementation of the district-managed turnaround options which entails:

- Principal/Administrator replacement.
- Reconstitution of staff (at least 50% of staff must be replaced).
- Differentiated pay scale to recruit/retain highly qualified staff.
- Revised curriculum.
- Increased learning time to reflect at least 300 hours of additional instructional time for all students. This criterion could be met with 60% of the increased learning time supporting all students (extended day and/or year) and 40% being supported through traditional targeted services including before school, after school, weekend, and summer academies.
- Demonstration that the LEA has prioritized the school in its support initiatives through

allocation of additional funds and human capital.

The selection of Florida's school grading system as the key input for determining schools' DA status is based on several factors:

- Florida's "A" through "F" School Grades program provides understandable measures of school achievement for all stakeholders and drives incentive for improving student achievement.
- School grading has a history of success (spanning more than a decade) in improving critical areas of academic performance for Florida's student populations spanning elementary, middle, and high school levels of instruction.
- School grading is founded on measurable student achievement in core academic areas, including test results measuring student performance as well as student progress.
- Florida's high school grading system includes additional measures of achievement for evaluating on-time graduation, advanced curriculum participation and performance (including at least one measure for career readiness), and college readiness.
- Florida's School Grades system is based on the idea that raised expectations are a vital part of success in implementing accountability to improve opportunities for all of Florida's students, and that continuing to raise expectations and standards is essential for moving Florida where we want to be within the next five years, when the state will apply national common assessments to provide both national and international comparative measures for evaluating Florida students' progress and achievement.
- Our School Grades system works to most effectively identify successful schools, reward success, and enable improvement.
- Florida's School Grades system is designed to accommodate progressive improvements in its own structure over time.
- The ability of LEAs to implement some of the more difficult interventions has been undermined by the disconnect between AYP measures and the state's successful school grading system.

TABLE 2: REWARD, PRIORITY, AND FOCUS SCHOOLS

Provide the SEA's list of reward, priority, and focus schools using the Table 2 template. Use the key to indicate the criteria used to identify a school as a reward, priority, or focus school.

TABLE 2: REWARD, PRIORITY, AND FOCUS SCHOOLS

FDOE has provided a table (Attachment 9) identifying the Reward, Priority/Intervene, and Focus/Correct schools using a combination of School Grades data. As the state has two distinct timelines for the release of School Grades, the state used 2009-10 data to categorize high schools and 2010-11 data to categorize elementary and middle schools. See "Actual Data" below for summary.
FDOE has provided a count of schools, by school type, that would be classified as Priority/Intervene and Focus/Correct schools using actual 2010-11 School Grades as applied to the state's newly proposed FCAT 2.0 criterion below.
<i>Elementary = 193 Focus/Correct and 77 Priority/Intervene</i>
<i>Middle = 47 Focus/Correct and 7 Priority/Intervene</i>
<i>High School = 38 Focus/Correct and 12 Priority/Intervene</i>
<i>Combination School (excludes High Schools) = 21 Focus/Correct and 6 Priority/Intervene</i>
Total Focus/Correct = 299 which equates to 16% of Title I schools
Total Priority/Intervene = 112 which equates to 6% of Title I schools

Actual Data

Total # of Title I schools in the state: **1,853**

Total # of Title I-participating high schools in the state with graduation rates less than 60%: **26**

Total # of Reward Schools: 1,975 (901 are Title I)

Total # of Focus/Correct Schools: 174 (144 are Title I)

Total # of Priority/Intervene Schools: 35 (29 are Title I)

2.F PROVIDE INCENTIVES AND SUPPORTS FOR OTHER TITLE I SCHOOLS

- 2.F Describe how the SEA's differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system will provide incentives and supports to ensure continuous improvement in other Title I schools that, based on the SEA's new AMOs and other measures, are not making progress in improving student achievement and narrowing achievement gaps, and an explanation of how these incentives and supports are likely to improve student achievement and school performance, close achievement gaps, and increase the quality of instruction for students.

The enhanced DA program works to ensure that schools not meeting an acceptable level of student achievement are categorized in and supported by DA and, as a result, must comply with the requirements applicable to their category. Florida had 1,853 Title I schools in 2010-11. Application of the federal criteria defining Priority/Intervene and Focus/Correct schools would result in the identification of 35 Priority/Intervene schools (of which 29 are Title I schools) and 174 Focus/Correct schools (of which 144 are Title I schools).

If Florida's 2010-11 school grading data were recalculated using expected new cut scores for FCAT 2.0 assessments in reading and mathematics, the state would have 1,188 schools in three categories of Priority/Intervene, Focus/Correct, and Prevent (of which 966 are Title I schools, or 52% of total Title I schools) that would receive support through the DA program.

Proposed School Designations

Based Upon Expected New FCAT 2.0 Criteria Applied to 2010-11 School Performance Data

School Grade	Federal Category	DA Category	Projected Number	% of Title I Schools
F	Priority	Intervene	112 (106 Title I)	6% (106/1,853)
D	Focus	Correct	299 (270 Title I)	15% (270/1,853)
C		Prevent	777 (590 Title I)	32% (590/1,853)
A or increased school grade	Reward		1,848	

Florida also applied proposed DA criteria for Focus/Correct and Priority/Intervene schools to the most recent actual school grading outcomes for Florida's schools. These outcomes do not reflect the impact of Florida's new FCAT 2.0 standards in reading and mathematics, and therefore reflect numbers and percentages in the Focus/Correct and Priority/Intervene categories that are lower than corresponding numbers in the table above.

**Proposed School Designations
Based Upon Actual School Performance Data
2009-10 for High Schools and 2010-11 for Elementary and Middle Schools
(Does not Factor in the Impact of New Standards)**

School Grade	Federal Category	DA Category	Actual Number	% of Title I Schools
F	Priority	Intervene	35 (29 Title I)	2% (29/1,853)
D	Focus	Correct	174 (144 Title I)	8% (144/1,853)
C		Prevent	534 (446 Title I)	24% (446/1,853)
A or increased school grade	Reward		1,971	

2.G BUILD SEA, LEA, AND SCHOOL CAPACITY TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING

- 2.G Describe the SEA's process for building SEA, LEA, and school capacity to improve student learning in all schools and, in particular, in low-performing schools and schools with the largest achievement gaps, including through:
- i. timely and comprehensive monitoring of, and technical assistance for, LEA implementation of interventions in priority and focus schools;
 - ii. holding LEAs accountable for improving school and student performance, particularly for turning around their priority schools; and
 - iii. ensuring sufficient support for implementation of interventions in priority schools, focus schools, and other Title I schools identified under the SEA's differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system (including through leveraging funds the LEA was previously required to reserve under ESEA section 1116(b)(10), SIG funds, and other Federal funds, as permitted, along with State and local resources).
- Explain how this process is likely to succeed in improving SEA, LEA, and school capacity.

Florida has worked systematically to build capacity for LEAs and their schools to support student success. In the last several years, FDOE has also executed considerable restructuring and dedicated resources to improve the state's capacity to effectively support struggling schools. It is because the state has taken a systematic approach that reaches every LEA and school, coupled with additional supports and expertise for schools with gaps and additional needs, that these approaches and strategies are likely to succeed. Florida's data showing improvements are already being made is the evidence that ultimate success is likely.

Curriculum Standards

Building capacity at the local level began with the alignment and consistency of state-level policies that affect the ability of the LEAs to work more effectively and efficiently. Florida adopted rigorous content standards for students in all content areas K-12. Our Next Generation Sunshine State Standards have been reviewed and highly rated by national and international experts. More

recently, the state has also adopted the Common Core State Standards. Florida was one of the first states in the nation to implement a statewide assessment system, funded by state appropriations, built to assess the identified state curriculum standards teachers were required to teach. Prior to this, LEAs identified and purchased norm-referenced assessments as required by the state that were not built to assess student mastery of the state standards. The next step was aligning the requirements of LEA purchases of instructional materials to the adoption of new standards. Florida's statewide instructional materials schedule was revised so that state funding dedicated to instructional materials would match the year LEAs are required to implement new standards. Florida has implemented this process for both Next Generation Sunshine State Standards and Common Core State Standards. Finally, the State Board of Education approval of course descriptions that include the new Common Core State Standards are scheduled the year prior to the year teachers are required to teach from those course descriptions and a year prior to when students are assessed on those same standards. This alignment allows LEAs to utilize their funds and implement local instructional changes and provide professional development more efficiently.

Educator Quality

During the 2010-11 school year, the state spent considerable human and financial resources through Race to the Top and existing staff to assist LEAs in the redevelopment of instructional personnel and school administrator evaluation systems. This included a combination of face-to-face academies for technical assistance lead by national experts; adoption of a statewide student growth measure for use in teacher and principal evaluations; research-based resources in improving instructional practice; onsite visits to LEAs; and technical assistance through webinars, conference calls, and e-mail. The state will continue its technical assistance during the 2011-12 school year by monitoring LEA implementation of new evaluation systems to support accuracy and improvement of instructional practice through:

- Assistance to LEAs to evaluate the effectiveness of professional development activities and to focus on professional development that is grounded in research showing improved student learning.
- Assistance to LEAs to ensure individual professional development is based on data as a result of evaluation system (results/analysis of instructional practice and student learning growth).
- Monitoring and feedback to LEAs on their professional development systems and their alignment to the state's Professional Development Evaluation Protocol Standards.
- Statewide support to LEAs in building capacity for a common language of instruction that includes classroom-level learning goals and formative assessments based on Next Generation Sunshine State Standards and Common Core State Standards and Florida's Multi-tiered System of Support.

School Improvement via Race to the Top

Additionally, Florida's Race to the Top funding is being used to support initiatives to develop turnaround leaders (a principal pipeline), develop rural LEA capacity, recruit teachers to two of the state's largest LEAs with the greatest representation of persistently lowest-achieving schools, and provide targeted summer professional development.

Leadership Pipeline for Turnaround Principals and Assistant Principals

The purpose of this project is to select a leadership preparation program partner. It is designed to prepare aspiring school leaders to effectively address the teaching and learning challenges of chronically low-achieving high schools and their feeder patterns. The primary objective of this initiative is to create a pool of the most promising candidates that can turn around schools through an innovative, problem solving-based program of study. This objective will be achieved by working with seven LEAs to recruit and train a minimum of 80 to 100 new principals and assistant principals to serve in the state's persistently lowest-achieving schools and their feeder patterns. The eligible LEAs are Miami-Dade and Duval, both of which have nine or more persistently lowest-achieving schools and Alachua, Broward, Osceola, Orange, and Pinellas, each of which has at least three persistently lowest-achieving schools. Each of these LEAs will be notified of their proportionate number of slots and the LEA will then develop a selection process to identify the aspiring turnaround leaders who will participate in the training.

The program will emphasize knowledge and behaviors that enable school leaders to promote successful teaching and learning, collaborative decision-making strategies, distributed leadership practices, a culture of collegiality in analysis, and use of data and instructional technologies to guide school improvement activities. Lesson Study, teacher evaluation, and project management will also be addressed. Quarterly topical seminars; an intensive half-year internship in a low-achieving middle or high school; and mentoring by a trained, highly effective principal will be cornerstones of this program. Once an aspiring principal or assistant principal completes the initial preparation program, the LEA will consider him/her for leadership vacancies in low-performing schools. When a program participant is placed, the LEA will provide a well-designed, two-year program of induction and support that includes ongoing professional development based on assessed needs to strengthen the participant's performance, coaching by an external school improvement coach, mentoring by an expert principal, and an opportunity to participate in a new principal network in which principals share their school leadership experiences and explore solutions to common problems in struggling schools. This will be a two-and-a-half year initiative that will result in a stronger administrative pool for Florida's persistently lowest-achieving schools.

Recognizing the role that charter schools can play in operating a turnaround school, or opening a new school within the feeder pattern a chronically low-achieving school, a separate strand will be created to provide leadership training for 20-25 current or aspiring charter school leaders in the seven LEAs. The charter school strand will emphasize knowledge and behaviors that enable school leaders to promote successful teaching and learning, collaborative decision-making strategies, distributed leadership practices, a culture of collegiality in analysis and use of data and instructional technologies to guide school improvement activities. In addition, the strand will focus on the effective use of the flexibility and autonomy provided to charter schools.

It is anticipated that this \$7,000,000 contract will be awarded in December 2011 in order for the selection process and training to begin in January 2012.

Building Rural LEA-level Capacity for Turnaround

This is a state-led initiative to partner with an outside provider to help build LEA leaders' capacity to support low-achieving schools in 10 rural LEAs in Florida. Eligible LEAs include Bradford,

Columbia, Franklin, Gadsden, Levy, Flagler, Hendry, Jefferson, Washington, and Madison.

The partner will adapt and deliver leadership modules and coaching targeted at improving the capacities of the superintendent, school board, principals, and LEA senior staff in rural LEAs with persistently lowest-achieving schools. LEAs will be guided in establishing strategic plans and evaluation systems specifically designed to improve low-achieving schools in rural LEAs. LEAs will also receive training in community involvement and in developing a shared vision for improving schools. The partner will design and deliver off-site, big picture, vision- and capacity-building training activities that serve as guideposts for improvement. Onsite training and coaching activities will support the sessions to ensure implementation of the training. Specific training for board members and superintendents will include scenarios that stimulate board issues, participation in small group discussions, and training on the context and history of education policy through a series of workshops. The modules will be organized around four themes: governance, politics, whole-system change, and theories of action for change.

This \$1,500,000 contract will fund a one-and-a-half year initiative. It is anticipated that the contract will be awarded in December 2011 and selection of candidates and training will begin in January 2012.

Recruiting Promising Teachers in Miami-Dade and Duval LEAs

The purpose of this discretionary grant award is to allow Miami-Dade and Duval LEAs to partner with a contractor(s) that will recruit and train promising teachers to work in their persistently lowest-achieving schools and their feeder patterns. The LEA shall partner with a contractor(s) with a proven track record for improving student achievement through innovative recruitment and training strategies. Several organizations provide highly specialized training to recent college graduates who do not have an education degree but are highly motivated, multi-talented, and wish to provide instruction in low-achieving schools. Recruiting such potentially promising teachers has been effective in raising student achievement in hard-to-staff schools, where they outperform traditionally prepared teachers. These teachers offer high expectations for student learning and a commitment to serving high-poverty neighborhoods.

The LEAs will leverage the experience of these teacher organizations and place recruits in schools and feeder patterns that comprise the persistently lowest-achieving schools list. The LEAs will rely upon the talent, track record, and capacity of these national organizations to bring a minimum of 504 high-quality teachers to Miami-Dade County School District and a minimum of 296 high-quality teachers to Duval County School District.

It is anticipated that this \$9,000,000 grant will be awarded to the LEAs in early November 2011. Miami Dade LEA will receive \$5,670,000 and Duval LEA will receive \$3,330,000, over a three-year period.

Summer Differentiated Accountability Academies

Considering the need to raise student achievement in Florida's persistently lowest-achieving schools, it is clear that reform efforts must focus on improving instructional leadership and

teacher quality. Regional teams have identified, through Instructional Reviews at the majority of the state's persistently lowest-achieving schools, the following areas that require technical support:

- *Quality of Instruction* – The creation and delivery of quality lesson plans to incorporate explicit instruction, higher order questioning, and grade level rigor.
- *Lesson Study* – The continual improvement of teaching through the analysis, discussion, and peer observation of the lesson planning and instructional delivery process. Teams of teachers within a department or grade level work together to refine their lesson plans and perfect the delivery of instruction.
- *Common Core State Standards and Next Generation Sunshine State Standards* – Transitioning teachers to these standards to ensure explicit teaching of the standards and benchmarks.
- *Problem Solving and Response to Instruction/Intervention (PS/RtI)* – Providing instruction and interventions using a systematic problem-solving process to maximize student achievement.
- *Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM)* – The knowledge and skills to understand how to analyze formative and interim assessments to identify students' academic needs, map curriculum to focus instruction, and modify delivery to ensure improved student learning.

At the summer DA academy, regional teams will provide professional development modules designed for principals, assistant principals, instructional coaches, department chairs, and lead teachers from the state's persistently lowest-achieving schools and their feeder patterns in the areas of Lesson Study, Common Core State Standards and Next Generation Sunshine State Standards, PS/RtI, and the FCIM over a four-year period in the summer. The summer DA Academy will provide a statewide approach to professional development that is designed to enhance instructional leadership and teacher effectiveness, improve instructional delivery, and increase student achievement. Regional teams are charged with ensuring that the components of the training are implemented with fidelity and effectiveness throughout the school year.

Regional Support for Building School and LEA Capacity

For low-performing schools the state's DA program works to support LEA and school capacity development. In order to build sustainable capacity within schools and LEAs, Florida created the DA regional system of support. There are five regional teams throughout the state with each consisting of a Regional Executive Director, Instructional Specialists (reading, mathematics, science, RtI, CTE, and using data), and STEM and reading coordinators. The regional teams provide LEAs and schools with change agents who possess a proven record of increasing student achievement in low-performing schools.

Regional teams provide onsite and LEA-wide professional development; offer expertise to superintendents, LEA teams, principals, and instructional coaches; monitor compliance in accordance with DA requirements; and monitor the academic progress of schools and LEAs through consistent follow-up visits to schools and through the analysis of assessment results. Each regional team is led by a Regional Executive Director, who drives turnaround efforts in the lowest-achieving schools and focuses on building the capacity of principals and LEA leadership teams in the turnaround process. The Regional Executive Director is required to have an accomplished record of turning around similar schools. Each Regional Executive Director reports to the FDOE's Deputy Chancellor for School Improvement and Student Achievement, who is

based in Tallahassee. The regional team staff members are FDOE employees, not outside consultants.

Similar to the Regional Executive Director, all specialists have a strong record of improving student achievement in turnaround situations. Whereas the work of the Regional Executive Directors focuses on building leadership capacity for turnaround, the specialists and coordinators focus on building the capacity of instructional coaches and teachers through LEA and school-wide professional development on using data to determine instructional interventions, using the new standards in mathematics and science, modeling effective instruction in the classroom, and Lesson Study implementation. Also similar to the DA Regional Executive Director, specialists and coordinators are required to significantly raise student achievement at their assigned lowest-performing schools or they are replaced.

The regional teams work directly with the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs in the areas of curriculum and instruction, LEA and school instructional leadership, school improvement planning, professional development, teacher quality, data analysis, and developing robust monitoring systems at the school and LEA level. An Instructional Review takes place at schools receiving direct support. The reviews are led by the regional teams but are conducted in collaboration with LEA and school leadership teams. At the conclusion of the Instructional Review, an action plan is crafted that outlines what steps need to be taken to improve the school. Action steps, timelines, and the persons responsible for each item are documented.

The ownership of the action steps is shared by the regional team, LEA, and school. Throughout the year, the Regional Executive Director monitors the implementation of the action steps and reports to the State Board of Education on the school's progress. Regional teams work specifically with a high-level LEA administrator who is in charge of the turnaround and school improvement process at the LEA. Monthly meetings are conducted at the LEA level to ensure that action steps are implemented and coordination occurs throughout the LEA to support the lowest-achieving schools.

The regional teams also work directly with schools and LEAs in the areas of curriculum and instruction, school leadership, school improvement planning, professional development, teacher quality, and data analysis with an emphasis on creating strong systems and practices to ensure sustainability. In order to build capacity the DA regional teams have an established framework that guides their work. The first steps include data analysis and development of the School Improvement Plan (SIP) and District Improvement Assistance Plan (DIAP). The regional teams work within these plans to ensure their alignment and focus. As the school and LEA begin to respond and develop their own systems the regional team's tiered support matrix serves as a means to gradually release responsibility back to the LEA and school once they have demonstrated sufficient capacity.

Initial LEA and School Site Visits

Initial site visits focus on developing rapport with LEA and school personnel and include a discussion of DA; the Strategies and Support document; and state, LEA, and school requirements. Trend data and plans for improvement are also discussed. The meetings are held at the LEA office or school sites, and participants include the regional team, superintendents, Title I

directors, school improvement directors, human resources directors, finance officers, principals, and any other LEA and school personnel with direct responsibility for ensuring implementation and compliance with DA.

The Regional Executive Director and/or Instructional Specialists meet with these local staff in order to:

- Complete the DA checklist and review the Instructional Review Action Plan.
- Review the Self-Assessment of Problem-Solving Implementation form and process.
- Review Tier I and II Critical Components Checklist and Observation tools and processes.
- Conduct observations of school Problem-Solving/Response to Intervention team meeting using Critical Components Checklist and Observation tools.
- Identify the systems in place to build the instructional capacity of teachers and the schools' immediate professional development needs.
- Identify the degree of alignment in instructional programs and instructional materials with particular emphasis on interventions for level 1 and level 2 students and subgroups.

Instructional Reviews

Once initial LEA and school site visits are complete, regional teams begin to implement instructional support by conducting an Instructional Review. These reviews are not evaluations of teacher performance; rather, they provide the opportunity to review instructional practices and develop action plans for improvement. Instructional Reviews occur via classroom walkthroughs performed over the course of a school day(s).

The following are expected observations during Instructional Reviews:

- Classroom Environment
 - Classrooms are consistently used as a resource to promote learning.
 - Classrooms contain literacy-rich, instructional-based visual aids and resources (e.g., interactive word walls, content posters, process posters, and project displays).
 - Classrooms display exemplar student work to establish quality control expectations for various types of student work (e.g., note-taking, homework, and quiz/tests).
 - Students are on-task, classroom activities are orderly, transitions between activities are smooth, and instruction is bell-to-bell.
 - Standards for acceptable student behavior and classroom procedures are established and maintained.
- Instructional Materials
 - Content materials are available in a variety of formats, are research-based, and are aligned with the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards.
 - Adequate content technologies that support student learning are available in the classroom and are easily accessible by all students.
 - Culturally and developmentally appropriate materials are utilized to support student learning.
 - Supplemental materials offer further breadth and depth to lessons.
 - Various learning styles are represented by resource materials (e.g., audio, visual, and motor).

- Supports and accommodations as identified in students' Individual Educational Plans.
- Course materials relate to students' lives and highlight ways learning can be applied in real-life situations.
- Materials are organized and readily available for teachers to use.
- Higher Order Questioning and Thinking
 - Students understand the purpose of a lesson or a lab and are able to explain what they are learning and how it relates to real world and/or current events relevant to students' gender, ethnicity, age, culture, etc.
 - Teachers model higher order thinking skills when presenting information and answering questions.
 - Scaffolding, pacing, prompting, and probing techniques are used when asking questions.
 - Teachers use adequate “wait time” between asking questions and eliciting student responses.
 - Students are engaged in “accountable talk” to show, tell, explain, and prove reasoning during modeled instruction and guided practice.
 - Questioning strategies are designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking.
 - Questioning techniques require students to compare, classify, analyze different perspectives, induce, investigate, problem solve, inquire, research, and to make decisions.
 - Teachers use inquiry methods to promote conceptual change and a deeper understanding of the content.
- Student Engagement
 - Students are effectively engaged in instruction through hands-on activities that include the use of technology.
 - Students are comfortable taking part in peer-to-peer interaction while working in small groups.
 - Teachers incorporate collaborative structures during guided practice.
 - Students take part in cooperative projects where each student's knowledge is needed by others in the group to complete the assignments.
- Differentiated Instruction
 - Teachers analyze data to design instruction that addresses the various needs, interests, learning styles, and abilities of individual students.
 - Teachers select strategies, materials, and technologies to address students' multiple learning styles and cultural experiences and to stimulate individual students' intellectual interests.
 - Students are effectively engaged in varied small group activities based on individual student needs while being monitored by the teacher.
 - Teachers assign tiered activities (i.e., a series of related tasks of varying complexity) as alternative ways of meeting the same benchmark taking into account individual student needs.
 - School administrators and teachers target interventions for individual students in subgroups based upon data analysis.
- Data Analysis

- Ongoing informal and formal assessments are used to monitor individual student progress, including progress toward mastery of the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards and to make instructional changes, if needed.
- Teachers incorporate Checks for Understanding throughout a lesson to ensure students are obtaining the knowledge and skills to answer the Essential Question by the end of class.
- Teachers use formative assessments to determine whole class and small group instruction.
- Teachers use summative assessments to evaluate what students have mastered.
- Students are provided with specific expectations as to how class tasks/assignments are to be completed, when they are to be finished, the form in which they are to be presented, and the quality of the final product.
- Teachers hold students accountable for and give appropriate feedback on class work and homework.
- Teachers maintain observational and anecdotal records in the course of monitoring students' development.
- Teachers employ performance-based assessments that require students to demonstrate skills and competencies that realistically represent problems and situations likely to be encountered in daily life, then judge the quality of the student's work based on an agreed-upon set of criteria.
- Portfolios are used as an ongoing measure of student progress and can include student work, reports, reflections, self-assessments, and even peer-teacher assessments.
- Diagnostic assessments are used for students not demonstrating progress in core content instruction.
- Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) calendars, mini-lessons, and mini-assessments are developed within professional learning communities (PLCs), and are delivered by all teachers.
- FCIM mini-assessment data is analyzed during PLCs and used to identify students reaching mastery and those not reaching mastery on FCIM lessons.
- Students are provided tutorial and enrichment opportunities based on FCIM assessment results.
- FCIM maintenance strategies are developed within PLCs and are a part of daily instruction.
- School leadership monitors the fidelity and evaluates the effectiveness of the FCIM process through regular meetings with grade levels and/or the department teams.
- Reading and Writing Across the Curriculum
 - Teachers are knowledgeable about research-based, appropriate reading and writing instructional strategies and incorporate them into their lessons.
 - Teachers incorporate vocabulary acquisition strategies (e.g., picture notes, word mapping, interactive word walls, and context clues) into their lessons before, during, and after reading content materials to support the learning of vocabulary.
 - Teachers provide examples of vocabulary use in text and through rich classroom discussions (e.g., word origins and their meanings, decontextualizing words, high frequency words across multiple domains, multi-faceted meanings, and shades of meaning).

- Teachers use non-fiction reading materials that support student learning and ensure these materials are readily available and easily accessible by all students.
- Teachers incorporate FCAT short response and extended response items in lessons, homework, and assessment.
- School and LEA Leadership and Coaching
 - LEA trains staff on performance appraisal instruments and the performance appraisal process is implemented with fidelity by school administration.
 - Members of the school and LEA leadership teams participate in a comprehensive instructional monitoring process that collects observational data on the fidelity of programs, policies, and procedures in the classroom.
 - Members of the school and LEA leadership serve as instructional leaders by providing teachers with guidance and modeling designed to improve instruction while adhering to all steps of the coaching cycle.
 - School and LEA leadership ensure all instructional staff members have access to curriculum-related materials and the training necessary to increase student attainment of the New Generation Sunshine State Standards.
 - School and LEA leadership plan and allocate resources, monitor progress, provide the organizational infrastructure, and remove barriers in order to sustain continuous school improvement.
 - School and LEA leadership monitor fidelity of implementation of the School Improvement Plan.
 - School Advisory Council receives quarterly updates on the implementation of the School Improvement Plans and makes necessary updates.
 - School leadership establishes a system for shared leadership to formalize roles and responsibilities for the instructional coach, department head, grade level lead teacher, etc.

Problem Solving/Response to Intervention (PS/RtI) Implementation Reviews

- Problem Identification activities:
 - Data are used to determine the effectiveness of core instruction.
 - Decisions are made to modify core instruction or to develop supplemental (Tier II) interventions.
 - Universal screening (e.g., DIBELS) or other data sources (e.g., LEA-wide assessments) are used to identify groups of students in need of supplemental intervention.
- Problem Analysis activities:
 - The school-based team generates hypotheses to identify potential reasons for students not meeting benchmarks.
 - Data are used to determine viable or active hypotheses for why students are not attaining benchmarks.
- Intervention Design and Implementation activities:
 - Tier I: Modifications are made to core instruction.
 - A plan for implementation of modifications to core instruction is documented.
 - Support for implementation of modifications to core instruction is documented.

- Documentation of implementation of modifications to core instruction is provided.
- Tier II: Supplemental instruction is developed or modified.
 - A plan for implementation of supplemental instruction is documented.
 - Support for implementation of supplemental instruction is documented.
 - Documentation of implementation of supplemental instruction is provided.
- Program Evaluation of RtI activities:
 - Criteria for positive RtI are defined.
 - Progress monitoring and/or universal screening data are collected/scheduled.
 - A decision regarding student RtI is documented.
 - A plan for continuing, modifying, or terminating the intervention plan is provided.

After classroom visits are completed and PS/RtI team processes are observed and reviewed, the School Improvement Plan is reviewed to ensure that it adequately addresses the needs of the school. The completed report includes the commendations and concerns and identifies specific action steps to remediate the concerns, as well as the person responsible for executing and monitoring implementation of the action steps that are to be included in the final School Improvement Plan (SIP). A SIP Action Plan (Attachment 13) for reading, mathematics, science, and PS/RtI are completed for each school. Prior to completion of the SIP Action Plan, there is communication between regional team members and appropriate LEA and school personnel. SIP Action Plans are then sent to the superintendent, LEA administrators, and the school principal. These documents remain flexible allowing for regular revision as activities are completed and/or new concerns are identified.

Action Plan Calendar and Visitation Schedule

After the SIP Action Plans are finalized, the regional teams meet with the school leadership team to develop a calendar to implement and monitor the SIP Action Plan steps. SIP Action Plan calendars target school-wide and content-specific strategies to be implemented in an agreed upon timeframe. This strategic planning provides a systematic approach to implement the SIP Action Plan while building school capacity for ongoing school improvement.

Based upon the SIP Action Plan calendar timeframes, the regional team and the school leadership team create a visitation schedule to provide professional development training and/or technical support and assistance as necessary to implement strategies. For example, the regional teams and the school leadership team reconvene every four weeks to adjust the SIP Action Plan calendar as necessary and review RtI data since RtI teams collect data in two-week intervals to measure the effectiveness implemented strategies. Additionally, the Regional Executive Director assigns content area specialists based upon each school's needs.

While the framework to support overall capacity is embedded within the comprehensive school and LEA improvement planning process the DA teams also rely on providing ongoing professional development for both school and LEA staff through side-by-side coaching, modeling, PS/RtI, data analysis, and summer professional development cadres. Additionally, the regional teams are supported by the FDOE resulting in a common vision and voice for all initiatives. The state's DA process took the first steps toward transitioning from compliance monitoring to implementation support, effectively transitioning from a theoretical process to

practical application.

Approval of External Providers for School Turnaround

DA regional teams, in collaboration with LEAs/schools, conduct rigorous program reviews prior to partnering with additional external providers. The process begins with the data analysis and review of existing programs and or processes. The PS/RtI process is instrumental in evaluating existing programs. The process involves reviewing the need, implementation, and fidelity in which a program was used. If it is deemed that a new program is needed the regional teams work to ensure that new program(s) is/are research-based and that the LEA and school have a comprehensive plan for implementation, monitoring, and annual evaluation. The regional teams do not endorse programs nor are they involved in the identification of possible programs, but are instrumental in ensuring that programs being considered align with state initiatives and incorporate sound instructional pedagogy.

The state has clearly defined criteria that LEAs must use as they recruit external partnerships with either charter operators or management companies for school turnaround. Through the existing Intervene Option Plan timeline LEAs submit specific deliverables that detail the organizations they are engaging for possible contract. Through this process the LEA and partner submit evidence of successful turnaround in similar schools and a sample contract to ensure autonomy. The FDOE defines these partners as an outside entity that:

- Operates a school or cluster of schools.
- Has experience achieving results with high-poverty student populations and working in a school turnaround environment.

In order to ensure that the partner is provided with the resources and flexibility to facilitate change the FDOE requires that each partner:

- Sign a three- to five-year performance contract for student achievement with an LEA with an annual performance review based upon clearly defined learning goals. The LEA will hold the partner accountable as outlined in the approved contract.
- Work with unionized teaching staff under modified contracts, be held accountable for student performance, operate under some but not all LEA procedures and regulations, and use some but not all LEA central office services.
- Demonstrate scalability to ramp up capacity quickly, modify an existing school model to meet the needs of a turnaround environment, and open new operations in or expand existing operations.
- Design a comprehensive school model including instructional programs and socioeconomic supports, and transform the existing culture to create a positive learning environment.
- Execute a full community engagement plan.
- Work collaboratively with LEA central office staff.
- Education Management Organizations/Lead Partners not be exempt from existing statute(s).
- Have the authority to hire a new principal/administrative team or approve the current one.
- Support the principal in hiring and replacing teachers and have responsibility for bringing

in a meaningful cohort of new instructional staff.

- Provide core academic and student support services directly or by aligning the services of other program and support partners and build internal capacity with the schools.
- To ensure success the group must clearly demonstrate that they have established an embedded, consistent, and intense relationship within each school.
- Provides instructional and operational support directly to school.
- Discuss progress and barriers with the principal on a regular basis.
- Ensure that appropriate services are procured from LEA offices.
- Manage key program functions:
 - Human Capital
 - Curriculum and Instruction
 - Policy/legal
 - Administration and finances
 - Community advocacy
 - Socio-emotional support service and partnerships
 - Data analysis and evaluation

Ensuring Sufficient Support and Leveraging of Federal Dollars

Florida's DA process clearly outlines the means to monitor and support meaningful research-based turnaround principles. The DA processes have been substantiated throughout this application with a focus on data analysis, program evaluation, longitudinal planning, resource allocation, human capital, and ongoing progress monitoring. Through the DA Strategies and Support document the state has clearly defined the responsibilities of the FDOE, school, and LEA that are aligned to research-based turnaround principles. It is important to note that since 2008 the DA processes have reflected the highly effective turnaround principles currently outlined in the School Improvement Grant (SIG) and Race to the Top. The state has been able to leverage new federal funds including SIG and Race to the Top to enhance existing structures for regional support and LEA/school activities. Examples of successful turnaround principles include:

- Common planning time
- Extended learning day
- Recruitment/retention bonuses
- Performance pay for instructional staff and administrators
- Differentiated pay for employees at persistently lowest-achieving schools
- Job-embedded professional development

The regional teams were able to leverage SIG dollars as each Regional Executive Director was responsible for working with schools in the development and approval of their SIG applications. The Regional Executive Director is instrumental in evaluating the LEA's capacity, program activities, budget allocation; and developing annual goals. Throughout the year, the Regional Executive Director incorporates the components of the SIG into their monthly monitoring meetings to ensure that the school/LEA is implementing the specified activities. The Regional Executive Director reviews the expenditures following the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act quarterly submissions to ensure that expenditures match the program activities. Significant deficiencies or overages trigger the Regional Executive Director to meet with the LEA to review

the application activities and, if needed, require the LEA to submit a timeline for corrective action. At the end of each year the Regional Executive Director meets with the school and LEA staff to evaluate the school's progress toward their established annual goals. If the school meets 80% of their goals the grant will be renewed. Failure to meet the approved goals requires the selection of a different improvement plan option. The Commissioner of Education reserves the right to require that LEAs with more than nine schools in both Priority/Intervene and/or Focus/Correct categories submit a funding plan that describes how the LEA will prioritize its schools and how each federal funding source supports the schools' overall improvement. The state also uses reverted SIG funds, due to school closure or unspent allocation, to provide additional competitive grants to existing SIG schools to promote additional reform initiatives.

At the state level, Race to the Top funds resulted in additions to the existing regional support teams. The Race to the Top funding provided for 40 reading coordinators, nine data coaches, five Career and Technical Education specialists, and 20 STEM specialists to better align the state's initiatives and ensure project outcomes.

Schools in DA are held accountable and monitored through a combination of plans/tools including:

- School Improvement Plan
- District Improvement Assistance Plan
- Analyses of baseline and mid-year assessments data in the areas of reading, writing, mathematics, and science
- DA Strategies and Support Document
- District Compliance Checklist
- School Compliance Checklist
- Instructional Review Action Plan
- School Improvement Grant Monitoring
- Intervene Option Plan Submission (Intervene Schools Only)

These plans act in unison to structure each reform initiative and serve as a means to monitor their progress toward meeting their designated activities.

LEAs failing to improve school and student performance must implement a series of rigorous requirements, including:

- Strengthening the school's instructional program based on student needs and ensuring that the instructional program is research-based, rigorous, and aligned with state academic content standards.
- Using data to inform instruction and for continuous improvement, including providing time for collaboration on the use of data.
- Establishing a school environment that improves school safety and discipline and addresses other non-academic factors that impact student achievement, such as students' social, emotional, and health needs; and providing ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.
- Providing the principal with operational flexibility in the areas of scheduling, staff, curriculum, and budget.

- Providing job-embedded, ongoing professional development informed by teacher evaluation and support systems and tied to teacher and student needs.
- Redesigning the school day, week, or year to include additional time for student learning and teacher collaboration.
- Reviewing the quality of all staff and retaining only those who are determined to be effective and have the ability to be successful in the turnaround effort.
- Preventing ineffective teachers from transferring to these schools.
- Reviewing the performance of the current principal.
- Replacing the principal if necessary to ensure strong and effective leadership, or demonstrating to the SEA that the current principal has a track record in improving achievement and has the ability to lead the turnaround effort.

For all LEAs and schools, non-compliance with any of the required interventions and supports may lead to:

- State Board of Education intervention in operations
- State funds withheld
- Report of non-compliance to the State Legislature with recommended legislative action
- Conditions placed on Title I or Title II grant awards
- Redirection of Title II, Part A funds
- Movement to a more severe category

Historically, the DA program has yielded significant improvement. In 2009-10 there were 52 schools receiving assistance through DA. As Table 1 below indicates, 48% of schools improved one or more letter grades. In 2010-11, there were 118 schools receiving such assistance. As Table 2 below indicates, 42% of these schools improved one or more letter grades. Additionally, the state tracks the impact that the DA program has had on schools regarding their AYP improvements. In 2009-10, as indicated by Table 3, below 60% of the schools demonstrated improvement in their overall AYP performance. Finally, Table 4 shows that in 2010-11, 36% of the targeted schools demonstrated improvement in their overall AYP performance.

Table 1: Changes in School Grade Performance 2009-10

School Type	Improved Grade	Remained Unchanged	Declined
Elementary/ Middle	9	5	4
High School (FCAT component scores only)	12	10	7
Combination	4	1	0

Table 2: Changes in School Grade Performance 2010-11

School Type	Improved Grade	Remained Unchanged	Declined	I/No Score
Elementary/ Middle	38	16	2	2
High School (FCAT component scores only)	5	30	8	1
Combination	6	7	0	3

Note: The high school grading criteria changed to include end-of-course assessments, elimination of FCAT mathematics in ninth grade, and increased standards in writing.

Table 3: Changes in School AYP Performance 2009-10

School Type	Improved AYP More than 5 Percentage Points	Improved by 5 Percentage Points or Less or Remained Unchanged	AYP Declined
Elementary/Middle	7	5	6
High School	21	7	1
Combination	3	1	1

Table 4: Changes in School AYP Performance 2010-11

School Type	Improved AYP More than 5 Percentage Points	Improved by 5 Percentage Points or Less or Remained Unchanged	AYP Declined
Elementary/Middle	28	18	10
High School	9	14	20
Combination	5	10	1

Principle 2 Conclusion

Florida has, over the past decade, developed and implemented a series of unprecedented reform efforts that include a state-based system of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support. State legislators have consistently supported these efforts as demonstrated by the annual allocation of approximately \$120 million to high-performing schools and schools that have significantly improved. These support and accountability systems will provide the needed levels of assistance and rewards as well as help schools meet ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) for all students. The four proposed AMOs will capture the needed objectives and establish local and state targets of achievement and growth needed for all students. These ever-rising targets will ultimately place Florida as a top-performing state in the nation and world. We see this effort not as a retreat from accountability, but an opportunity to strengthen accountability and support and put in place the right conditions for schools and teachers to do their jobs most effectively.

PRINCIPLE 3: SUPPORTING EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTION AND LEADERSHIP

3.A DEVELOP AND ADOPT GUIDELINES FOR LOCAL TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL EVALUATION AND SUPPORT SYSTEMS

Select the option that pertains to the SEA and provide the corresponding description and evidence, as appropriate, for the option selected.

Option A	Option B	Option C
<input type="checkbox"/> If the SEA has not already developed any guidelines consistent with Principle 3, provide: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. the SEA's plan to develop and adopt guidelines for local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems by the end of the 2011–2012 school year; ii. a description of the process the SEA will use to involve teachers and principals in the development of these guidelines; and iii. an assurance that the SEA will submit to the Department a copy of the guidelines that it will adopt by the end of the 2011–2012 school year (see Assurance 	<input type="checkbox"/> If the SEA has already developed and adopted one or more, but not all, guidelines consistent with Principle 3, provide: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. a copy of any guidelines the SEA has adopted (Attachment 10) and an explanation of how these guidelines are likely to lead to the development of evaluation and support systems that improve student achievement and the quality of instruction for students; ii. evidence of the adoption of the guidelines (Attachment 11); iii. the SEA's plan to develop and adopt the remaining guidelines for local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems by the end of the 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If the SEA has developed and adopted all of the guidelines consistent with Principle 3, provide: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. a copy of the guidelines the SEA has adopted (Attachment 10) and an explanation of how these guidelines are likely to lead to the development of evaluation and support systems that improve student achievement and the quality of instruction for students; ii. evidence of the adoption of the guidelines (Attachment 11); and iii. a description of the

14).	<p>2011–2012 school year;</p> <p>iv. a description of the process used to involve teachers and principals in the development of the adopted guidelines and the process to continue their involvement in developing any remaining guidelines; and</p> <p>v. an assurance that the SEA will submit to the Department a copy of the remaining guidelines that it will adopt by the end of the 2011–2012 school year (see Assurance 14).</p>	process the SEA used to involve teachers and principals in the development of these guidelines.
------	--	---

Florida’s Implementation of Teacher and Principal Evaluation Systems is Designed to Increase Instructional Quality and Improve Student Success

Florida’s Theory of Action, exemplified in its Race to the Top application and in reforms further codified by the Student Success Act (Attachment 10a), is that a strategic and sustained investment in improving teacher and principal effectiveness will result in increased achievement for all students. The implementation design:

- Begins with adopting clear expectations for effective instruction and leadership.
- Establishes and revises the evaluation system to be the vehicle for the standards and the engine for instructional improvement in schools.
- Coordinates a common language of instruction that includes specific strategies based on state-adopted student standards, the Multi-tiered System of Support, and formative assessment data.
- Engages educators in individual professional development based on data from the evaluation system.
- Aligns remaining human capital process to evaluation results so that the entire system supports the actions and results desired in classrooms and schools.
- Weights student growth as 50% of the evaluation and differentiates educators’ effectiveness with four performance categories.

Crosswalk of ESEA Flexibility Requirements and Florida’s Adopted Guidelines

The two primary source documents representing guidelines for local teacher and principal evaluation systems are Section 1012.34, Florida Statutes, *Personnel evaluation procedures and criteria*, and Florida’s Race to the Top Phase II Participating LEA Memorandum of Understanding (MOU, Attachment 10b). In addition, the primary technical assistance document provided to LEAs for implementation is the Review and Approval Checklist for Race to the Top Teacher/Principal Evaluation Systems. The Checklists combine the requirements of the law and the MOU and specify the documentation expected from LEAs to determine compliance with

both. The Checklists were used both for technical assistance and review purposes, so that there was a consistent message about what a successful LEA submission would be. Two governing rules are also in effect that assist LEAs with implementation: Rule 6A-5.065, Florida Administrative Code, *The Educator Accomplished Practices* (Attachment 10c), and Rule 6A-5.080, Florida Administrative Code, *Florida Principal Leadership Standards* (Attachment 10d).

The chart below includes the text and associated references for the modifications to Section 1012.34, Florida Statutes, and Florida's Race to the Top Phase II Participating LEA MOU with those required for evaluation systems under the ESEA flexibility requirements. Attachment 10e shows the Review and Approval Checklist for Race to the Top Teacher Evaluation Systems modified with tags for each requirement under this application.

ESEA Requirement for Evaluation Systems	Corresponding Language from Florida's Guidelines	Guideline Reference
(a) Will be used for continual improvement of instruction	<p style="text-align: center;">Florida law and rule supports improved instructional practice.</p> <p>(1)(a) For the purpose of increasing student learning growth by improving the quality of instructional, administrative, and supervisory services in the public schools of the state, the district school superintendent shall establish procedures for evaluating the performance of duties and responsibilities of all instructional, administrative, and supervisory personnel employed by the school district.</p> <p>(2) The evaluation systems for instructional personnel and school administrators must:</p> <p>(a) Be designed to support effective instruction and student learning growth, and performance evaluation results must be used when developing district and school level improvement plans.</p> <p>(b) Provide appropriate instruments, procedures, and criteria for continuous quality improvement of the professional skills of instructional personnel and school administrators,</p> <p>(h) Include a process for monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of the system itself in improving instruction and student learning.</p> <p>(3)(a) The performance evaluation must be based upon sound educational principles and contemporary research in effective educational practices.</p> <p>The Florida Educator Accomplished Practices</p>	<p>S. 1012.34(1)(a), F.S.</p> <p>S. 1012.34(2)(a), (b) and (h), F.S.</p> <p>S. 1012.34(3)(a), F.S.</p> <p>Rule 6A-5.065, F.A.C.</p>

<p>(b) Meaningfully differentiate performance using at least three performance levels</p>	<p>Florida law requires 50% of evaluation results to be based on student growth, and differentiates four evaluation performance levels. The State Board of Education must adopt rules to ensure clear and sufficient differentiation between these levels.</p> <p>The evaluation systems for instructional personnel and school administrators must:</p> <p>(e) Differentiate among four levels of performance as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Highly effective. 2. Effective. 3. Needs improvement or, for instructional personnel in the first 3 years of employment who need improvement, developing. 4. Unsatisfactory 	<p>S. 1012.34(2)(e), F.S.</p>
<p>(c) Use multiple valid measures in determining performance levels</p> <p>...including as a significant factor data on student growth for all students (including English Learners and students with</p>	<p>Florida law requires valid, multiple measures: value-added growth for all students on statewide assessments (50%) and other measures of professional practice (50%). For non-statewide assessments, the state will provide guidance on growth models and review LEAs' methodologies as they update their systems. The law also requires the State Board of Education to adopt rules establishing 1) a student learning growth standard that, if not met, will result in the employee receiving an unsatisfactory performance evaluation rating and 2) a student learning growth standard that must be met in order for an employee to receive a highly effective rating or an effective rating. The state has adopted rigorous standards for instructional practice and instructional leadership as the basis for evaluation systems.</p> <p>(2) The evaluation systems for instructional personnel and school administrators must:</p> <p>(c) Include a mechanism to examine performance data from multiple sources, including opportunities for parents to provide input into employee performance evaluations when appropriate.</p> <p>(3)(a) The evaluation criteria must include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Performance of students.—At least 50 percent of a performance evaluation must be based upon data and indicators of student learning growth assessed annually by statewide assessments 	<p>S. 1012.34(2)(c), F.S.</p> <p>S. 1012.34(3)(a)1., F.S.</p>

<p>disabilities)</p>	<p>or, for subjects and grade levels not measured by statewide assessments, by school district assessments as provided in s. 1008.22(8). Each school district must use the formula adopted pursuant to paragraph (7)(a) for measuring student learning growth in all courses associated with statewide assessments and must select an equally appropriate formula for measuring student learning growth for all other grades and subjects</p> <p>a. For classroom teachers, the student learning growth portion of the evaluation must include growth data for students assigned to the teacher over the course of at least 3 years. If less than 3 years of data are available, the years for which data are available must be used and the percentage of the evaluation based upon student learning growth may be reduced to not less than 40 percent.</p> <p>c. For school administrators, the student learning growth portion of the evaluation must include growth data for students assigned to the school over the course of at least 3 years. If less than 3 years of data are available, the years for which data are available must be used and the percentage of the evaluation based upon student learning growth may be reduced to not less than 40 percent.</p> <p>(7) MEASUREMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING GROWTH.—</p> <p>(a) On June 1, 2011, the Commissioner of Education approved a formula to measure individual student learning growth on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) administered under s. 1008.22(3)(c)1. The formula must take into consideration each student’s prior academic performance. The formula must not set different expectations for student learning growth based upon a student’s gender, race, ethnicity, or socioeconomic status. In the development of the formula, the commissioner shall consider other factors such as a student’s attendance record, disability status, or status as an English language learner.</p> <p>(b) Beginning in the 2011-2012 school year, each school district shall measure student learning growth using the formula approved by the commissioner under paragraph (a) for courses associated with the FCAT. Each school district shall implement the additional student learning growth measures selected by the commissioner</p>	<p>S. 1012.34(7)(a) and (b), F.S.</p>
----------------------	---	---------------------------------------

<p>... and other measures of professional practice (which may be gathered through multiple formats and sources, such as observations based on rigorous teacher performance standards, teacher portfolios, and student and parent surveys)</p>	<p>(3)(a)2. Instructional practice.—Evaluation criteria used when annually observing classroom teachers, must include indicators based upon each of the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices adopted by the State Board of Education. For instructional personnel who are not classroom teachers, evaluation criteria must be based upon indicators of the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices and may include specific job expectations related to student support.</p> <p>3. Instructional leadership.—For school administrators, evaluation criteria must include indicators based upon each of the leadership standards adopted by the State Board of Education under s. 1012.986, including performance measures related to the effectiveness of classroom teachers in the school, the administrator’s appropriate use of evaluation criteria and procedures, recruitment and retention of effective and highly effective classroom teachers, improvement in the percentage of instructional personnel evaluated at the highly effective or effective level, and other leadership practices that result in student learning growth. The system may include a means to give parents and instructional personnel an opportunity to provide input into the administrator’s performance evaluation.</p> <p>Florida Educator Accomplished Practices Florida Principal Leadership Standards</p>	<p>S. 1012.34(3)(a)2. and 3., F.S.</p> <p>Rule 6A-5.065, F.A.C. Rule 6A-5.080, F.A.C.</p>
<p>(d) Evaluate teachers and principals on a regular basis</p>	<p>Florida law requires annual evaluations and bi-annual evaluations for new teachers in an LEA.</p> <p>A performance evaluation must be conducted for each employee at least once a year, except that a classroom teacher who is newly hired by the district school board must be observed and evaluated at least twice in the first year of teaching in the school district.</p> <p>Instructional leadership.—For school administrators, evaluation criteria must include indicators based upon each of the leadership standards adopted by the State Board of Education.</p>	<p>S. 1012.34(3)(a), F.S.</p>
<p>(e) Provide clear, timely, and useful feedback,</p>	<p>Florida law and the Race to the Top MOU require professional development to be based</p>	

<p>including feedback that identifies needs and guides professional development</p>	<p>on evaluation results. LEA professional development systems are differentiated based on individual needs, including additional support for beginning teachers.</p> <p>(2) The evaluation systems for instructional personnel and school administrators must:</p> <p>(b) Provide appropriate instruments, procedures, and criteria for continuous quality improvement of the professional skills of instructional personnel and school administrators, and performance evaluation results must be used when identifying professional development.</p> <p>(4)(b) Each school district shall develop a professional development system as specified in subsection (3). The system shall be developed in consultation with teachers, teacher-educators of community colleges and state universities, business and community representatives, and local education foundations, consortia, and professional organizations. The professional development system must:</p> <p>2. Be based on analyses of student achievement data and instructional strategies and methods that support rigorous, relevant, and challenging curricula for all students. Schools and districts, in developing and refining the professional development system, shall also review and monitor ...performance appraisal data of teachers, managers, and administrative personnel;</p> <p><u>(iv)(a) Use evaluations to inform professional development.</u></p> <p>The LEA will use results from teacher and principal evaluations as described in (D)(2)(ii) in its professional development system as follows:</p> <p>For Teachers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish an Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP) for each teacher that is, in part, based on an analysis of student performance data and results of prior evaluations. • Individualize the support and training provided to first-and second-year teachers and determine the effective teachers who will provide coaching/mentoring in the district’s beginning teacher support program. <p>For Principals:</p>	<p>S. 1012.34(2)(b), F.S.</p> <p>S. 1012.98(4)(b)2., F.S.</p> <p>RTTT Phase II Participating LEA MOU (D)(2)(iv)(a)</p> <p>(Note: the IPDP is also required by S. 1012.98, F.S.)</p>
---	--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish an Individual Leadership Development Plan (ILDP) for each principal that is based, in part, on an analysis of student performance data and results of prior evaluations. 	
<p>(f) Will be used to inform personnel decisions</p>	<p align="center">Florida law and the Race to the Top MOU require evaluation results to be used to inform personnel decisions.</p> <p><u>Compensation</u></p> <p>“Grandfathered salary schedule” means the salary schedule or schedules adopted by a district school board before July 1, 2014,</p> <p>“Performance salary schedule” means the salary schedule or schedules adopted by a district school board</p> <p>In determining the grandfathered salary schedule for instructional personnel, a district school board must base a portion of each employee’s compensation upon performance demonstrated under s. 1012.34 and shall provide differentiated pay for both instructional personnel and school administrators based upon district-determined factors, including, but not limited to, additional responsibilities, school demographics, critical shortage areas, and level of job performance difficulties.</p> <p>By July 1, 2014, the district school board shall adopt a performance salary schedule that provides annual salary adjustments for instructional personnel and school administrators based upon performance determined under s. 1012.34. Salary adjustments.—Salary adjustments for highly effective or effective performance shall be established as follows:</p> <p>(I) The annual salary adjustment under the performance salary schedule for an employee rated as highly effective must be greater than the highest annual salary adjustment available to an employee of the same classification through any other salary schedule adopted by the district.</p> <p>(II) The annual salary adjustment under the performance salary schedule for an employee rated as effective must be equal to at least 50 percent and no more than 75 percent of the annual adjustment provided for a highly effective employee of the same classification.</p> <p>(III) The performance salary schedule shall not provide an annual salary adjustment for an</p>	<p>S. 1012.22 (1)(c), F.S.</p>

	<p>employee who receives a rating other than highly effective or effective for the year.</p> <p><u>Retention, Dismissal and Reduction in Force</u></p> <p>Contracts with instructional staff, supervisors, and school principals.— (1) contracts... shall contain provisions for dismissal during the term of the contract only for just cause. Just cause includes, but is not limited to, the following instances, as defined by rule of the State Board of Education: ... two consecutive annual performance evaluation ratings of unsatisfactory under s. 1012.34, two annual performance evaluation ratings of unsatisfactory within a 3-year period under s. 1012.34, three consecutive annual performance evaluation ratings of needs improvement or a combination of needs improvement and unsatisfactory under s. 1012.34</p> <p>(3) A professional service contract shall be renewed each year unless:</p> <p>(a) The district school superintendent, after receiving the recommendations required by s. 1012.34, charges the employee with unsatisfactory performance and notifies the employee of performance deficiencies as required by s. 1012.34; or</p> <p>(b) The employee receives two consecutive annual performance evaluation ratings of unsatisfactory under s. 1012.34, two annual performance evaluation ratings of unsatisfactory within a 3-year period under s. 1012.34, or three consecutive annual performance evaluation ratings of needs improvement or a combination of needs improvement and unsatisfactory under s. 1012.34.</p> <p>(5) If workforce reduction is needed, a district school board must retain employees at a school or in the school district based upon educational program needs and the performance evaluations of employees within the affected program areas. Within the program areas requiring reduction, the employee with the lowest performance evaluations must be the first to be released; the employee with the next lowest performance evaluations must be the second to be released; and reductions shall continue in like manner until the needed number of reductions has occurred. A district school board may not prioritize retention of employees based upon seniority.</p> <p>Contracts with instructional personnel hired on or after July 1, 2011— (2) EMPLOYMENT.—</p>	<p>S. 1012.33(1), (3) and (5), F.S.</p> <p>S. 1012.335(2), F.S.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>(a) Beginning July 1, 2011, each individual newly hired as instructional personnel by the district school board shall be awarded a probationary contract. Upon successful completion of the probationary contract, the district school board may award an annual contract</p> <p>(c) An annual contract may be awarded only if the employee:</p> <p>3. Has not received two consecutive annual performance evaluation ratings of unsatisfactory, two annual performance evaluation ratings of unsatisfactory within a 3-year period, or three consecutive annual performance evaluation ratings of needs improvement or a combination of needs improvement and unsatisfactory under s. 1012.34.</p> <p><u>Assignment and Transfer</u></p> <p>(2) ASSIGNMENT TO SCHOOLS CATEGORIZED AS IN NEED OF IMPROVEMENT.—School districts may not assign a higher percentage than the school district average of temporarily certified teachers, teachers in need of improvement, or out-of-field teachers to schools in one of the three lowest-performing categories</p> <p>Before transferring a teacher who holds a professional teaching certificate from one school to another, the district school superintendent shall consult with the principal of the receiving school and allow the principal to review the teacher’s records and interview the teacher. If, in the judgment of the principal, students would not benefit from the placement, an alternative placement may be sought.</p> <p><u>(iv)(b) Use evaluations to inform compensation, promotion, and retention</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LEA will implement a compensation system for teachers that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ties the most significant gains in salary to effectiveness demonstrated by annual evaluations as described in (D)(2)(ii). 3. Provides promotional opportunities for effective teachers to remain teaching in addition to moving into school leadership positions and bases promotions on effectiveness as demonstrated on annual evaluations as described in (D)(2)(ii), including a multi-metric evaluation in the year prior to 	<p>S. 1012.2315, F.S.</p> <p>S. 1012.27, F.S.</p> <p>RTTT Phase II MOU (D)(2)(iv)(b-d) Note – these are provisions <i>in addition</i> to those outlined in law.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>promotion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LEA will implement a compensation system for principals that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 .Ties the most significant gains in salary to effectiveness demonstrated by annual evaluations as described in (D)(2)(ii). <p><u>(iv)(c) Use evaluations to inform tenure and/or full certification</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LEA will base decisions to award employment contracts to teachers and principals on effectiveness as demonstrated through annual evaluations as described in (D)(2)(ii). <p><u>(iv)(d) Use evaluations to inform removal</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LEA will base decisions surrounding reductions in staff, including teachers and principals holding employment contracts, on their level of effectiveness demonstrated on annual evaluations as described in (D)(2)(ii). • The LEA will hold principals, their supervisors, and all LEA staff who have a responsibility in the dismissal process accountable for utilizing the process and timeline in statute (ss. 1012.33 and 1012.34, F.S.) to remove ineffective teachers from the classroom. 	
--	---	--

Florida has a high degree of confidence that this initiative will be successful in improving achievement for all students for four reasons. First, the heart of the initiative is the student. Second, both the state’s Theory of Action and its thorough implementation plan are grounded in contemporary research and in lessons learned through years of experience in educational reform and real progress – so the information serving as the foundation for action is sound. Third, the state’s approach is to put a premium on actions taking place at the classroom level, where research indicates is the most likely point of impact student learning, and then to align our systems of school improvement and human capital to support those very actions. It is important that, no matter where an educator, parent, or student turns, the message and the goals are the same, and that they are the same for all students.

Finally, confidence comes in a form less tangible but no less real, which is from the people of Florida – students, educators, parents, and leaders at all levels. Our students have risen to and exceeded every standard we have put before them. Floridians, particularly educators, have chosen to meet every educational challenge, including this enormous shift in how educators implement professional and student learning, by making a conscious decision to focus on the students and on

instruction. Beginning with and going beyond the 65 Race to the Top participating LEA MOUs, every academy on teacher evaluation, every professional association meeting that FDOE staff has attended, and every avenue for communication and dialogue has produced evidence of this focused conversation. Over and over, teachers, principals, LEA administrators, and teacher union representatives have expressed how they see the value in this to students and to the profession. To be sure, even positive change that is this pervasive brings doubt, questioning, and, honestly, some missteps along the way. While unprecedented time and effort have been spent by participants at all levels to plan and prepare, the implementation effort is still near the beginning, so the need for more communication and dialogue is ever-present. For success to be realized which means it is felt and demonstrated by individuals, schools, LEAs, and as a state, perseverance and the ability to continue to adjust as lessons are learned are non-negotiables. These are characteristics Floridians have demonstrated throughout this initiative and will continue to insist upon as we move forward to greater and greater success.

Overview of Timelines for Development and Adoption of Existing Guidelines

Each of the events, activities, or milestones in the chart below is discussed in the narrative that follows.

Date	Event
April 2006	The State Board of Education adopts the Florida Principal Leadership Standards, the state's standards for effective instructional leadership for school administrators
Spring 2010	Governor's Race to the Top Working Group completes the Phase II LEA Memorandum of Understanding
August 2010	Florida is awarded a Phase II Race to the Top grant
December 2010	The State Board of Education adopts the revised Florida Educator Accomplished Practices, the state's standards for effective instruction
February-June 2011	FDOE issues technical assistance on redesigning evaluation systems; hosts multiple sets of redesign academies to support all LEA teams in redesigning their teacher evaluation systems
March 2011	The Florida Legislature passes the Student Success Act (Senate Bill 736) which redesigns teacher and principal evaluations patterned after the principles of Race to the Top; FDOE technical assistance is adjusted immediately to combine Race to the Top MOU requirements with those of the new law
June 1, 2011	All Race to the Top participating LEAs submit redesigned evaluation systems focused on implementing the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices, that includes 50% of the summative rating based on the performance of each teacher's or principal's students and distinguishes performance at four performance levels
Summer 2011	LEAs begin training educators on their new evaluation systems
September 30, 2011	After review, feedback, and approval by the FDOE, LEAs submit final evaluation systems and collective bargaining and begin implementation of new systems for the 2011-12 school year
October 2011	FDOE publishes for public comment the first Common Language Document, designed to bring curriculum, evaluation, and school improvement areas under a common set of definitions and to foster

	the implementation of Common Core State Standards, Next Generation Sunshine State Standards, and research-based instructional strategies in all schools and LEAs
--	--

Florida's Regulations Prior to 2010 and Winning Race to the Top

Florida's process for revising teacher and principal evaluation systems began with the MOU developed and approved by Florida's Race to the Top Working Group, called by the Governor in the spring of 2010, which helped Florida make a successful bid for a Phase II Race to the Top grant. The MOU outlines specific items that LEAs would agree to in order to be considered a participating LEA under the Race to the Top grant. Florida made the decision to develop a specific MOU so that an LEA could make an informed decision about the work ahead when determining whether to participate. Governor Crist called together a Race to the Top Working Group who determined the specific requirements and language of the MOU. This Working Group included teachers, legislators, principals, superintendents, as well as the state teachers' union president and advocates for parents and the business community. The aim of this inclusive process was to ensure that when LEAs were making local decisions about participation, there was a foundation of statewide contribution to the work, buy-in to the process, and a clearly understood framework for moving forward.

One of Florida's advantages in competing for Race to the Top funds was the law governing teacher and principal evaluations, which was in existence prior to the grant (Section 1012.34, Florida Statutes). The law already required that student performance comprise the "primary" criterion of teacher and principal evaluations and required annual evaluations for all instructional and administrative employees, two major commitments under Race to the Top human capital reform. Florida's Race to the Top MOU elaborated on these two requirements and set forth a timeline for completing evaluation system revisions under the grant. Florida also had an administrative rule (Rule 6B-4.010, Florida Administrative Code), that set forth procedures for the submission, review, and approval of LEA instructional personnel evaluation systems by the FDOE. The timeline in the MOU calls for the 2010-11 school year to be a development year for evaluation systems and that these revised evaluation systems would be implemented LEA-wide during the 2011-12 school year. LEAs were advised that their revised evaluation systems were due to FDOE for review and approval by May 1, 2011.

Revision of Standards to Support Effective Instruction and Leadership

In January of 2010, during the time Florida was developing its Race to the Top application, but well prior to the Phase II award notification, Florida began revision of the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs), the state's standards for effective instruction. Since 1997, the FEAPs existed in Rule 6A-5.065, Florida Administrative Code, and were widely used in teacher preparation programs. They were, however, less consistently used in teacher evaluation systems. Whether the state had been successful in Race to the Top or not, the Department planned to update both the FEAPs themselves and the State Board of Education rule governing evaluation systems to ensure consistent use of the FEAPs to evaluate instructional practice in all LEAs.

The revision process for the FEAPs was initiated by the Commissioner of Education Eric Smith, through his 18-member Teacher Advisory Council, with a final recommendation completed by a

statewide, representative FEAPs work group. The work group consisted of members of the Teacher Advisory Council, teacher educators from institutions of higher education, LEA professional development administrators, a school principal, and a teacher's union representative, and as a group represented various grade levels and subject matter, as well as Florida's diverse culture, geographic regions, and LEA size. Three separate drafts were provided to the public over three time periods in order to allow for thorough input. Public input was facilitated by means of a web page that allowed for input and comment by each Accomplished Practice, workshops at professional educators' association meetings around the state and public hearings. A number of colleges of education and schools, and LEAs used the revision process as the subject of their learning communities and, as a result, FDOE received feedback collectively from groups of educators and feedback from individuals. The State Board of Education adopted the revised FEAPs (through an amendment to Rule 6A-5.065, Florida Administrative Code) in December 2010.

The Florida Principal Leadership Standards were adopted into Rule 6A-5.080, Florida Administrative Code, in 2006 and form the basis for school administrator preparation programs and professional development delivered by colleges of education and LEAs. Similar to the FEAPs, a great deal of statewide input was solicited and obtained. The process began with a leadership summit hosted by the Commissioner of Education Jim Horne, and was followed by a series of public meetings and a distribution of the draft standards to every principal and assistant principal in the state with a request for input. The Standards were adopted under the authority of Section 1012.986, Florida Statutes, *William Cecil Golden Professional Development Program for School Leaders*, which requires LEA professional development systems and preparation programs for aspiring school leaders to be based on these Standards.

Regulations after the Commencement of Race to the Top and the Student Success Act of 2011

Through the Race to the Top Phase II MOU, the state requires that participating LEAs use the revised FEAPs and the Florida Principal Leadership Standards as the basis for documentation of effective instructional practice and leadership in their revised teacher and principal evaluation systems. Therefore, when the Race to the Top grant was awarded, FDOE developed and issued specific guidelines for LEAs for developing teacher and principal evaluation systems under Race to the Top. These guidelines (Review and Approval Checklist for Race to the Top Teacher Evaluation Systems) provide the criteria for how participating LEAs substantiate that their new teacher evaluation systems meet all requirements of existing law and the Race to the Top Phase II MOU.

During the fall of 2010, FDOE implemented a series of statewide meetings with national experts on specific topics in education. The *What's Working* series was held regionally and webcast live around the state to provide dialogue among Florida educators, the public, and national experts, as well as receive input regarding matters related to educator quality. This project was initiated by the State Board of Education to gain input for its 2011 legislative agenda. The input received from these meetings was instrumental in FDOE testimony surrounding educator quality issues that later became part of Senate Bill 736, the Student Success Act. National experts included researchers in teacher evaluation, value-added calculations, school leadership, as well as the state president of the Florida Education Association.

On March 24, 2011, Governor Rick Scott signed into law the Student Success Act. This Act substantially revised the sections of the Florida School Code pertaining to personnel evaluations, employment contracts, and compensation. The revisions that coincided with areas of Florida's Race to the Top application were substantially aligned to the application, and in no way codified any requirement less rigorous than those of the grant. In some instances, the statute is more rigorous than the terms of the grant, providing increased system alignment to the principles of the grant. While the chart at the beginning of this section shows the portions of the Act directly related to this flexibility request, the full legislation is included as Attachment 10a.

By April 8, 2011, the Checklist was updated based upon the requirements of the Act, published on the FDOE's Race to the Top technical assistance web page and redistributed to all participating LEAs. Participating LEAs were advised that their initial system submission date was moved from May 1, 2011, to June 1, 2011, to allow them time to adjust to some of the new requirements enacted as part of the Student Success Act. A similar Checklist was recreated for nonparticipating LEAs (based on the law, but omitting Race to the Top MOU requirements) that formed the basis for their revision process. Non-participating LEAs were sent a memorandum advising them that their systems were due to FDOE for review no later than December 1, 2011. Section 120.54, Florida Statutes, requires agencies to adopt rules as soon as feasible. As a result, rule development notices have been advertised to revise Rule 6B-4.010, Florida Administrative Code, based on the new statutory requirements. Further, because of the incorporation of many of the Race to the Top requirements addressing teacher and principal evaluations in the Student Success Act, the requirements of the Act in this area were immediately applicable when the bill was signed on March 24, 2011.

3.B ENSURE LEAS IMPLEMENT TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL EVALUATION AND SUPPORT SYSTEMS

- 3.B Provide the SEA's process for ensuring that each LEA develops, adopts, pilots, and implements, with the involvement of teachers and principals, including mechanisms to review, revise, and improve, high-quality teacher and principal evaluation and support systems consistent with the SEA's adopted guidelines.

LEA Development of Evaluation Systems Based on the Adopted Guidelines

LEAs redesigned their evaluation systems with the involvement of teachers and principals. The SEA will review and approve them for implementation in all schools in 2011-12, ensuring valid measures linked to student achievement. The level of SEA support and assistance will further successful implementation.

The FDOE began technical assistance to LEAs participating and not participating in Race to the Top prior to the passage of the Student Success Act. Participating LEAs were required to submit revised evaluation systems based on these guidelines by June 1, 2011, and FDOE used its state-level Race to the Top funds to secure and provide technical assistance in the form of national expertise directly to LEAs throughout the spring and summer. All participating LEAs were required to form redesign teams with members of their LEA administrative staff, teachers, and

principals to work on the instructional practice revisions to their evaluation systems. Four series of 12-15 regional redesign academies (111 days) were provided by Learning Sciences International staff, the Leadership and Learning Center staff and FDOE staff. Academies included scaffolded, specific guidance on developing high-quality evaluation systems as defined by Race to the Top, contemporary research on instructional and leadership practice, technical assistance and information sessions on the Student Success Act, and facilitated work time for LEA redesign teams. An additional part of the technical assistance was a model evaluation system based on the research of Dr. Robert Marzano that LEAs could choose to adopt or adapt. Thirty LEAs have adopted the state model, while another 14 have adopted a model that could be described as a hybrid between the state model and others. LEA plans were reviewed and feedback provided from FDOE, and plans were subsequently resubmitted as revised September 30, 2011. For the remaining LEAs not participating in Race to the Top, revised evaluation systems are due to the state for review by December 1, 2011. The content of the state model and all technical assistance materials are available at <http://www.fldoe.org/arra/TeacherEvaluationSystems.asp>.

Along with the scheduled academies, FDOE and contracted staff provided onsite team visits and conference calls upon request with LEA redesign teams. In addition, several webinars and technical assistance conference calls were held with all LEAs throughout the development period. A complete list of all scheduled academies, technical assistance calls, webinars, and meetings is provided as Attachment 10f. The FDOE also held a special technical assistance academy for charter schools who are participating in Race to the Top to assist their redesign teams in revising their evaluation systems.

The other significant component of the evaluation system is measurement of student growth, which, beginning in 2011-12, comprises 50% of an evaluation for each teacher and principal in Florida. Using Race to the Top funds, Florida combined national expertise and our 27-member Student Growth Implementation Committee to develop and recommend to the Commissioner of Education a value-added model for measuring student growth based on data from the Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT). Based on the Commissioner's selection in June of this model as the state's model for FCAT under the requirements of the Student Success Act, this process for measuring student learning growth is being used in all LEA teacher and principal evaluation systems during the 2011-12 school year. Then, August 1-2, 2011, the FDOE provided teachers' historical data to LEAs at a statewide technical assistance meeting regarding the use of value-added results to classify teacher performance in their evaluation systems. LEAs were required to include their choice of classification methods and standards for use in 2011-12 in their revised evaluation systems documents submitted to FDOE September 30, 2011. Rule development notices have been advertised to adopt the model into State Board of Education rule (Rule 6A-5.0411, Florida Administrative Code), although the Commissioner's selection of the model by June 1, 2011, was the required action to implement the model in all LEAs during the 2011-12 school year. Information on the Student Growth Implementation Committee and Florida's Value-Added Model is available at <http://www.fldoe.org/committees/sg.asp>.

In the unlikely event that an LEA fails to revise their teacher and principal evaluation systems in accordance with the Student Success Act, the State Board of Education has the authority to take several actions in order to ensure compliance with the law. Under Section 1008.32, Florida Statutes, an LEA may be declared ineligible for competitive grants, funding may be withheld and the LEA may be reported to the State Legislature so that that body can consider taking action.

Additionally, if the LEA is participating in Race to the Top, their allocation would be in jeopardy.

Principle 3 Conclusion

Florida LEAs' revised teacher and principal evaluation systems will lead to increased quality of instruction and improved student achievement because of the emphasis on contemporary research in instructional practice, frequency of observations, multiple measures of effectiveness, a value-added student growth model, professional development and other human capital decisions informed by evaluation results, and differentiated performance levels with thresholds that will be put into governing rule. Florida is confident that the state law and other guidelines combined with Race to the Top resources and strong SEA technical assistance will ensure successful implementation of revised evaluation systems.

Florida ESEA Flexibility Request
Appendix

LABEL	LIST OF ATTACHMENTS	PAGE
1	Notice to LEAs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. E-mail seeking input on process b. E-mail and survey seeking input on draft proposal 	A-1
2	Comments on request received from LEAs (if applicable)	A-8
3	Notice and information provided to the public regarding the request <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. E-mail seeking input on process b. E-mail and survey seeking input on draft proposal c. Florida Department of Education ESEA website 	A-13
4	Evidence that the State has formally adopted college- and career-ready content standards consistent with the State’s standards adoption process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. State Board of Education Certification and Meeting Minutes b. Standards Activities Alignment Chart 	A-24
5	Memorandum of understanding or letter from a State network of institutions of higher education (IHEs) certifying that meeting the State’s standards corresponds to being college- and career-ready without the need for remedial coursework at the postsecondary level (if applicable)	N/A
6	State’s Race to the Top Assessment Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) (if applicable)	A-39
7	Evidence that the SEA has submitted high-quality assessments and academic achievement standards to the Department for peer review, or a timeline of when the SEA will submit the assessments and academic achievement standards to the Department for peer review (if applicable)	N/A
8	A copy of the average statewide proficiency based on assessments administered in the 2010–2011 school year in reading/language arts and mathematics for the “all students” group and all subgroups (if applicable).	A-69
9	Table 2: Reward, Priority, and Focus Schools	A-71
10	A copy of any guidelines that the SEA has already developed and adopted for local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems (if applicable). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Senate Bill 736 b. Race to the Top Phase II MOU c. Florida Educator Accomplished Practices d. Florida Principal Leadership Standards e. Review and Approval Checklist for Race to the Top Teacher Evaluation Systems f. Communications to LEAs Regarding Revised Evaluation Systems and Value-Added Model 	A-133
11	Evidence that the SEA has adopted one or more guidelines of local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Evidence for Senate Bill 736 b. Evidence for Race to the Top Phase II MOU c. Evidence for Florida Educator Accomplished Practices d. Evidence for Florida Principal Leadership Standards 	A-228
12	Differentiated Accountability Strategies and Support Document	A-238
13	School Improvement Plan Template	A-260

Attachment 1
Notice to LEAs

Attachment 1a

E-mail seeking input on process

Edenfield, Holly

From: Grego, Michael
Sent: Wednesday, October 12, 2011 2:19 PM
To: Alachua - Dan Boyd; Bay - William Husfelt; Bradford - Beth Moore; Brevard - Brian Binggeili; Broward - Robert Runcie; Calhoun - Tommy McClellan; Charlotte - Doug Whittaker; Citrus - Sandra Himmel; Clay - Ben Wortham; Collier - Kamela Patton; Columbia - Michael Millikin; DeSoto - Adrian H. Cline ; Dixie - Mark Rains; Duval - Ed Pratt-Dannels; Escambia - Malcolm Thomas; Eyerman, Gina; Flagler - Janet Valentine; Franklin - Nina Marks; Gadsden - Reginald James; Gilchrist - Don Thomas; Glades - Wayne Aldrich ; Gulf - Jim Norton; Hamilton - Martha Butler; Hardee - David Durastanti; Hendry - Rick Murphy; Hernando - Bryan Blavatt; Highlands - Wallace Cox (Wally); Hillsborough - MaryEllen Elia; Holmes - Gary Galloway; Indian River - Frances Adams; Jackson - Lee Miller; Jefferson - Bill Brumfield; Lafayette - Thomas Lashley; Lake - Susan Moxley; Lee - Joseph Burke; Leon - Jackie Pons; Levy - Robert Hastings; Liberty - Sue Summers; Madison - Lou Miller; Manatee - Tim McGonegal; Marion - Jim Yancey; Martin - Nancy Kline; Miami-Dade - Alberto Carvalho; Miami-Dade - Alberto Carvalho; Monroe - Jesus Jara; Nassau - John L. Ruis ; Okaloosa - Alexis Tibbetts; Okeechobee - Ken Kenworthy; Orange - Ron Blocker; Osceola - Terry Andrews; Palm Beach - Bill Malone; Pasco - Heather Fiorentino; Pinellas - John Stewart; Polk - Sherrie Nickell; Putnam - Tom Townsend; Santa Rosa - Tim Wyrosdick; Sarasota - Lori White; Seminole - Bill Vogel; St. Johns - Joseph Joyner; St. Lucie - Michael Lannon; Sumter - Richard A. Shirley (Rick) ; Suwannee - Jerry Scarborough; Taylor - Paul Dyal; Union - Carlton Faulk ; Volusia - Margaret Smith; Wakulla - David Miller; Walton - Carlene Anderson; Washington - Sandra Cook
Cc: Grego, Michael; Rand, Laura; Edenfield, Holly; bmontford@fadss.org; Blanton@fsba.org; jmixon@fasa.net; surrencyj@nefec.org; mcdaniel@paec.org; tom.conner@heartlanded.org
Subject: ESEA

Dear Superintendents:

The Florida Department of Education has created a new web page that contains information on our plans to apply for a waiver on No Child Left Behind. This law was established a decade ago to help our nation improve our education system. Although it has helped many students throughout the country, it has also had some limitations that we want to address. As such, the Department plans on applying for a flexibility waiver that will enable us to closely align our state's accountability system with a revised federal plan. Please take a moment to review our new web page and also share this information with your friends, colleagues and anyone you feel would like to participate in this state and national conversation on public education.

You may view the web page here: www.fldoe.org/esea.

We will soon post our draft application and solicit stakeholder feedback.

Thank you for your support of public education.

Sincerely,

Michael Grego

Attachment 1b

E-mail and survey seeking input on draft proposal

Edenfield, Holly

From: Grego, Michael
Sent: Tuesday, November 08, 2011 10:53 AM
To: Alachua - Dan Boyd; Bay - William Husfelt; Bradford - Beth Moore; Brevard - Brian Binggeilli; Broward - Robert Runcie; Calhoun - Tommy McClellan; Charlotte - Doug Whittaker; Citrus - Sandra Himmel; Clay - Ben Wortham; Collier - Kamela Patton; Columbia - Michael Millikin; DeSoto - Adrian H. Cline ; Dixie - Mark Rains; Duval - Ed Pratt-Dannels; Escambia - MalcolmThomas; Eyerman, Gina; Flagler - Janet Valentine; Franklin - Nina Marks; Gadsden - Reginald James; Gilchrist - Don Thomas; Glades - Wayne Aldrich ; Gulf - Jim Norton; Hamilton - Martha Butler; Hardee - David Durastanti; Hendry - Rick Murphy; Hernando - Bryan Blavatt; Highlands - Wallace Cox (Wally); Hillsborough - MaryEllen Elia; Holmes - Gary Galloway; Indian River - Frances Adams; Jackson - Lee Miller; Jefferson - Bill Brumfield; Lafayette - Thomas Lashley; Lake - Susan Moxley; Lee - Joseph Burke; Leon - Jackie Pons; Levy - Robert Hastings; Liberty - Sue Summers; Madison - Lou Miller; Manatee - Tim McGonegal; Marion - Jim Yancey; Martin - Nancy Kline; Miami-Dade - Alberto Carvalho; Miami-Dade - Alberto Carvalho; Monroe - Jesus Jara; Nassau - John L. Ruis ; Okaloosa - Alexis Tibbetts; Okeechobee - Ken Kenworthy; Orange - Ron Blocker; Osceola - Terry Andrews; Palm Beach - Wayne Gent; Pasco - Heather Fiorentino; Pinellas - John Stewart; Polk - Sherrie Nickell; Putnam - Tom Townsend; Santa Rosa - Tim Wyrosdick; Sarasota - Lori White; Seminole - Bill Vogel; St. Johns - Joseph Joyner; St. Lucie - Michael Lannon; Sumter - Richard A. Shirley (Rick) ; Suwannee - Jerry Scarborough; Taylor - Paul Dyal; Union - Carlton Faulk ; Volusia - Margaret Smith; Wakulla - David Miller; Walton - Carlene Anderson; Washington - Sandra Cook
Cc: Robinson, Gerard; Grego, Michael; Rand, Laura; Edenfield, Holly; Reynolds, Hue; Abbott, Lynn
Subject: ESEA Flexibility Request and Survey

Superintendents:

A draft of Florida's ESEA waiver request is available here: [Florida's Draft ESEA Flexibility Request](#).

Please complete this online survey to share your formal input: <http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/Y7FXJHQ>.

Sincerely,

Michael Grego

Florida's ESEA Flexibility Waiver Superintendent Feedback

Please provide the Florida Department of Education with your suggestions and ideas to strengthen and improve Florida's ESEA Flexibility Waiver Request. Your feedback is a critical component of our application. Please use the following tables to provide us your feedback. Feel free to provide comments in all the areas or one area.

1. Please select one of the following.

I am responding to
this survey as a(n)

2. Please select one of the following:

County

*3. Name

First

Last

4. Email Address (optional)



Florida's ESEA Flexibility Waiver Superintendent Feedback

Please submit your feedback, comments, and suggestions in the boxes below the corresponding heading.

5. Principle 1: College and Career ready expectations for all students

6. Principle 2: State Developed Differentiated Recognition, Accountability and Support

7. Principle 3: Supporting Effective Instruction and Leadership

8. Reducing Duplication and Unnecessary Burden: In order to provide an environment in which schools and school districts have the flexibility to focus on what's best for students, please identify any specific Florida Statutes or state rules (Florida Administrative Code) that could be eliminated to reduce duplication and unnecessary burden on school districts and/or schools. Please provide the rationale along with the specific state law and/or rule that should be eliminated.

9. General Comments:

Attachment 2

Comments on Request received from LEAs

Note: Initial LEA comments are included. We will continue to seek and receive input during the peer review process.

Page 2, Q5. Principle 1: College and Career ready expectations for all students

- | | | |
|---|--|----------------------|
| 1 | Florida's waiver request addresses high expectations for all students being prepared for college or career ready standards | Nov 8, 2011 3:34 PM |
| 2 | I agree with each area. | Nov 8, 2011 11:09 AM |

Page 2, Q6. Principle 2: State Developed Differentiated Recognition, Accountability and Support

- | | | |
|---|--|----------------------|
| 1 | Florida's waiver request incorporates our State Differentiated Accountability program based on annual measurable objectives that includes our sub-group populations and use our tiered school grading system with interventions. | Nov 8, 2011 3:34 PM |
| 2 | Using the school grades to categorize all schools will make the accountability process clear and eliminates the confusion that AYP brings to schools. | Nov 8, 2011 11:49 AM |
| 3 | This is one of the best initiatives we as a state have ever come up with. | Nov 8, 2011 11:09 AM |

Page 2, Q7. Principle 3: Supporting Effective Instruction and Leadership

- | | | |
|---|---|----------------------|
| 1 | Florida's waiver request includes FLDOE support for implementation of the educator evaluation component of the proposal and for ongoing support of two Florida initiatives that are congruent with the proposal- Student Success Statute and Race to the Top. | Nov 8, 2011 3:34 PM |
| 2 | This really helps with the importance of our RTTT grant. | Nov 8, 2011 11:09 AM |

Page 2, Q8. Reducing Duplication and Unnecessary Burden: In order to provide an environment in which schools and school districts have the flexibility to focus on what's best for students, please identify any specific Florida Statutes or state rules (Florida Administrative Code) that could be eliminated to...

- | | | |
|---|---|----------------------|
| 1 | Rather than focusing on burdensome state requirements to eliminate, I support the approach of providing a waiver to Florida for our public education accountability system which I believe is rigorous. In other words by approving Florida's waiver proposal, the result would be eliminating the duplicated system of ESEA federal requirements. | Nov 8, 2011 3:34 PM |
| 2 | Please consolidate the application process for Title programs including SIG, School Improvement, parent involvement, professional development, etc. all are required in each of these applications and are a duplication of work by limited staff. | Nov 8, 2011 11:49 AM |
| 3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unfunded mandates o Grandfathered and Performance Pay Schedules Section 1012.22, Florida Statutes (FS), as currently written, school districts cannot meet our legal contract obligations to employees and also offer a performance pay schedule where no step increase is smaller than the greatest step of the grandfathered pay schedule. School districts simply do not have the funds available to comply with both this law and contract law simultaneously. o Required Instruction Section 1003.42, FS, catalogs a list of required instruction for which multiple special interest groups lobbied successfully. State-adopted instructional materials include these topics already. A repeal of this statute and an enhancement to Section 1006.34(2), FS, that includes these topics as requirements for instructional materials would relieve the burden of all educators statewide. o Required Services to Charter Schools Section 1002.33(20), FS, mandates services school districts must provide to charter schools but limits what school districts may charge up to 5%, which will not cover the actual cost of these services. o Computer-Based Testing Section 1008.22, FS, requires all statewide end-of-course assessments to be administered online beginning 2014-15. FDOE plans to expand online testing for statewide assessments as a cost-savings at the state level. No funds exist to provide an adequate number of new school computers or to retrofit existing school computers to meet these new requirements and testing specifications. Schools that moved computers from labs to the classrooms for students and teachers to use must now move the same computers back into labs for testing centers. For test security, teachers and students cannot use computers configured for statewide computer-based testing. Essentially, computers are removed from classroom instruction. o Weak Unfunded Mandate Provision Article VII, Section 18, of the Florida Constitution prohibits many unfunded mandates but needs meaningful enhancements to assist school districts such as: Eliminate exemptions from unfunded mandate scrutiny; Provide greater public notice, legislative scrutiny, and fiscal information; Enhance accountability and transparency; and Preserve self-determination and local fiscal stewardship. • Flexibility o Local Control Restore the fiduciary authority for school boards to: Levy an additional .25 mills for critical operating or capital outlay needs; Levy 2 mills for capital outlay purposes without impacting operating millage; Set salary schedules, opening and closing dates of schools, appropriate instructional and administrative staffing expenses, etc. o Regulatory Relief Offer schools and districts the following options: Same regulatory flexibility for non-charter schools as charter schools; Relief for school districts regarding State Requirements for Educational Facilities (SREF) regulations; Relief for choice schools in meeting Class Size Reduction requirements; Suspension or repeal of the requirement that funds to cover property casualty insurance transferred from capital must be spent on | Nov 8, 2011 11:37 AM |

Page 2, Q8. Reducing Duplication and Unnecessary Burden: In order to provide an environment in which schools and school districts have the flexibility to focus on what's best for students, please identify any specific Florida Statutes or state rules (Florida Administrative Code) that could be eliminated to...

nonrecurring projects; Flexibility for the date of organization of the school board that Section 1001.371, FS mandates. • Unnecessary or repetitive paperwork, record keeping, etc. o Biennial Policy Review Section 120.74, FS, mandates that school districts to submit a biennial policy report to the Florida Legislature. Sections 120.54 and 120.81, FS, already mandate that school districts to advertise all policy changes in a local newspaper, and Section 286.011, FS, "Sunshine Law," compels school districts to post their policy documents online for public review to decrease public records requests received. Given the above, Section 120.74 is an unnecessary and burdensome duplication. o Duplication of Information Requests Bureaus and offices within the Department of Education do not communicate efficiently among themselves and regularly require school districts to submit reports with the same student achievement data that the Department already possesses. Sections 1008.25 and 1008.31, FS, authorize FDOE to require school districts to develop and submit multiple accountability plans that overlap in scope, data, and information required. The FDOE Bureau of School Improvement requires school and district staff to enter by hand FCAT data in the Student Progression Annual Report and District/ School Improvement Plans on special FDOE web pages. The FDOE Bureau of K-12 Assessment already posts this same data on their FCAT webpage of the FDOE website. FDOE has the technology to prepopulate these templates with the data required. Section 1000.05, FS, authorizes FDOE to require school districts to develop and submit plans for the implementation of the Florida Education Equity Act. The FDOE Office of Equal Educational Opportunity requires school districts to enter by hand student data from Excel spreadsheets to a Word document template for the Annual Educational Equity Update. All of these documents originate from this bureau in the first place. Again, FDOE has the technology to prepopulate the Word document template with the student data. • Unnecessary testing o Middle School Civics Promotion Requirement Repeal the requirement that middle school students must pass the middle school civics end-of-course exam in order to be promoted to high school or graduate from high school. Existing funds for student remediation are already allocated for reading and math. No additional funds exist for civics. Retention of middle school students will increase middle school dropout rates and likely contribute to juvenile delinquency in local communities. o Postsecondary Education Readiness Test (PERT) Repeal the requirement that school districts must administer the Postsecondary Education Readiness Test (PERT) and restore that responsibility to the colleges and universities. School and district personnel will have to manage yet another high stakes test administration besides FCAT, EOC, etc. Each new test administration means more legal and test coordination responsibilities for schools and districts such as additional training sessions, test administrator and proctor assignments, and arrangements for appropriate accommodations, etc. Schools and districts have to enter and create accounts for all schools and students by hand. School staff must log in students individually to the test. Students cannot log themselves into the web-based assessment. Test accommodations within the PERT online utility are accessible to all students, which is not appropriate. Test security concerns and accuracy of student data could impact high school accountability and school grades. Districts will now have to monitor students who test with PERT and do not meet the college ready cut scores, and who later gain a concordant college ready score on ACT or SAT, in order to be dismiss such students from the remedial requirement. FDOE is funding districts based upon their prior year's Grade 11

Page 2, Q8. Reducing Duplication and Unnecessary Burden: In order to provide an environment in which schools and school districts have the flexibility to focus on what's best for students, please identify any specific Florida Statutes or state rules (Florida Administrative Code) that could be eliminated to...

student enrollments which may or may not reflect current enrollment.

- 4 I think you have covered everything. This has been too long coming. Nov 8, 2011 11:09 AM

Page 2, Q9. General Comments:

- 1 Florida superintendents support high standards for student achievement , including all student sub-groups. We promote rigor and accountibility for our school districts. We believe that having a unified federal and state system of accouontibility will best serve the interests of high standards for student achievement. Nov 8, 2011 3:34 PM
- 2 The waiver will assist districts in focusing on improving student performance and giving the stakeholders clearer picture of that progress. Nov 8, 2011 11:49 AM
- 3 I appreciate the work, the open lines of communication, and the importance of this waiver. I think this will do more for the K-12 education program for our state than anything we have done. Nov 8, 2011 11:09 AM

Attachment 3

Notice and information provided to the public
regarding the request

Attachment 3a

E-mail seeking input on process

October 12, 2011

Dear _____ ,

The Florida Department of Education has created a new web page that contains information on our plans to apply for a waiver on No Child Left Behind. This law was established a decade ago to help our nation improve our education system. Although it has helped many students throughout the country, it has also had some limitations that we want to address. As such, the Department plans on applying for a flexibility waiver that will enable us to closely align our state's accountability system with a revised federal plan. Please take a moment to review our new web page and also share this information with your friends, colleagues and anyone you feel would like to participate in this state and national conversation on public education.

You may view the web page here: www.fl DOE.org/esea.

We will soon post our draft application and solicit stakeholder feedback.

Thank you for your support of public education.

Attachment 3b

E-mail and survey seeking input on draft proposal

November 8, 2011

Dear _____,

A few weeks ago, I shared with you a new web page that was created to provide information on Florida's plan to submit a waiver to the No Child Left Behind Act. I hope you had the opportunity to review the information and will also be able to help us by submitting your feedback on our proposed plan. Today, we have a draft proposal to share and an online survey ready to capture your input on this very important issue. The proposal and survey link can be found at www.fl DOE.org/csea.

Florida's ESEA Flexibility Waiver Request Draft

Please provide the Florida Department of Education with your suggestions and ideas to strengthen and improve Florida's ESEA Flexibility Waiver Request. Your feedback is a critical component of our application. Please use the following tables to provide us your feedback. Feel free to provide comments in all the areas or one area.

1. Please select one of the following.

I am responding to
this survey as a(n)

2. Please select one of the following:

County

3. Name (Optional)

4. Email Address (optional)



Florida's ESEA Flexibility Waiver Request Draft

Please submit your feedback, comments, and suggestions in the boxes below the corresponding heading.

5. Principle 1: College and Career ready expectations for all students

6. Principle 2: State Developed Differentiated Recognition, Accountability and Support

7. Principle 3: Supporting Effective Instruction and Leadership

8. Reducing Duplication and Unnecessary Burden: In order to provide an environment in which schools and school districts have the flexibility to focus on what's best for students, please identify any specific Florida Statutes or state rules (Florida Administrative Code) that could be eliminated to reduce duplication and unnecessary burden on school districts and/or schools. Please provide the rationale along with the specific state law and/or rule that should be eliminated.

9. General Comments:

Thank you for taking your time to share your thoughts with the Florida Department of Education on the ESEA Flexibility Waiver Request application. Your time and effort are greatly appreciated.



Powered by **SurveyMonkey**
Create your own [free online survey](#) now!

Attachment 3c

Florida Department of Education ESEA website

Florida Department of Education

[DOE](#)
[Home](#)

No Child Left Behind Flexibility Waiver

No Child Left Behind Flexibility Waiver

As recently allowed by the U.S. Department of Education, the Florida Department of Education is in the process of seeking a flexibility waiver for adhering to certain federal requirements for our public education system. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), commonly referred to as "No Child Left Behind," was created a decade ago to establish an accountability system that aimed to help close the achievement gap among all students.

Draft Application

- [Florida's Draft ESEA Flexibility Request \(PDF, 8MB\)](#)
- [Submit your feedback](#)

From U.S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan - Sept. 23, 2011: Many of our reform efforts to help students were not anticipated when the federal No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) was enacted. While NCLB helped states and district increase the accountability for groups of high-need students, it inadvertently encouraged some states to set low academic standards, failed to recognize or reward growth in student learning, and did little to elevate the teaching profession or recognize the most effective teachers. Instead of fostering progress and accelerating academic improvement, many NCLB requirements have unintentionally become barriers to state and local implementation of reforms designed to raise academic achievement.

With Florida's implementation of its statewide Differentiated Accountability school improvement program, coupled with our existing school accountability program, our desire is to fully have resources channeled to best serve the needs of our students. It is our goal to take this opportunity to apply for the waiver to better align our state's system of supporting our most struggling schools.

This web page contains various resources and documents that will provide you with more information about the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and the various deadlines associated with the waiver application.

- [Letter from U.S. Department of Education Secretary Arne Duncan](#)
- [Commissioner Robinson's Blog: A Waiver for Clarity](#)
- [ESEA Flexibility \(Word\)](#)
- [ESEA Flexibility Request \(Word\)](#)
- [ESEA Flexibility Review Guidance \(Word\)](#)
- [Frequently Asked Questions \(Word\)](#)
- [Overview Presentation to Florida State Board of Education \(PDF, 365KB\) - Oct. 18, 2011](#)

This is a critical time in our nation's history and we hope you will take this opportunity to review the information provided on this site and take time to submit your thoughts on

No Child Left Behind Flexibility Waiver

Florida's ESEA Flexibility Application. While your initial feedback will be used as we develop our draft application, you will also have an opportunity to provide comments on a draft of Florida's proposal. We strongly encourage you to submit comments to eseaflexibility@fldoe.org to assist us with our development of a draft application by Oct. 17, 2011.

Links:

- [U.S. Department of Education ESEA page](#)

Attachment 4

Evidence that the State has formally adopted college- and career-ready content standards consistent with the State's standards adoption process

Attachment 4a

**State Board of Education Certification and
Meeting Minutes**

CERTIFICATION OF ACTION BY THE FLORIDA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

I hereby certify that the State Board of Education met by conference call on July 27, 2010, at 10:00 a.m. and unanimously approved proposed rule 6A-1.09401, Florida Administrative Code, Student Performance Standards, including the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (Common Core) for Reading and Language Arts and Mathematics as incorporated by reference.

(b)(6)

Deborah Lynn Abbott
Corporate Secretary
State Board of Education

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Action Item
September 21, 2010

SUBJECT: Approval of Minutes of June 15, 2010, July 27, 2010, and August 23, 2010, State Board of Education Meetings

PROPOSED BOARD ACTION

For Approval

AUTHORITY FOR STATE BOARD ACTION

N/A

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The minutes of the June 15, 2010, July 27, 2010, and August 23, 2010, State Board of Education meetings are presented for approval.

Supporting Documentation Included: Minutes, June 15, 2010, July 27, 2010, and August 23, 2010

Facilitator/Presenter: Chairman T. Willard Fair

MINUTES
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
June 15, 2010
Orange County School Board Office
Orlando, Florida

Chairman T. Willard Fair called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and welcomed members and guests to the State Board of Education meeting. The following members were present: Roberto Martinez, Kathleen Shanahan, Susan Story, Mark Kaplan, and John R. Padget.

WELCOME

Chairman Fair recognized Ron Blocker, Superintendent, Orange County School District, to welcome the members of the State Board of Education.

MEMBER COMMENTS

Mr. Padget requested that the Department provide an update at the September meeting on the status of the Federal Regulations relating to beverages to be offered in schools. Mr. Padget also requested that prior to the amendment of the current rule 6A-7.0411, FAC., School Food Service Program, testimony from national experts, including pediatricians, be made available to the Board. Mr. Martinez stated that he agreed with Mr. Padget and requested that testimony from the scientific and medical communities, specifically the Institute of Medicine, be made available. Mr. Martinez stated that this testimony should be completely independent of any industry group. Ms. Story also requested to hear from school district nutritionists when the rule is brought back to the Board.

Ms. Shanahan stated that newspaper articles were reporting that some school districts were developing side bar agreements which may differ from the Memorandums of Understanding they had signed in order to be eligible to receive funds through the Race to the Top. Ms. Shanahan stated that these agreements were not done in a transparent process and recommended that the Board issue a statement to clearly state that compliance with the Memorandums of Understanding as submitted to the U.S. DOE was critical in order to be eligible to receive these funds. Commissioner Smith stated that the requirement to comply with the Memorandums of Understanding would be the basis for eligibility for school districts to receive funds through Race to the Top and that a statement would be drafted for the Board's review and released immediately.

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Chairman Fair called for a motion to approve the minutes from the State Board meeting of May 18, 2010. The motion was made by Mr. Martinez with a second by Ms. Shanahan. The motion passed unanimously.

COMMISSIONER'S REPORT

Museum of Science, Boston -- Commissioner Smith recognized Dr. Ioannis Miaoulis, Director and President of the Museum of Science, Boston, to present his recommendations relating to the inclusion of engineering and technology as a core discipline in schools. Dr. Miaoulis stated that he would encourage the Board to consider integrating engineering and technology into the current standards and offered the support of the Museum in order to do so. Ms. Shanahan requested that Commissioner Smith report back to the Board on how engineering and technology are currently included in the Next Generation Sunshine State

Standards and what changes should be made by the Board to strengthen the current standards.

Commissioner's Teacher Task Force -- Commissioner Smith recognized two members of the Commissioner's Teacher Task Force, Melissa Reiker, High School English, AP/Honors Journalism Teacher, Apopka High School, Orange County, and Jasmine Ulmer, Title I Math Coach and Gifted Teacher, Lake Butler Elementary School, Union County, to provide an update on the Task Force. Ms. Ulmer stated that the Task Force has set collaborative goals to enhance dialogue between teachers and policymakers to ensure excellent teachers in the classroom. Ms. Reiker stated that the Task Force consists of 18 teachers from all regions of Florida from various subject areas. Ms. Reiker further stated that the Task Force is currently working on two major deliverables -- updating the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices and conducting a series of roundtable discussions to address the following four topics: 1) teacher effectiveness, 2) student assessment, 3) teacher assessment, and 4) merit pay. Mr. Martinez requested the dates and locations of the Commissioner's Teacher Task Force meetings. Ms. Story suggested that the Task Force partner with businesses such as the Florida Chamber, Florida Council of 100, and Enterprise Florida, to help cover travel expenses for the group.

Contract with Pearson Assessment -- Commissioner Smith recognized Steven Ferst, Office of the General Counsel, to provide an overview of the selection process and the provisions of the contract with Pearson Assessment (Pearson) as it relates to the release of FCAT scores.

Mr. Ferst stated that two companies, Pearson Assessment and McGraw Hill, were evaluated on the following four criteria: price, performance, ability, and technical responses. Mr. Ferst reported that this contract was unique in that ten evaluators read the proposals and then a public meeting was held to provide the vendors the opportunity to make a presentation to the evaluators and to answer questions. After the public meeting, the evaluators independently scored the proposals. Mr. Ferst further stated that Pearson scored the highest in all four areas and was \$300 million less than the other proposal.

At the request of the Board, Kris Ellington provided a summary of her conversations with staff of Pearson and a review of the penalties that may be assessed as a result of the FCAT scores not having been released pursuant to the timeline in the contract.

Commissioner Smith recognized Doug Kubach, CEO, Pearson Assessment, to explain the difficulties during this process, what created the problems, and how they are to be resolved. Mr. Kubach provided an overview of the process and the challenges that prevented the release of the FCAT scores in compliance with the contract. Mr. Kubach stated that the scores were scheduled to be released on June 28, 2010, and that should this not occur they would be released on June 29, 2010.

Before concluding his remarks, Mr. Kubach committed that Pearson would reimburse all the school districts for all the costs they will have to incur as a result of the FCAT scores not being released on schedule as well as meeting the terms in the contract relating to liquidated damages. (Pages 54 through 103 of the attached certified transcript are incorporated as part of these minutes to reflect the complete statements relating to the issue of the contract, release of the FCAT scores, reimbursement of expenses, and liquidated damages.)

Chairman Fair called for a motion to adopt the Commissioner's Report as presented. The motion was made by Ms. Shanahan with a second by Mr. Kaplan. The motion passed unanimously.

ITEMS RELATING TO FLORIDA COLLEGE SYSTEM

Commissioner Smith recognized Dr. Will Holcombe, Chancellor, The Florida College System, to present the items relating to The Florida College System.

ACTION ITEMS

Approval of Baccalaureate Degree Proposal by Palm Beach State College for a BS in Nursing and a BAS in Information Management with Concentrations in Business Analyst, Database Administration, and Network/Security Assurance

Mr. Kaplan made a motion to approve the BS in Nursing and BAS in Information Management with a second by Ms. Story. The motion passed unanimously.

Approval of Baccalaureate Degree Proposal by State College of Florida, Manatee-Sarasota for a BAS in Energy Technology Management

Chancellor Holcombe stated that this baccalaureate degree proposal was deferred at the March 26th State Board meeting and has since been revised and presented for approval.

Mr. Padgett made a motion to approve the BAS in Engineering Technology Management with a second by Mr. Kaplan. The motion passed unanimously.

Approval of New Rule 6A-14.095, Site Determined Baccalaureate Access

Chancellor Holcombe stated the new rule was developed to implement Section 1007.33, Florida Statutes, Site-determined baccalaureate degree access, requiring the State Board to adopt rules to prescribe format and content requirements and submission procedures for notices of intent, proposals, and alternative proposals relating to the requests for baccalaureate degree programs at the Florida Colleges. Chancellor Holcombe presented the following new language to be included in the rule: "a college's exemption status may be revoked by the State Board of Education should a college fail to submit an annual Baccalaureate Performance Accountability report or fail to continue to meet the statutory requirements for initial exemption."

Chairman Fair called for a motion to approve Rule 6A-14.095, Site Determined Baccalaureate Access, as amended. The motion was made by Mr. Padgett with a second by Mr. Kaplan. The motion passed unanimously.

ITEMS RELATING TO PreK-12

ACTION ITEMS

Approval of Amendment to Rule 6A-1.09422, Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test and End-of-Course Assessment Requirements

Chairman Fair called for a motion to approve Rule 6A-1.09422, Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test and End-of-Course Assessment Requirements. The motion was made by Ms. Shanahan with a second by Mr. Padgett. The motion passed unanimously.

Approval of Amendment to Rule 6A-1.099811, Differentiated Accountability State System of School Improvement

Commissioner Smith recognized Nikolai Vitti, Deputy Chancellor of School Improvement and Student Achievement, to explain the amendment to the rule. Mr. Vitti stated that the rule

was approved for adoption by the State Board of Education in March 2010, but was challenged by the Florida Education Association (FEA). Mr. Vitti further stated that the Department worked with the FEA to address the concerns of the challenge which resulted in clarification of the collective bargaining process.

Mr. Vitti recognized Dr. Elaine Anderson, No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Curriculum Specialist, North and Central Zones, Okaloosa County, and Dr. Cheryl Seals, NCLB Curriculum Specialist, South Zone, Okaloosa County, for a presentation about the progress made in Okaloosa County on advancing minority achievement.

Chairman Fair called for a motion to approve Rule 6A-1.099811, Differentiated Accountability State System of School Improvement. The motion was made by Mr. Kaplan with a second by Mr. Padgett. The motion passed unanimously.

Approval of New Rule 6A-6.0211, Performance-Based Exit Option Model and State of Florida High School Performance-Based Diploma

Chairman Fair called for a motion to approve new Rule 6A-6.0211, Performance-Based Exit Option Model and State of Florida High School Performance-Based Diploma. The motion was made by Mr. Kaplan with a second by Mr. Padgett. The motion passed unanimously.

Approval of Amendment to Rule 6A-1.0995, Form of High School Diplomas and Certificates of Completion

Chairman Fair called for a motion to approve Rule 6A-1.0995, Form of High School Diplomas and Certificates of Completion. The motion was made by Ms. Shanahan with a second by Ms. Story. The motion passed unanimously.

Approval of Budget Guidelines for Development of 2011-2012 Legislative Budget

Chairman Fair called for a motion to approve the Budget Guidelines for Development of the 2011-2012 Legislative Budget. The motion was made by Ms. Shanahan with a second by Mr. Kaplan. The motion passed unanimously.

Consideration of Good Cause Exemptions for Two Summer Voluntary Prekindergarten Education Programs

Commissioner Smith recognized Chancellor Haithcock to provide an overview of the good cause exemptions for the summer Voluntary Prekindergarten education program. Ms. Shanahan made a motion to approve the Good Cause Exemptions for Summer Voluntary Prekindergarten Education Programs for United Cerebral Palsy, Orlando, and United Cerebral Palsy, Lake Mary, with a second by Ms. Story. The motion passed unanimously.

Charter School Appeal Commission Recommendation RE: Shine! Educational Services Growth Academies for Remarkable Youths of South Area, Central Area, North Area, and West Area of Palm Beach County vs. Palm Beach County School District

Chairman Fair recognized Lois Tepper, Commissioner's Designee as Chair, Charter School Appeal Commission, to provide an overview of the appeal. Ms. Tepper stated that the Charter School Appeal Commission recommendation is to deny the appeal based on significant problems with the budget. Ms. Tepper recognized Harry Daniel, attorney representing Shine! Educational Services, to speak on behalf of the charter school. Mr. Martinez made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Charter School Appeal

Commission and deny the appeal of Shine! Educational Services with a second by Ms. Shanahan. The motion passed unanimously.

Charter School Appeal Commission Recommendation RE: Florida High School for Accelerated Learning - West Palm Beach Campus vs. School Board of Palm Beach County and Florida High School for Accelerated Learning – Palm Beach County Campus vs. School Board of Palm Beach County

Ms. Tepper stated that this appeal had been withdrawn by the Florida High School for Accelerated Learning.

**Dismissal of Charter School Appeal for Lack of Jurisdiction:
Shine! Education Services vs. Miami-Dade County School District**

Chairman Fair called for a motion to ratify the dismissal of the charter appeal for lack of jurisdiction. The motion was made by Mr. Kaplan with a second by Mr. Padget. The motion passed unanimously.

CONSENT AGENDA

Chairman Fair called for a motion to approve the consent agenda, items 1 – 5. The motion was made by Ms. Shanahan with a second by Mr. Martinez. The motion to approve the consent agenda passed unanimously.

POLICY ISSUE FOR CONCURRENCE

Development and Review of Common Core State Standards

Commissioner Smith recognized Mary Jane Tappen, Deputy Chancellor for Curriculum, Instruction, and Student Services, for a presentation on the Common Core State Standards. Ms. Shanahan recommended conducting a workshop with legislators similar to the one done with the American Diploma Project, providing the history of the FCAT, the timeline, and to explain the different metrics. Commissioner Smith stated it would be done in the fall. Ms. Tappen recognized Karen Brown, President, Florida Parent Teacher Association (PTA), and Latha Krishnaiyer, Chair, PTA Legislation, to speak in favor of the Common Core State Standards. Mr. Martinez recommended inviting the PTA to the workshops on teacher reform.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Fair announced the next scheduled State Board of Education meeting will be on July 27, 2010, via conference call and September 21, 2010, in Tallahassee.

Having no further business, Chairman Fair adjourned the meeting of the State Board of Education at 12:23 p.m.

Lynn Abbott, Corporate Secretary

T. Willard Fair, Chairman

MINUTES
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
MEETING
July 27, 2010
Via Conference Call

Chairman T. Willard Fair called the meeting to order at 10:01 a.m. and welcomed members and guests to the State Board of Education meeting. The following members were present: Akshay Desai, Mark Kaplan, John R. Padget, and Susan Story. Roberto Martínez and Kathleen Shanahan were unable to connect to the conference call. However, immediately following the call they individually contacted the Corporate Secretary and expressed their support for the Common Core Standards.

ACTION ITEM

Approval of Amendment to Rule 6A-1.09401, Student Performance Standards

Chairman Fair recognized Commissioner Smith to provide a summary of the proposed amendment to Rule 6A-1.09401, FAC. Commissioner Smith recommended the Board approve the amendment and adopt the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (Common Core) - Reading and Language Arts and Mathematics.

Chairman Fair called for a motion to approve the Amendment to Rule 6A-1.09401, Student Performance Standards. The motion was made by Mr. Padget with a second by Ms. Story. The motion passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

Having no further business, Chairman Fair adjourned the conference call of the State Board of Education at 10:05 a.m.

Lynn Abbott, Corporate Secretary

T. Willard Fair, Chairman

MINUTES
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
MEETING

August 23, 2010
Via Conference Call

Chairman T. Willard Fair called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m. and welcomed members and guests to the State Board of Education meeting. The following members were present: Akshay Desai, Mark Kaplan, Roberto Martinez, John R. Padget, Kathleen Shanahan, and Susan Story.

Chairman Fair called for a motion to adopt the agenda as presented. The motion was made by Mr. Martinez with a second by Mr. Padget. The motion passed unanimously.

ACTION ITEM

Approval of Recommendation to Grant a Good Cause Waiver to VPK Program Providers

Chairman Fair recognized Commissioner Smith to provide a summary of the agenda item. Commissioner Smith recommended the Board approve a good cause waiver for the following VPK program providers: Centro Villas; Krome Child Development Center; Las Americas Day Care; La Estancia Child Development Center; Little Hands of America; Mascotte Child Development Center; Mira Verde Child Development Center; My Little World; Nancy's Land; Pomona Park Child Development Center; Redlands Child Development Center; Snively Elementary; Tender Love and Care Child Development Center; and Wimauma Child Development Center.

Chairman Fair called for a motion to approve the recommendation to grant a good cause waiver for the proposed VPK program providers. The motion was made by Mr. Padget with a second by Mr. Martinez. The motion passed unanimously.

Approval of Adoption of a Resolution Requesting the Issuance and Sale of Not Exceeding \$540,000,000 State of Florida, State Board of Education Lottery Revenue Refunding Bonds, [Series to be determined]

Commissioner Smith recognized Ben Watkins, Director, Division of Bond Finance, to provide a summary of the agenda item. Mr. Watkins stated that the Division of Bond Finance has exhausted the authority it was delegated with respect to the refinancing of outstanding indebtedness and that approval of the proposed resolution would allow the Division to take advantage of the current historically low interest rates in the market.

Mr. Kaplan made the motion to adopt the resolution with a second by Mr. Padget. The motion passed unanimously.

Closing

Ms. Shanahan requested an update from Commissioner Smith on post-Pearson and FCAT. Commissioner Smith stated that the Department has received the full payment of liquidated damages from Pearson Assessment. Commissioner Smith further stated that the Department is continuing to work with Superintendents on the final costs related to the delayed school grades and will have a detailed report prior to the next State Board meeting.

Mr. Martinez requested that a representative from Pearson Assessment be present at the September Board meeting to provide objective assurances that there will not be problems this year.

Mr. Martinez reminded the Board that there will be a workshop in Panama City, on September 13th, to discuss Value Added Measures.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Fair announced the next scheduled State Board of Education meeting will be on September 21, 2010, in Tallahassee.

Having no further business, Chairman Fair adjourned the conference call of the State Board of Education at 10:19 a.m.

Lynn Abbott, Corporate Secretary

T. Willard Fair, Chairman

Attachment 4b
Standards Activities Alignment Chart

CURRICULUM ALIGNMENT			INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS					PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT				ASSESSMENT			TEA
Public	State Board of Education approved	Adopt course descriptions	Vendor Instructional Materials Alignment	State Instructional Materials Adoption Process	Contract years for Instructional Materials – District Purchase	Classroom implementation of aligned Instructional Materials	Develop research-based practices for new standards	Lead trainers	Teacher training	Full implementation of new standards	Assessment realignment started	Field test	New generation of tests first given		
January 06	January 2007	June 2008	2007-2008	2007-08	2008-14	2008-09	2007-09	2007-08	2008-09	2008-09	January 2007	March 2010	April 2011	20	
January 07	September 2007	February 2008	2008-2009	2009-10	2010-16	2010-11	2007-10	2008-10	2008-11	2010-11	March 2007	March 2010	April 2011	20	
October 07	February 2008	June 2008	2009-2010	2010-11	2011-17	2011-12	2008-10	2008-11	2008-12	2011-12	October 2007	April 2011	April 2012	20	
June 08	December 2008	March 2010	2010-2011	2011-12	2012-17	2012-13	2009-10	2010-12	2011-13	2012-13	NA	US History 2012 Civics 2013	US History 2013 Civics 2014	20	
June 08	December 2008	February 2009	2013-14	2014-15	2015-20	2015-16	2008-10	2008-10	2009-11	2012-13	NA	NA	NA	20	
June 08	December 2008	February 2009	2013-14	2014-15	2015-20	2015-16	2009-12	2009-12	2010-13	2012-13	NA	NA	NA	20	
June 09	June 2010	June 2012	2011-12	2012-13	2013-18	2013-14	2010-13	2010-13	2011-13	2013-14	NA	CCSS-aligned PARCC Summative Assessment 2013-2014	CCSS-aligned PARCC Summative Assessment 2014-2015	20	
June 09	June 2010	June 2012	2012-13	2013-14	2014-19	2014-15	2010-13	2010-13	2011-13	2013-14	NA	CCSS-aligned PARCC Summative Assessment 2013-2014	CCSS-aligned PARCC Summative Assessment 2014-2015	20	
January 10	December 2010	June 2011	2013-14	2014-15	2015-20	2015-16	2010-13	2010-13	2011-13	2013-14	NA	NA	NA	20	
June 10	December 2010	December 2011	NA	NA	NA	NA	2011-14	2011-14	2012-14	2014-15	NA	NA	NA	20	

CURRICULUM ALIGNMENT			INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS					PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT					ASSESSMENT			TEA
Public Input for draft standards	State Board of Education approved	Adopt course descriptions	Vendor Instructional Materials Alignment	State Instructional Materials Adoption Process	Contract years for Instructional Materials – District Purchase	Classroom implementation of aligned Instructional Materials	Develop research-based practices for new standards	Lead trainers	Teacher training	Full implementation of new standards	Assessment realignment started	Field test	New generation of tests first given	Ed Preferred Pro		
June 2010	December 2010	December 2011	NA	NA	NA	NA	2011-14	2011-14	2012-14	2014-15	NA	NA	NA	20		
April 2010	June 2010	June 2012	2011-12	2012-13	2013-18	2013-14	2010-13	2010-13	2011-13	2013-14	NA	CCSS-aligned PARCC Summative Assessment 2013-2014	CCSS-aligned PARCC Summative Assessment 2014-2015	20		
April 2010	June 2010	June 2012	2012-13	2013-14	2014-19	2014-15	2010-13	2010-13	2011-13	2013-14	NA	CCSS-aligned PARCC Summative Assessment 2013-2014	CCSS-aligned PARCC Summative Assessment 2014-2015	20		

Attachment 6

**State's Race to the Top Assessment Memorandum of
Understanding (MOU)**

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
For
Race To The Top – Comprehensive Assessment Systems Grant

**PARTNERSHIP FOR ASSESSMENT OF READINESS FOR COLLEGE AND
CAREERS MEMBERS**

JUNE 3, 2010

I. Parties

This Memorandum of Understanding (“MOU”) is made and effective as of this 15 day of June 2010, (the “Effective Date”) by and between the State of Florida and all other member states of the Partnership For Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (“Consortium” or “PARCC”) who have also executed this MOU.

II. Scope of MOU

This MOU constitutes an understanding between the Consortium member states to participate in the Consortium. This document describes the purpose and goals of the Consortium, presents its background, explains its organizational and governance structure, and defines the terms, responsibilities and benefits of participation in the Consortium.

III. Background – Comprehensive Assessment Systems Grant

On April 9, 2010, the Department of Education (“ED”) announced its intent to provide grant funding to consortia of States for two grant categories under the Race to the Top Fund Assessment Program: (a) Comprehensive Assessment Systems grants, and (b) High School Course Assessment grants. 75 Fed. Reg. 18171 (April 9, 2010) (“Notice”).

The Comprehensive Assessment Systems grant will support the development of new assessment systems that measure student knowledge and skills against a common set of college- and career-ready standards in mathematics and English language arts in a way that covers the full range of those standards, elicits complex student demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills as appropriate, and provides an accurate measure of student achievement across the full performance continuum and an accurate measure of student growth over a full academic year or course.

IV. Purpose and Goals

The states that are signatories to this MOU are members of a consortium (Partnership For Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers) that have organized themselves to apply for and carry out the objectives of the Comprehensive Assessment Systems grant program.

Consortium states have identified the following major purposes and uses for the assessment system results:

- To measure and document students' college and career readiness by the end of high school and progress toward this target. Students meeting the college and career readiness standards will be eligible for placement into entry-level credit-bearing, rather than remedial, courses in public 2- and 4-year postsecondary institutions in all participating states.
- To provide assessments and results that:
 - Are comparable across states at the student level;
 - Meet internationally rigorous benchmarks;
 - Allow valid measures of student longitudinal growth; and
 - Serve as a signal for good instructional practices.
- To support multiple levels and forms of accountability including:
 - Decisions about promotion and graduation for individual students;
 - Teacher and leader evaluations;
 - School accountability determinations;
 - Determinations of principal and teacher professional development and support needs; and
 - Teaching, learning, and program improvement.
- Assesses all students, including English learners and students with disabilities.

To further these goals, States that join the Consortium by signing this MOU mutually agree to support the work of the Consortium as described in the PARCC application for funding under the Race to the Top Assessment Program.

V. Definitions

This MOU incorporates and adopts the terms defined in the Department of Education's Notice, which is appended hereto as Addendum 1.

VI. Key Deadlines

The Consortium has established key deadlines and action items for all Consortium states, as specified in Table (A)(1)(b)(v) and Section (A)(1) of its proposal. The following milestones represent major junctures during the grant period when the direction of the Consortium's work will be clarified, when the Consortium must make key decisions, and when member states must make additional commitments to the Consortium and its work.

- A. The Consortium shall develop procedures for the administration of its duties, set forth in By-Laws, which will be adopted at the first meeting of the Governing Board.
- B. The Consortium shall adopt common assessment administration procedures no later than the spring of 2011.

- C. The Consortium shall adopt a common set of item release policies no later than the spring of 2011.
- D. The Consortium shall adopt a test security policy no later than the spring of 2011.
- E. The Consortium shall adopt a common definition of "English learner" and common policies and procedures for student participation and accommodations for English learners no later than the spring of 2011.
- F. The Consortium shall adopt common policies and procedures for student participation and accommodations for students with disabilities no later than the spring of 2011.
- G. Each Consortium state shall adopt a common set of college- and career-ready standards no later than December 31, 2011.
- H. The Consortium shall adopt a common set of common performance level descriptors no later than the summer of 2014.
- I. The Consortium shall adopt a common set of achievement standards no later than the summer of 2015.

VII. Consortium Membership

A. Membership Types and Responsibilities

- 1. **Governing State:** A State becomes a Governing State if it meets the eligibility criteria in this section.
 - a. The eligibility criteria for a Governing State are as follows:
 - (i) A Governing State may not be a member of any other consortium that has applied for or receives grant funding from the Department of Education under the Race to the Top Fund Assessment Program for the Comprehensive Course Assessment Systems grant category;
 - (ii) A Governing State must be committed to statewide implementation and administration of the assessment system developed by the Consortium no later than the 2014-2015 school year, subject to availability of funds;
 - (iii) A Governing State must be committed to using the assessment results in its accountability system, including for school accountability determinations;

teacher and leader evaluations; and teaching, learning and program improvement;

(iv) A Governing State must provide staff to the Consortium to support the activities of the Consortium as follows:

- Coordinate the state's overall participation in all aspects of the project, including:
 - ongoing communication within the state education agency, with local school systems, teachers and school leaders, higher education leaders;
 - communication to keep the state board of education, governor's office and appropriate legislative leaders and committees informed of the consortium's activities and progress on a regular basis;
 - participation by local schools and education agencies in pilot tests and field test of system components; and
 - identification of barriers to implementation.
- Participate in the management of the assessment development process on behalf of the Consortium;
- Represent the chief state school officer when necessary in Governing Board meetings and calls;
- Participate on Design Committees that will:
 - Develop the overall assessment design for the Consortium;
 - Develop content and test specifications;
 - Develop and review Requests for Proposals (RFPs);
 - Manage contract(s) for assessment system development;
 - Recommend common achievement levels;
 - Recommend common assessment policies; and
 - Other tasks as needed.

(v) A Governing State must identify and address the legal, statutory, regulatory and policy barriers it must change in order for the State to adopt and implement

the Consortium's assessment system components by the 2014-15 school year.

- b. A Governing State has the following additional rights and responsibilities:
- (i) A Governing State has authority to participate with other Governing States to determine and/or to modify the major policies and operational procedures of the Consortium, including the Consortium's work plan and theory of action;
 - (ii) A Governing State has authority to participate with other Governing States to provide direction to the Project Management Partner, the Fiscal Agent, and to any other contractors or advisors retained by or on behalf of the Consortium that are compensated with Grant funds;
 - (iii) A Governing State has authority to participate with other Governing States to approve the design of the assessment system that will be developed by the Consortium;
 - (iv) A Governing State must participate in the work of the Consortium's design and assessment committees;
 - (v) A Governing State must participate in pilot and field testing of the assessment systems and tools developed by the Consortium, in accordance with the Consortium's work plan;
 - (vi) A Governing State must develop a plan for the statewide implementation of the Consortium's assessment system by 2014-2015, including removing or resolving statutory, regulatory and policy barriers to implementation, and securing funding for implementation;
 - (vii) A Governing State may receive funding from the Consortium to defray the costs associated with staff time devoted to governance of the Consortium, if such funding is included in the Consortium budget;
 - (viii) A Governing State may receive funding from the Consortium to defray the costs associated with intra-State communications and engagements, if such funding is included in the Consortium budget.

- (ix) A Governing State has authority to vote upon significant grant fund expenditures and disbursements (including awards of contracts and subgrants) made to and/or executed by the Fiscal Agent, Governing States, the Project Management Partner, and other contractors or subgrantees.

2. **Fiscal Agent:** The Fiscal Agent will be one of the Governing States in the Consortium.

- (i) The Fiscal Agent will serve as the "Applicant" state for purposes of the grant application, applying as the member of the Consortium on behalf of the Consortium, pursuant to the Application Requirements of the Notice (Addendum 1) and 34 C.F.R. 75.128.
- (ii) The Fiscal Agent shall have a fiduciary responsibility to the Consortium to manage and account for the grant funds provided by the Federal Government under the Race to the Top Fund Assessment Program Comprehensive Assessment Systems grants, including related administrative functions, subject to the direction and approval of the Governing Board regarding the expenditure and disbursement of all grant funds, and shall have no greater decision-making authority regarding the expenditure and disbursement of grant funds than any other Governing State;
- (iii) The Fiscal Agent shall issue RFPs in order to procure goods and services on behalf of the Consortium;
- (iv) The Fiscal Agent has the authority, with the Governing Board's approval, to designate another Governing State as the issuing entity of RFPs for procurements on behalf of the Consortium;
- (v) The Fiscal Agent shall enter into a contract or subgrant with the organization selected to serve as the Consortium's Project Management Partner;
- (vi) The Fiscal Agent may receive funding from the Consortium in the form of disbursements from Grant funding, as authorized by the Governing Board, to cover the costs associated with carrying out its

responsibilities as a Fiscal Agent, if such funding is included in the Consortium budget;

- (vii) The Fiscal Agent may enter into significant contracts for services to assist the grantee to fulfill its obligation to the Federal Government to manage and account for grant funds;
- (viii) Consortium member states will identify and report to the Fiscal Agent, and the Fiscal Agent will report to the Department of Education, pursuant to program requirement 11 identified in the Notice for Comprehensive Assessment System grantees, any current assessment requirements in Title I of the ESEA that would need to be waived in order for member States to fully implement the assessment system developed by the Consortium.

3. Participating State

a. The eligibility criteria for a Participating State are as follows:

- (i) A Participating State commits to support and assist with the Consortium's execution of the program described in the PARCC application for a Race to the Top Fund Assessment Program grant, consistent with the rights and responsibilities detailed below, but does not at this time make the commitments of a Governing State;
- (ii) A Participating State may be a member of more than one consortium that applies for or receives grant funds from ED for the Race to the Top Fund Assessment Program for the Comprehensive Assessment Systems grant category.

b. The rights and responsibilities of a Participating State are as follows:

- (i) A Participating State is encouraged to provide staff to participate on the Design Committees, Advisory Committees, Working Groups or other similar groups established by the Governing Board;
- (ii) A Participating State shall review and provide feedback to the Design Committees and to the Governing Board regarding the design plans,

strategies and policies of the Consortium as they are being developed;

- (iii) A Participating State must participate in pilot and field testing of the assessment systems and tools developed by the Consortium, in accordance with the Consortium's work plan; and
- (iv) A Participating State is not eligible to receive reimbursement for the costs it may incur to participate in certain activities of the Consortium.

4. Proposed Project Management Partner:

Consistent with the requirements of ED's Notice, the PARCC Governing States are conducting a competitive procurement to select the consortium Project Management Partner. The PARCC Governing Board will direct and oversee the work of the organization selected to be the Project Management Partner.

B. Recommitment to the Consortium

In the event that that the governor or chief state school officer is replaced in a Consortium state, the successor in that office shall affirm in writing to the Governing Board Chair the State's continued commitment to participation in the Consortium and to the binding commitments made by that official's predecessor within five (5) months of taking office.

C. Application Process For New Members

- 1. A State that wishes to join the Consortium after submission of the grant application may apply for membership in the Consortium at any time, provided that the State meets the prevailing eligibility requirements associated with its desired membership classification in the Consortium. The state's Governor, Chief State School Officer, and President of the State Board of Education (if applicable) must sign a MOU with all of the commitments contained herein, and the appropriate state higher education leaders must sign a letter making the same commitments as those made by higher education leaders in the states that have signed this MOU.
- 2. A State that joins the Consortium after the grant application is submitted to the Department of Education is not authorized to re-open settled issues, nor may it participate in the review of proposals for Requests for Proposals that have already been issued.

D. Membership Opt-Out Process

At any time, a State may withdraw from the Consortium by providing written notice to the chair of the Governing Board, signed by the individuals holding the same positions that signed the MOU, at least ten (10) days prior to the effective date of the withdrawal, including an explanation of reasons for the withdrawal.

VIII. Consortium Governance

This section of the MOU details the process by which the Consortium shall conduct its business.

A. Governing Board

1. The Governing Board shall be comprised of the chief state school officer or designee from each Governing State;
2. The Governing Board shall make decisions regarding major policy, design, operational and organizational aspects of the Consortium's work, including:
 - a. Overall design of the assessment system;
 - b. Common achievement levels;
 - c. Consortium procurement strategy;
 - d. Modifications to governance structure and decision-making process;
 - e. Policies and decisions regarding control and ownership of intellectual property developed or acquired by the Consortium (including without limitation, test specifications and blue prints, test forms, item banks, psychometric information, and other measurement theories/practices), provided that such policies and decisions:
 - (i) will provide equivalent rights to such intellectual property to all states participating in the Consortium, regardless of membership type;
 - (ii) will preserve the Consortium's flexibility to acquire intellectual property to the assessment systems as the Consortium may deem necessary and consistent with "best value" procurement principles, and with due regard for the Notice requirements regarding broad availability of such intellectual property except as otherwise protected by law or agreement as proprietary information.

3. The Governing Board shall form Design, Advisory and other committees, groups and teams (“committees”) as it deems necessary and appropriate to carry out the Consortium’s work, including those identified in the PARCC grant application.
 - a. The Governing Board will define the charter for each committee, to include objectives, timeline, and anticipated work product, and will specify which design and policy decisions (if any) may be made by the committee and which must be elevated to the Governing Board for decision;
 - b. When a committee is being formed, the Governing Board shall seek nominations for members from all states in the Consortium;
 - c. Design Committees that were formed during the proposal development stage shall continue with their initial membership, though additional members may be added at the discretion of the Governing Board;
 - d. In forming committees, the Governing Board will seek to maximize involvement across the Consortium, while keeping groups to manageable sizes in light of time and budget constraints;
 - e. Committees shall share drafts of their work products, when appropriate, with all PARCC states for review and feedback; and
 - f. Committees shall make decisions by consensus; but where consensus does not exist the committee shall provide the options developed to the Governing Board for decision (except as the charter for a committee may otherwise provide).
4. The Governing Board shall be chaired by a chief state school officer from one Governing State.
 - a. The Governing Board Chair shall serve a one-year term, which may be renewed.
 - b. The Governing States shall nominate candidates to serve as the Governing Board Chair, and the Governing Board Chair shall be selected by majority vote.
 - c. The Governing Board Chair shall have the following responsibilities:
 - (i) To provide leadership to the Governing Board to ensure that it operates in an efficient, effective, and

orderly manner. The tasks related to these responsibilities include:

- (a) Ensure that the appropriate policies and procedures are in place for the effective management of the Governing Board and the Consortium;
 - (b) Assist in managing the affairs of the Governing Board, including chairing meetings of the Governing Board and ensure that each meeting has a set agenda, is planned effectively and is conducted according to the Consortium's policies and procedures and addresses the matters identified on the meeting agenda;
 - (c) Represent the Governing Board, and act as a spokesperson for the Governing Board if and when necessary;
 - (d) Ensure that the Governing Board is managed effectively by, among other actions, supervising the Project Management Partner; and
 - (e) Serve as in a leadership capacity by encouraging the work of the Consortium, and assist in resolving any conflicts.
5. The Consortium shall adhere to the timeline provided in the grant application for making major decisions regarding the Consortium's work plan.
- a. The timeline shall be updated and distributed by the Project Management Partner to all Consortium states on a quarterly basis.
6. Participating States may provide input for Governing Board decisions, as described below.
7. Governing Board decisions shall be made by consensus; where consensus is not achieved among Governing States, decisions shall be made by a vote of the Governing States. Each State has one vote. Votes of a supermajority of the Governing States are necessary for a decision to be reached.
- a. The supermajority of the Governing States is currently defined as a majority of Governing States plus one additional State;
 - b. The Governing Board shall, from time to time as necessary, including as milestones are reached and additional States become

Governing States, evaluate the need to revise the votes that are required to reach a decision, and may revise the definition of supermajority, as appropriate. The Governing Board shall make the decision to revise the definition of supermajority by consensus, or if consensus is not achieved, by a vote of the supermajority as currently defined at the time of the vote.

8. The Governing Board shall meet quarterly to consider issues identified by the Board Chair, including but not limited to major policy decisions of the Consortium.

B. Design Committees

1. One or more Design Committees will be formed by the Governing Board to develop plans for key areas of Consortium work, such as recommending the assessment system design and development process, to oversee the assessment development work performed by one or more vendors, to recommend achievement levels and other assessment policies, and address other issues as needed. These committees will be comprised of state assessment directors and other key representatives from Governing States and Participating States.
2. Design Committees shall provide recommendations to the Governing Board regarding major decisions on issues such as those identified above, or as otherwise established in their charters.
 - a. Recommendations are made on a consensus basis, with input from the Participating States.
 - b. Where consensus is not achieved by a Design Committee, the Committee shall provide alternative recommendations to the Governing Board, and describe the strengths and weaknesses of each recommendation.
 - c. Design Committees, with support from the Project Management Partner, shall make and keep records of decisions on behalf of the Consortium regarding assessment policies, operational matters and other aspects of the Consortium's work if a Design Committee's charter authorizes it to make decisions without input from or involvement of the Governing Board.
 - d. Decisions reserved to Design Committees by their charters shall be made by consensus; but where consensus is not achieved decisions shall be made by a vote of Governing States on each Design Committee. Each Governing State on the committee has one vote. Votes of a majority of the Governing States on a Design Committee, plus one, are necessary for a decision to be reached.

3. The selection of successful bidders in response to RFPs issued on behalf of the Consortium shall be made in accordance with the procurement laws and regulations of the State that issues the RFP, as described more fully in Addendum 3 of this MOU.
 - a. To the extent permitted by the procurement laws and regulations of the issuing State, appropriate staff of the Design Committees who were involved in the development of the RFP shall review the proposals, shall provide feedback to the issuing State on the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal, and shall identify the proposal believed to represent the best value for the Consortium members, including the rationale for this conclusion.

C. General Assembly of All Consortium States

1. There shall be two convenings of all Consortium states per year, for the purpose of reviewing the progress of the Consortium's work, discussing and providing input into upcoming decisions of the Governing Board and Design Committees, and addressing other issues of concern to the Consortium states.
 - a. A leadership team (comprised of chief state school officers, and other officials from the state education agency, state board of education, governor's office, higher education leaders and others as appropriate) from each state shall be invited to participate in one annual meeting.
 - b. Chief state school officers or their designees only shall be invited to the second annual convening.
2. In addition to the two annual convenings, Participating States shall also have the opportunity to provide input and advice to the Governing Board and to the Design Committees through a variety of means, including:
 - a. Participation in conference calls and/or webinars;
 - b. Written responses to draft documents; and
 - c. Participation in Google groups that allow for quick response to documents under development.

IX. Benefits of Participation

Participation in the Consortium offers a number of benefits. For example, member States will have opportunities for:

- A. Possible coordinated cooperative purchase discounts;

- B. Possible discount software license agreements;
- C. Access to a cooperative environment and knowledge-base to facilitate information-sharing for educational, administrative, planning, policy and decision-making purposes;
- D. Shared expertise that can stimulate the development of higher quality assessments in an efficient and cost-effective manner;
- E. Cooperation in the development of improved instructional materials, professional development and teacher preparation programs aligned to the States' standards and assessments; and
- F. Obtaining comparable data that will enable policymakers and teachers to compare educational outcomes and to identify effective instructional practices and strategies.

X. Binding Commitments and Assurances

A. Binding Assurances Common To All States – Participating and Governing

Each State that joins the Consortium, whether as a Participating State or a Governing State, hereby certifies and represents that it:

1. Has all requisite power and authority necessary to execute this MOU;
2. Is familiar with the Consortium's Comprehensive Assessment Systems grant application under the ED's Race to the Top Fund Assessment Program and is supportive of and will work to implement the Consortium's plan, as defined by the Consortium and consistent with Addendum 1 (Notice);
3. Will cooperate fully with the Consortium and will carry out all of the responsibilities associated with its selected membership classification;
4. Will, as a condition of continued membership in the Consortium, adopt a common set of college- and career-ready standards no later than December 31, 2011, and common achievement standards no later than the 2014-2015 school year;
5. Will, as a condition of continued membership in the Consortium, ensure that the summative components of the assessment system (in both mathematics and English language arts) will be fully implemented statewide no later than the 2014-2015 school year, subject to the availability of funds;
6. Will conduct periodic reviews of its State laws, regulations and policies to identify any barriers to implementing the proposed assessment system and

address any such barriers prior to full implementation of the summative assessment components of the system:

- a. The State will take the necessary steps to accomplish implementation as described in Addendum 2 of this MOU.
7. Will use the Consortium-developed assessment systems to meet the assessment requirements in Title I of the ESEA;
 8. Will actively promote collaboration and alignment between the State and its public elementary and secondary education systems and their public Institutions of Higher Education ("IHE") or systems of IHEs. The State will endeavor to:
 - a. Maintain the commitments from participating public IHEs or IHE systems to participate in the design and development of the Consortium's high school summative assessments;
 - b. Obtain commitments from additional public IHEs or IHE systems to participate in the design and development of the Consortium's high school summative assessments;
 - c. Involve participating public IHEs or IHE systems in the Consortium's research-based process to establish common achievement standards on the new assessments that signal students' preparation for entry level, credit-bearing coursework; and
 - d. Obtain commitments from public IHEs or IHE systems to use the assessment in all partnership states' postsecondary institutions, along with any other placement requirement established by the IHE or IHE system, as an indicator of students' readiness for placement in non-remedial, credit-bearing college-level coursework.
 9. Will provide the required assurances regarding accountability, transparency, reporting, procurement and other assurances and certifications; and
 10. Consents to be bound by every statement and assurance in the grant application.

B. Additional Binding Assurances By Governing States

In addition to the assurances and commitments required of all States in the Consortium, a Governing State is bound by the following additional assurances and commitments:

1. Provide personnel to the Consortium in sufficient number and qualifications and for sufficient time to support the activities of the Consortium as described in Section VII (A)(1)(a)(iv) of this MOU.

XI. Financial Arrangements

This MOU does not constitute a financial commitment on the part of the Parties. Any financial arrangements associated with the Consortium will be covered by separate project agreements between the Consortium members and other entities, and subject to ordinary budgetary and administrative procedures. It is understood that the ability of the Parties to carry out their obligations is subject to the availability of funds and personnel through their respective funding procedures.

XII. Personal Property

Title to any personal property, such as computers, computer equipment, office supplies, and office equipment furnished by a State to the Consortium under this MOU shall remain with the State furnishing the same. All parties agree to exercise due care in handling such property. However, each party agrees to be responsible for any damage to its property which occurs in the performance of its duties under this MOU, and to waive any claim against the other party for such damage, whether arising through negligence or otherwise.

XIII. Liability and Risk of Loss

- A. To the extent permitted by law, with regard to activities undertaken pursuant to this MOU, none of the parties to this MOU shall make any claim against one another or their respective instrumentalities, agents or employees for any injury to or death of its own employees, or for damage to or loss of its own property, whether such injury, death, damage or loss arises through negligence or otherwise.
- B. To the extent permitted by law, if a risk of damage or loss is not dealt with expressly in this MOU, such party's liability to another party, whether or not arising as the result of alleged breach of the MOU, shall be limited to direct damages only and shall not include loss of revenue or profits or other indirect or consequential damages.

XIV. Resolution of Conflicts

Conflicts which may arise regarding the interpretation of the clauses of this MOU will be resolved by the Governing Board, and that decision will be considered final and not subject to further appeal or to review by any outside court or other tribunal.

XV. Modifications

The content of this MOU may be reviewed periodically or amended at any time as agreed upon by vote of the Governing Board.

XVI. Duration, Renewal, Termination

- A. This MOU will take effect upon execution of this MOU by at least five States as "Governing States" and will have a duration through calendar year 2015, unless otherwise extended by agreement of the Governing Board.
- B. This MOU may be terminated by decision of the Governing Board, or by withdrawal or termination of a sufficient number of Governing States so that there are fewer than five Governing States.
- C. Any member State of the Consortium may be involuntarily terminated by the Governing Board as a member for breach of any term of this MOU, or for breach of any term or condition that may be imposed by the Department of Education, the Consortium Governing Board, or of any applicable bylaws or regulations.

XVII. Points of Contact

Communications with the State regarding this MOU should be directed to:

Name: Kris Ellington, Assistant Deputy Commissioner, Office of Assessment

Mailing Address: 325 West Gaines Street, Suite 414, Tallahassee, Florida, 32399-0400

Telephone: (850) 245-0513

Fax: (850) 245-0793

E-mail: Kris.Ellington@fldoe.org

AND

Name: Linda Champion, Deputy Commissioner

Mailing Address: 325 West Gaines Street, Suite 1214, Tallahassee, Florida, 32399-0400

Telephone: (850) 245-0406

Fax: (850) 245-9378

E-mail: Linda.Champion@fldoe.org

Or hereafter to such other individual as may be designated by the State in writing transmitted to the Chair of the Governing Board and/or to the PARCC Project Management Partner.

XVIII. Signatures and Intent To Join in the Consortium

The State of Florida hereby joins the Consortium as a Governing State, and agrees to be bound by all of the assurances and commitments associated with the Governing State membership

XVI. Duration, Renewal, Termination

- A. This MOU will take effect upon execution of this MOU by at least five States as "Governing States" and will have a duration through calendar year 2015, unless otherwise extended by agreement of the Governing Board.
- B. This MOU may be terminated by decision of the Governing Board, or by withdrawal or termination of a sufficient number of Governing States so that there are fewer than five Governing States.
- C. Any member State of the Consortium may be involuntarily terminated by the Governing Board as a member for breach of any term of this MOU, or for breach of any term or condition that may be imposed by the Department of Education, the Consortium Governing Board, or of any applicable bylaws or regulations.

XVII. Points of Contact

Communications with the State regarding this MOU should be directed to:

Name: Kris Ellington, Assistant Deputy Commissioner, Office of Assessment

Mailing Address: 325 West Gaines Street, Suite 414, Tallahassee, Florida, 32399-0400

Telephone: (850) 245-0513

Fax: (850) 245-0793

E-mail: Kris.Ellington@fldoe.org

AND

Name: Linda Champion, Deputy Commissioner

Mailing Address: 325 West Gaines Street, Suite 1214, Tallahassee, Florida, 32399-0400

Telephone: (850) 245-0406

Fax: (850) 245-9378

E-mail: Linda.Champion@fldoe.org

Or hereafter to such other individual as may be designated by the State in writing transmitted to the Chair of the Governing Board and/or to the PARCC Project Management Partner.

XVIII. Signatures and Intent To Join in the Consortium

The State of Florida hereby joins the Consortium as a Governing State, and agrees to be bound by all of the assurances and commitments associated with the Governing State membership

classification. Further, the State of Florida agrees to perform the duties and carry out the responsibilities associated with the Governing State membership classification.




Signatures required:

- Each State's Governor;
- Each State's chief school officer; and
- If applicable, the president of the State board of education.

Addenda:

- **Addendum 1:** Department of Education Notice Inviting Applications for New Awards for Fiscal Year (FY) 2010.
- **Addendum 2:** Each State describes the process it plans to follow to ensure that it will be able to implement the assessment systems developed by the Consortium by the 2014-2015 school year, pursuant to Assurance 6 in Section X of this MOU.
- **Addendum 3:** Signature of each State's chief procurement official confirming that the State is able to participate in the Consortium's procurement process.

STATE SIGNATURE BLOCK

State of:	
Signature of the Governor: 	
Printed Name: Charlie Crist	Date: June 12, 2010
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: 	
Printed Name: Eric J. Smith	Date: June 15, 2010
Signature of the State Board of Education President (if applicable): 	
Printed Name: T. Willard Fair	Date: June 15, 2010

ADDENDUM 2:
FLORIDA ASSURANCE REGARDING PROCESS AND PLANS FOR IMPLEMENTING
PROPOSED ASSESSMENT SYSTEM

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

For

Race To The Top -- Comprehensive Assessment Systems Grant Partnership For
Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers Members

ADDENDUM 2: ASSURANCE REGARDING PROCESS AND PLANS FOR
IMPLEMENTING PROPOSED ASSESSMENT SYSTEM

June 3, 2010

Plan of Florida

Florida conducted a review of State laws, regulations and policies to identify current barriers to implementing the proposed assessment system. As a result of this review, Florida found several laws that would need to be revised to fully transition to a new assessment system, as well as several rules that would need to be revised to implement these revised laws. While revisions in laws and rules will be required, these revisions are not considered to be barriers to implementing the new common assessments because current Florida law authorizes the Commissioner of Education to design and implement student testing programs, for any grade level and subject area, in addition to those required in law. The revisions to Florida law would allow for the new assessments to replace the current assessment program.

The following references in the Florida Statutes (F.S.) are directly related to the statewide assessment program and would need to be revised to fully transition to the new assessments in grades 3-8 and high school:

- Section 1008.22, F.S., defines the statewide K-12 assessment program, its purposes, and its components; requires the State Board of Education to approve student performance standards in various subject areas and grade levels which form the basis for the statewide assessment tests; requires public school students to earn passing scores on the Grade 10 statewide assessment test or an alternative test to qualify for a standard high school diploma; and authorizes the use of alternative tests to the Grade 10 FCAT when concordant scores can be determined and establishes certain requirements for the use of concordant scores. CHANGES REQUIRED: Amendments would be needed to specify new assessment requirements based on the new Common Core State Standards.
- Section 1008.25, F.S., requires districts to have a comprehensive program for student progression that incorporates statewide assessment results; specifies participation in the statewide assessment tests is required for all students; requires students scoring at a Level 1 on the statewide assessment test in reading for Grade 3 to be retained; and provides for good cause exemptions to the required retention. CHANGES REQUIRED: Amendments would be needed to specify new requirements based on the new assessments.
- Section 1008.34, F.S., specifies the requirements for Florida's school grading system, including the assessments that are used in school grades calculations. CHANGES

ADDENDUM 2:
FLORIDA ASSURANCE REGARDING PROCESS AND PLANS FOR IMPLEMENTING
PROPOSED ASSESSMENT SYSTEM

REQUIRED: Amendments would be needed to specify new requirements based on the new assessments.

In addition, the following State Board of Education rules relate to the various assessment requirements and accountability programs that would need to have references and requirements related to FCAT changed to the new standards and assessments, and references to the new college readiness assessments incorporated:

- 6A-1.09422, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test® Requirements
- 6A-1.0943, F.A.C., Statewide Assessment for Students with Disabilities
- 6A-1.09432, F.A.C., Assessment of Limited English Language Learners
- 6A-1.094221, F.A.C., Alternative Standardized Reading Assessment and Use of Student Portfolio for Good Cause Promotion
- 6A-1.094222, F.A.C., Standards for Mid-Year Promotion of Retained Third Graders
- 6A-1.09981, F.A.C., Implementation of Florida's System of School Improvement and Accountability
- 6A-10.0315, F.A.C., College Preparatory Testing, Placement, and Instruction

Florida's Commissioner of Education will work closely with Florida's Governor and legislative leaders to propose the required changes to Florida's laws through the annual, routine process of preparing for Florida's legislative session. This process includes working with legislative staff to prepare amendments to current statute based on educational priorities and implementation schedules. Once amendments are proposed, they are supported throughout the legislative session with briefings and other support systems to ensure that legislative leaders fully understand, and are able to support, the changes to the assessment system. As changes are made to Florida law, these changes will be implemented in the appropriate State Board of Education rules.

While Florida has conducted this review of current laws and rules, Florida will continue to conduct periodic reviews of Florida laws, regulations and policies to identify any barriers to implementing new aspects of the proposed assessment system, if applicable, and will address any such barriers prior to full implementation of the summative assessment components of the system. The necessary steps required to amend Florida laws, regulations and policies will follow the same routine processes that Florida has in place and has used successfully to increase educational standards over the years.

Timeline:

- January—May 2013: The Commissioner will hold legislative workshops to begin the development of changes required in Florida laws to fully transition to the new assessment system in 2014-15.
- June—August 2013: The Commissioner will prepare the 2014-15 legislative budget request to include the necessary funding to support the new assessment system.
- September—November 2013: The Commissioner will recommend the final changes to Florida laws and the final legislative budget request to the State Board of Education for

ADDENDUM 2:
FLORIDA ASSURANCE REGARDING PROCESS AND PLANS FOR IMPLEMENTING
PROPOSED ASSESSMENT SYSTEM

approval. Once approved, the Department's legislative package will be transmitted to the Governor for approval and use during the 2014 legislative session.

- March—May 2014: The Commissioner will seek legislative approval for changes to Florida laws and for the legislative budget request.
- May—July 2014: The Commissioner will seek State Board of Education approval on required rule modifications to implement revised Florida laws.
- August 2014: Florida begins full implementation of the new assessment system.

ADDENDUM 3:
FLORIDA ASSURANCE REGARDING PARTICIPATION IN CONSORTIUM
PROCUREMENT PROCESS

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

For

Race To The Top -- Comprehensive Assessment Systems Grant Partnership For
Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers Members

ADDENDUM 3: ASSURANCE REGARDING PARTICIPATION
IN CONSORTIUM PROCUREMENT PROCESS

June 3, 2010

The signature of the chief procurement official of Florida on Addendum 3 to the Memorandum of Understanding for the Race to the Top Comprehensive Assessment Systems Grant Partnership For Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers ("Consortium") Members constitutes an assurance that the chief procurement official has determined that Florida may, consistent with its applicable procurement laws and regulations, participate in and make procurements using the Consortium's procurement processes described herein.

I. Consortium Procurement Process

This section describes the procurement process that will be used by the Consortium. The Governing Board of the Consortium reserves the right to revise this procurement process as necessary and appropriate, consistent with its prevailing governance and operational policies and procedures. In the event of any such revision, the Consortium shall furnish a revised Addendum Three to each State in the Consortium for the signature by its chief procurement official.

1. *Competitive Procurement Process; Best Value Source Selection.* The Consortium will procure supplies and services that are necessary to carry out its objectives as defined by the Governing Board of the Consortium and as described in the grant application by a competitive process and will make source selection determinations on a "best value" basis.
2. *Compliance with federal procurement requirements.* The Consortium procurement process shall comply with all applicable federal procurement requirements, including the requirements of the Department of Education's grant regulation at 34 CFR § 80.36, "Procurement," and the requirements applicable to projects funded under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 ("ARRA").
3. *Lead State for Procurement.* The Fiscal Agent of the Consortium shall act as the Lead State for Procurement on behalf of the Consortium, or shall designate another Governing State to serve the Consortium in this capacity. The Lead State for Procurement shall conduct procurements in a manner consistent with its own procurement statutes and regulations.
4. *Types of Procurements to be Conducted.* The Lead State for Procurement shall conduct two types of procurements: (a) procurements with the grant funds provided by the

ADDENDUM 3:
FLORIDA ASSURANCE REGARDING PARTICIPATION IN CONSORTIUM
PROCUREMENT PROCESS

Department of Education to the Fiscal Agent, and (b) procurements funded by a Consortium member State's non-grant funds.

5. *Manner of Conducting Procurements with Grant Funds.* Procurements with grant funds shall be for the acquisition of supplies and/or services relating only to the design, development, and evaluation of the Consortium's assessment system, and a vendor awarded a contract in this category shall be paid by grant funds disbursed by the Fiscal Agent at the direction of the Governing Board of the Consortium. The Lead State for Procurement shall conduct the procurement and perform the following tasks, and such other tasks as may be required or necessary to conduct the procurement effectively, in a manner consistent with its own State procurement laws and regulations, provided however that such procurements involve a competitive process and best value source selection:
 - a. Issue the procurement documents;
 - b. Receive and evaluate responses to the procurement;
 - c. Make source selection determinations on a best value basis;
 - d. Execute a contract with the awardee(s);
 - e. Administer awarded contracts.

6. *Manner of Conducting Procurements with State Funds.* The Consortium shall conduct procurements related to the implementation of operational assessments using the cooperative purchasing model described in this section.
 - a. The Lead State for Procurement shall conduct such procurements and perform the following tasks, and such other tasks as may be required or necessary to conduct the procurement effectively, in a manner consistent with its own State procurement laws and regulations, provided however that such procurements involve a competitive process and best value source selection:
 - i. Issue the procurement documents, and include a provision that identifies the States in the Consortium and provides that each such State may make purchases or place orders under the contract resulting from the competition at the prices established during negotiations with offerors and at the quantities dictated by each ordering State;
 - ii. Receive and evaluate responses;
 - iii. Make source selection determinations on a best value basis;
 - iv. Execute a contract with the awardee(s);
 - v. Administer awarded contracts.

 - b. A Consortium State other than the Lead State for Procurement shall place orders or make purchases under a contract awarded by the Lead State for Procurement pursuant to the cooperative purchasing authority provided for under its state procurement code and regulations, or other similar authority as may exist or be created or permitted under the applicable laws and regulations of that State.

**ADDENDUM 3:
FLORIDA ASSURANCE REGARDING PARTICIPATION IN CONSORTIUM
PROCUREMENT PROCESS**

- i. An ordering State shall execute an agreement ("Participating Addendum") with the contractor, which shall be incorporated into the contract. The Participating Addendum will address, as necessary, the scope of the relationship between the contractor and the State; any modifications to contract terms and conditions; the price agreement between the contractor and the State; the use of any servicing subcontractors and lease agreements; and shall provide the contact information for key personnel in the State, and any other specific information as may be relevant and/or necessary.

II. Assurance Regarding Participation in Consortium Procurement Process

I, Linda South, in my capacity as the chief procurement official for Florida, confirm by my signature below that Florida may, consistent with the procurement laws and regulations of Florida, participate in the Consortium procurement processes described in this Addendum 3 to the Memorandum of Understanding For Race To The Top -- Comprehensive Assessment Systems Grant Consortium Members.

(b)(6)

Linda H. South, Secretary
Department of Management Services
State of Florida
June 9, 2010

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



Gerard Robinson
Commissioner of Education

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

KATHLEEN SHANAHAN, *Chair*

ROBERTO MARTÍNEZ, *Vice Chair*

Members

SALLY BRADSHAW

GARY CHARTRAND

DR. AKSHAY DESAI

BARBARA S. FEINGOLD

JOHN R. FADGET



October 11, 2011

Commissioner Mitchell Chester
Chair, PARCC Governing Board
75 Pleasant Street
Malden, MA 02148-4906

Dear Commissioner Chester,

On February 16, 2011, Florida Governor Rick Scott signed a renewed commitment to the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for Colleges and Careers Consortium (Consortium) on behalf of the state. This recommitment is required per the Consortium states' Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) each time a member state undergoes a change in governor or chief state school officer.

I was appointed Florida's Commissioner of Education by the Florida State Board of Education on June 21, 2011 as successor to Commissioner Eric Smith. As per the Consortium MOU, I am writing this letter to affirm Florida's continued commitment to the Consortium and to the binding commitments made by my predecessor.


Florida has been a strong leader in the Consortium's work thus far, and I assure you that our state will continue to work diligently to help develop world-class assessments and stakeholder supports.

Sincerely,


Handwritten signature of Gerard Robinson in cursive script.
Gerard Robinson

cc: Kris Ellington
Laura Slover

*Signature Block for Recommitment to Participation as a Governing State in PARCC
as outlined in the*
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING for
PARTNERSHIP FOR ASSESSMENT OF READINESS FOR COLLEGE AND
CAREERS MEMBERS (June 2010)

State of: FLORIDA	
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: 	
Printed Name: Gerard Robinson	Date: 10/11/11

STATE SIGNATURE BLOCK

State of:	
Signature of the Governor: 	
Printed Name: Rick Scott	Date: February 16, 2011
Signature of the Chief State School Officer:	
Printed Name:	Date:
Signature of the State Board of Education President (if applicable):	
Printed Name:	Date:

Attachment 8

A copy of the average statewide proficiency based on assessments administered in the 2010-2011 school year in reading/language arts and mathematics for the “all students” group and all subgroups

Percentage of Students Scoring Level 3 and Above in Math and Reading in 2011

Group	Percentage Scoring Proficient in Reading	Percentage Scoring Proficient in Math
All Students	62	68
WHITE	73	78
BLACK	44	51
HISPANIC	59	66
ASIAN	78	88
AMERICAN INDIAN	61	68
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	53	59
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	42	53
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	35	41

Attachment 9

Table 2: Reward, Priority, and Focus Schools

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	EASTSIDE HIGH SCHOOL	120003000028	X		
	F. W. BUCHHOLZ HIGH SCHOOL	120003000029	X		
	GAINESVILLE HIGH SCHOOL	120003000013	X		
	NEWBERRY HIGH SCHOOL	120003000019	X		
	HAWTHORNE MIDDLE/HIGH SCHOOL	120003000016			X
	PROFESSIONAL ACADEMY MAGNET AT LOFTEN HIGH SCHOOL	120003000027			X
	J. J. FINLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120003000002	X		
	STEPHEN FOSTER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120003000003	X		
	LITTLEWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120003000007	X		
	ABRAHAM LINCOLN MIDDLE SCHOOL	120003000010	X		
	HOWARD W. BISHOP MIDDLE SCHOOL	120003000011	X		
	WESTWOOD MIDDLE SCHOOL	120003000012	X		
	ARCHER ELEMENTARY	120003000015	X		
	MYRA TERWILLIGER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120003000023	X		
	GLEN SPRINGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120003000025	X		
	HIGH SPRINGS COMMUNITY SCHOOL	120003003989	X		
	FORT CLARKE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120003000032	X		
	HIDDEN OAK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120003002588	X		
	KIMBALL WILES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120003002465	X		
	KANAPAHA MIDDLE SCHOOL	120003003022	X		
	NEWBERRY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120003000033	X		
	WILLIAM S. TALBOT ELEM SCHOOL	120003002466	X		
	OAK VIEW MIDDLE SCHOOL	120003000619	X		
	THE ONE ROOM SCHOOL HOUSE PROJECT	120003003144	X		
	MICANOPY AREA COOPERATIVE SCHOOL, INC.	120003003145	X		
	ALACHUA LEARNING CENTER	120003003534	X		
	MICANOPY MIDDLE SCHOOL, INC.	120003003811	X		
	SWEETWATER BRANCH ACADEMY	120003007457	X		
	CHARLES W. DUVAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120003000001	X		
	CHESTER SHELL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120003000021	X		
	LAKE FOREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120003000005			X
	W. A. METCALFE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120003000008			X
	IDYLWILD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120003000024			X
	MARJORIE KINNAN RAWLINGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120003000026			X
	SWEETWATER BRANCH ACADEMY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120003007867		X	

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	BAKER COUNTY SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120006000035			X
	BAKER COUNTY MIDDLE SCHOOL	120006000037	X		
	J FRANKLYN KELLER INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL	120006002647			X
	BAY HIGH SCHOOL	120009000039	X		
	RUTHERFORD HIGH SCHOOL	120009000064	X		
	MERRITT BROWN MIDDLE SCHOOL	120009002589	X		
	HUTCHISON BEACH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120009000040	X		
	MERRIAM CHERRY STREET ELEMENTARY	120009000043	X		
	HILAND PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120009000047	X		
	JINKS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120009000048	X		
	LYNN HAVEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120009000049	X		
	SURFSIDE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120009002665	X		
	SOUTHPORT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120009000053	X		
	MOWAT MIDDLE SCHOOL	120009000063	X		
	NORTHSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120009000065	X		
	TYNDALL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120009000068	X		
	TOMMY SMITH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120009000059	X		
	PATRONIS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120009002976	X		
	BREAKFAST POINT ACADEMY	120009007518	X		
	BAY HAVEN CHARTER ACADEMY	120009003676	X		
	BAY HAVEN CHARTER MIDDLE SCHOOL	120009005429	X		
	NORTH BAY HAVEN CHARTER ACADEMY MIDDLE SCHOOL	120009007791	X		
	NORTH BAY HAVEN CHARTER ACADEMY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120009007896	X		
	CALLAWAY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120009000042	X		
	LUCILLE MOORE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120009000045	X		
	EVERITT MIDDLE SCHOOL	120009000046	X		
	OSCAR PATTERSON ELEMENTARY MAGNET	120009000060	X		
	NEWPOINT ACADEMY	120009007779			X
D	BRADFORD HIGH SCHOOL	120012000070			X
D	STARKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120012000071	X		
D	LAWTEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120012000073	X		
D	BRADFORD MIDDLE SCHOOL	120012000076	X		
	COCOA HIGH SCHOOL	120015000100	X		
	MELBOURNE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120015000103	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	WESTSHORE JUNIOR/SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120015003296	X		
	EDGEWOOD JR/SR HIGH SCHOOL	120015000119	X		
	SATELLITE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120015000131	X		
	OAK PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015000079	X		
	JAMES MADISON MIDDLE SCHOOL	120015000080	X		
	APOLLO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015000081	X		
	COQUINA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015000083	X		
	MIMS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015000084	X		
	SOUTH LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015000085	X		
	ANDREW JACKSON MIDDLE SCHOOL	120015000086	X		
	IMPERIAL ESTATES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015000087	X		
	PINEWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015000089	X		
	CHALLENGER 7 ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015002483	X		
	ATLANTIS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015002662	X		
	ENTERPRISE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015002036	X		
	CAMBRIDGE ELEMENTARY MAGNET SCHOOL	120015000093	X		
	GOLFVIEW ELEMENTARY MAGNET SCH	120015000095	X		
	RONALD MCNAIR MAGNET MIDDLE	120015000096	X		
	FAIRGLEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015000097	X		
	JOHN F. KENNEDY MIDDLE SCHOOL	120015000098	X		
	SATURN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015000101	X		
	HANS CHRISTIAN ANDERSEN ELEMENTARY	120015000102	X		
	RALPH M WILLIAMS JUNIOR ELEMENTARY	120015003538	X		
	MANATEE ELEMENTARY	120015004061	X		
	MEADOWLANE INTERMEDIATE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015007391	X		
	W. MELBOURNE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL FOR SCIENCE	120015004308	X		
	PORT MALABAR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015002038	X		
	STONE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120015000107	X		
	PALM BAY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015000108	X		
	LOCKMAR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015002112	X		
	SOUTHWEST MIDDLE SCHOOL	120015002590	X		
	COLUMBIA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015002484	X		
	DISCOVERY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015002591	X		
	CHRISTA MCAULIFFE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015002485	X		
	RIVIERA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015002698	X		
	JUPITER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015002799	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	WESTSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015003294	X		
	SUNRISE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015004246	X		
	CENTRAL MIDDLE SCHOOL	120015000110	X		
	LYNDON B. JOHNSON MIDDLE SCHOOL	120015000111	X		
	SHERWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015000112	X		
	HARBOR CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015000113	X		
	CROTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015000116	X		
	ROY ALLEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015000117	X		
	SUNTREE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015000091	X		
	LONGLEAF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015003295	X		
	QUEST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015003978	X		
	MILA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015000120	X		
	TROPICAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015000121	X		
	AUDUBON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015000122	X		
	ROBERT L. STEVENSON ELEMENTARY	120015004310	X		
	GARDENDALE ELEMENTARY MAGNET SCHOOL	120015000124	X		
	THOMAS JEFFERSON MIDDLE SCHOOL	120015000125	X		
	LEWIS CARROLL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015000126	X		
	THEODORE ROOSEVELT ELEMENTARY	120015000128	X		
	FREEDOM 7 ELEMENTARY SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES	120015004311	X		
	CAPE VIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015000130	X		
	DELAURA MIDDLE SCHOOL	120015000132	X		
	SPESSARD L. HOLLAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015000133	X		
	SEA PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015000134	X		
	SURFSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015000135	X		
	OCEAN BREEZE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015000136	X		
	INDIALANTIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015000137	X		
	HERBERT C. HOOVER MIDDLE SCHOOL	120015000138	X		
	GEMINI ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015000139	X		
	DR. W.J. CREEL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120015000140	X		
	SCULPTOR CHARTER SCHOOL	120015003541	X		
	PALM BAY COMMUNITY CHARTER-PATRIOT CAMPUS	120015007090	X		
	ENDEAVOUR ELEMENTARY MAGNET	120015000094			X
	IMAGINE SCHOOLS AT WEST MELBOURNE	120015003979		X	
	POMPANO BEACH HIGH SCHOOL	120018003301	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	CORAL SPRINGS HIGH SCHOOL	120018000225	X		
	NOVA HIGH SCHOOL	120018000234	X		
	WILLIAM T. MCFATTER TECHNICAL CENTER	120018002488	X		
	COOPER CITY HIGH SCHOOL	120018000265	X		
	SOUTH PLANTATION HIGH SCHOOL	120018000272	X		
	WESTERN HIGH SCHOOL	120018002120	X		
	CYPRESS BAY HIGH SCHOOL	120018003815	X		
	WEST BROWARD HIGH SCHOOL	120018007555	X		
	CITY OF CORAL SPRINGS CHARTER	120018003545	X		
	CITY/PEMBROKE PINES CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL	120018004318	X		
	SOMERSET ACADEMY CHARTER HIGH	120018003823	X		
	SOUTH BROWARD HIGH SCHOOL	120018000153	X		
	STRANAHAN HIGH SCHOOL	120018000157	X		
	DILLARD HIGH SCHOOL	120018000169	X		
	FORT LAUDERDALE HIGH SCHOOL	120018000217	X		
	PLANTATION HIGH SCHOOL	120018000241	X		
	DEERFIELD BEACH HIGH SCHOOL	120018000251	X		
	MIRAMAR HIGH SCHOOL	120018000253	X		
	EVERGLADES HIGH SCHOOL	120018004052	X		
	BLANCHE ELY HIGH SCHOOL	120018000168	X		
	HOLLYWOOD HILLS HIGH SCHOOL	120018000247	X		
	COCONUT CREEK HIGH SCHOOL	120018000249	X		
	BOYD H. ANDERSON HIGH SCHOOL	120018000252	X		
	PARKWAY ACADEMY	120018003689			X
	EAGLE ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL	120018004055			X
	DEERFIELD BEACH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000141	X		
	OAKLAND PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000143	X		
	DANIA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000147	X		
	HOLLYWOOD HILLS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000148	X		
	HALLANDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000150	X		
	WEST HOLLYWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000152	X		
	WILTON MANORS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000155	X		
	BENNETT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000156	X		
	CROISSANT PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000158	X		
	SUNRISE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120018000161	X		
	COLLINS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000165	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	ATTUCKS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120018000167	X		
	NORTH ANDREWS GARDENS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000181	X		
	MIRAMAR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000182	X		
	BAYVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000192	X		
	STIRLING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000196	X		
	ORANGE BROOK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000198	X		
	DRIFTWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000199	X		
	TROPICAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000200	X		
	BROADVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000204	X		
	FLORANADA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000207	X		
	DRIFTWOOD MIDDLE SCHOOL	120018000208	X		
	CRESTHAVEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000212	X		
	STEPHEN FOSTER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000214	X		
	PETERS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000215	X		
	BOULEVARD HEIGHTS ELEMENTARY	120018000218	X		
	WILLIAM DANDY MIDDLE SCHOOL	120018000222	X		
	LLOYD ESTATES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000223	X		
	COOPER CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000229	X		
	PLANTATION PARK ELEMENTARY	120018000232	X		
	NOVA DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER ELEM	120018000233	X		
	NOVA BLANCHE FORMAN ELEMENTARY	120018000235	X		
	NOVA MIDDLE SCHOOL	120018000236	X		
	SHERIDAN PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000237	X		
	LAUDERHILL PAUL TURNER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000238	X		
	COCONUT CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000240	X		
	ANNABEL C. PERRY ELEMENTARY	120018000245	X		
	HOLLYWOOD PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000254	X		
	APOLLO MIDDLE SCHOOL	120018000256	X		
	SHERIDAN HILLS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000257	X		
	MIRROR LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000259	X		
	PINES MIDDLE SCHOOL	120018000262	X		
	SEMINOLE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120018000263	X		
	JAMES S. HUNT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000267	X		
	BANYAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018002039	X		
	CORAL COVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018004039	X		
	GLADES MIDDLE SCHOOL	120018004038	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	BEACHSIDE MONTESSORI VILLAGE	120018007843	X		
	WESTPINE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120018000145	X		
	PASADENA LAKES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000268	X		
	JAMES S. RICKARDS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120018002802	X		
	ATLANTIC WEST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000273	X		
	HORIZON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000274	X		
	FLAMINGO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000275	X		
	CORAL SPRINGS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120018000277	X		
	PIONEER MIDDLE SCHOOL	120018000278	X		
	TAMARAC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000280	X		
	FOREST HILLS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000281	X		
	CENTRAL PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018002701	X		
	PEMBROKE LAKES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000282	X		
	NOB HILL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000283	X		
	WESTCHESTER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000284	X		
	RAMBLEWOOD MIDDLE SCHOOL	120018000286	X		
	MAPLEWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018002044	X		
	DAVIE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018002041	X		
	GRIFFIN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018002043	X		
	SEA CASTLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018002720	X		
	WELLEBY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000146	X		
	RIVERGLADES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018001355	X		
	EVERGLADES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018003302	X		
	CHAPEL TRAIL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018002979	X		
	COUNTRY ISLES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018002542	X		
	WALTER C. YOUNG MIDDLE SCHOOL	120018002703	X		
	RIVERSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018002491	X		
	FOREST GLEN MIDDLE SCHOOL	120018002544	X		
	SANDPIPER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018002594	X		
	SILVER RIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018002545	X		
	WINSTON PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018002705	X		
	LYONS CREEK MIDDLE SCHOOL	120018004314	X		
	COUNTRY HILLS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018002706	X		
	QUIET WATERS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018002803	X		
	HAWKES BLUFF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018002707	X		
	TEQUESTA TRACE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120018002722	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	PARK SPRINGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018002708	X		
	INDIAN TRACE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018002723	X		
	EMBASSY CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000154	X		
	PALM COVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000193	X		
	VIRGINIA SHUMAN YOUNG ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018002080	X		
	SILVER TRAIL MIDDLE SCHOOL	120018002981	X		
	SILVER LAKES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018003303	X		
	SAWGRASS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000194	X		
	SAWGRASS SPRINGS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120018003030	X		
	EAGLE RIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018002982	X		
	EAGLE POINT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018002081	X		
	INDIAN RIDGE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120018002983	X		
	TRADEWINDS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018003031	X		
	SILVER PALMS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018002984	X		
	FOX TRAIL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018003304	X		
	PANTHER RUN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018003154	X		
	SILVER SHORES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018003814	X		
	LAKESIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018003305	X		
	FALCON COVE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120018004316	X		
	PARKSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018004317	X		
	GATOR RUN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018003306	X		
	SUNSET LAKES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018003816	X		
	COCONUT PALM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018003681	X		
	DOLPHIN BAY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018004040	X		
	CHALLENGER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018003682	X		
	PARK TRAILS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018003683	X		
	LIBERTY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018003818	X		
	MANATEE BAY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018003819	X		
	WESTGLADES MIDDLE SCHOOL	120018003820	X		
	NEW RENAISSANCE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120018003821	X		
	HERON HEIGHTS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018007654	X		
	DISCOVERY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018007250	X		
	MILLENNIUM MIDDLE SCHOOL	120018003822	X		
	IMAGINE MIDDLE SCHOOL AT BROWARD	120018007881	X		
	CHARTER SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE	120018003156	X		
	CENTRAL CHARTER SCHOOL	120018003157	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	CITY OF PEMBROKE PINES CHARTER	120018003307	X		
	CITY/PEMBROKE PINES CHARTER MIDDLE SCHOOL	120018003544	X		
	IMAGINE CHARTER SCHOOL AT WESTON	120018003685	X		
	SOMERSET ACADEMY	120018004320	X		
	SOMERSET ACADEMY MIDDLE SCHOOL	120018003686	X		
	NORTH BROWARD ACADEMY OF EXCELLENCE	120018003687	X		
	CHARTER SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE TAMARAC 1	120018007582	X		
	SOMERSET ACADEMY DAVIE CHARTER	120018004054	X		
	CHARTER SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE AT DAVIE	120018007476	X		
	HOLLYWOOD ACADEMY OF ARTS & SCIENCE	120018004215	X		
	FLORIDA INTERCULTURAL ACADEMY	120018005455	X		
	HOLLYWOOD ACADEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120018005456	X		
	NORTH BROWARD ACADEMY OF EXCELLENCE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120018005458	X		
	PARAGON ELEMENTARY CHARTER SCHOOL	120018005459	X		
	PARAGON ACADEMY OF TECHNOLOGY	120018005460	X		
	SOMERSET ACADEMY EAST PREPARATORY	120018007569	X		
	POMPANO CHARTER MIDDLE SCHOOL	120018004462	X		
	BROWARD COMMUNITY CHARTER WEST	120018004469	X		
	SOMERSET ACADEMY ELEMENTARY (MIRAMAR CAMPUS)	120018004471	X		
	SOMERSET ACADEMY MIDDLE (MIRAMAR CAMPUS)	120018004472	X		
	BEN GAMLA CHARTER SCHOOL	120018006981	X		
	IMAGINE CHARTER SCHOOL OF BROWARD	120018007386	X		
	SOMERSET PREPARATORY CHARTER MIDDLE SCHOOL	120018007832	X		
	DILLARD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000162	X		
	LARKDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000190	X		
	LAKE FOREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000205	X		
	PALMVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000224	X		
	CASTLE HILL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000242	X		
	VILLAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000244	X		
	ORIOLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000258	X		
	PARK RIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000266	X		
	GULFSTREAM MIDDLE SCHOOL	120018005426	X		
	SMART SCHOOL CHARTER MIDDLE	120018003309	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	BROWARD COMMUNITY CHARTER SCHOOL	120018004209	X		
	DISCOVERY MIDDLE CHARTER SCHOOL	120018007265	X		
	WALKER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (MAGNET)	120018000164	X		
	NORTH FORK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000228	X		
	MARTIN LUTHER KING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000243	X		
	NORTH LAUDERDALE ELEMENTARY	120018000271	X		
	RISE ACADEMY II	120018007560	X		
	DEERFIELD PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000170			X
	LAUDERDALE MANORS ELEMENTARY	120018000173			X
	BROWARD ESTATES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000179			X
	SUNLAND PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000189			X
	PLANTATION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000216			X
	LAUDERHILL MIDDLE SCHOOL	120018000239			X
	ROYAL PALM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120018000260			X
	ARTHUR ROBERT ASHE, JUNIOR MIDDLE SCHOOL	120018004053			X
	SOMERSET PREPARATORY ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL AT NORTH LAUDERDALE	120018007780			X
	SUNSHINE ELEMENTARY CHARTER SCHOOL	120018004467			X
	IMAGINE CHARTER/N LAUDERDALE	120018003688		X	
	IMAGINE AT N LAUDERDALE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120018003824		X	
	CHARTER SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE AT RIVERLAND	120018007503		X	
	BROWARD COMMUNITY CHARTER MIDDLE SCHOOL	120018004296		X	
	BLOUNTSTOWN HIGH SCHOOL	120021000290	X		
	BLOUNTSTOWN MIDDLE SCHOOL	120021000291	X		
	CARR ELEMENTARY & MIDDLE SCHOOL	120021000292	X		
	BLOUNTSTOWN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120021000294	X		
E	CHARLOTTE HIGH SCHOOL	120024000296	X		
E	LEMON BAY HIGH SCHOOL	120024000298	X		
E	SALLIE JONES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120024000295	X		
E	PEACE RIVER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120024000297	X		
E	EAST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120024000300	X		
E	PUNTA GORDA MIDDLE SCHOOL	120024000302	X		
E	MEADOW PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120024000304	X		
E	L. A. AINGER MIDDLE SCHOOL	120024002422	X		
E	VINELAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120024002548	X		
E	LIBERTY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120024002549	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
E	MURDOCK MIDDLE SCHOOL	120024002668	X		
E	DEEP CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120024002725	X		
E	KINGSWAY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120024003333	X		
E	EDISON COLLEGIATE HIGH SCHOOL	120024007659	X		
	CITRUS HIGH SCHOOL	120027000305	X		
	CRYSTAL RIVER HIGH SCHOOL	120027000314	X		
	LECANTO HIGH SCHOOL	120027002425	X		
	PLEASANT GROVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120027002595	X		
	FOREST RIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120027004325	X		
	INVERNESS PRIMARY SCHOOL	120027000306	X		
	CENTRAL RIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120027006894	X		
	INVERNESS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120027000307	X		
	FLORAL CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120027000309	X		
	HOMOSSA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120027000310	X		
	CRYSTAL RIVER MIDDLE SCHOOL	120027000312	X		
	CRYSTAL RIVER PRIMARY SCHOOL	120027000313	X		
	LECANTO PRIMARY SCHOOL	120027002424	X		
	LECANTO MIDDLE SCHOOL	120027002123	X		
	HERNANDO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120027002426	X		
	CITRUS SPRINGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120027002493	X		
	ROCK CRUSHER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120027002727	X		
	CITRUS SPRINGS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120027002089	X		
	KEYSTONE HEIGHTS JUNIOR/SENIOR HIGH	120030000328	X		
	FLEMING ISLAND HIGH SCHOOL	120030004062	X		
	ORANGE PARK HIGH SCHOOL	120030000323	X		
	CLAY HIGH SCHOOL	120030000330	X		
	GREEN COVE SPRINGS JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120030000317	X		
	ORANGE PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120030000320	X		
	W E CHERRY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120030000322	X		
	DOCTORS INLET ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120030000325	X		
	MIDDLEBURG ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120030000326	X		
	KEYSTONE HEIGHTS ELEMENTARY	120030000327	X		
	S BRYAN JENNINGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120030000329	X		
	LAKESIDE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120030000331	X		
	LAKESIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120030000332	X		
	ORANGE PARK JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120030000333	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	WILKINSON JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120030000334	X		
	RIDGEVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120030002287	X		
	LAKE ASBURY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120030002550	X		
	ROBERT M. PATERSON ELEMENTARY	120030000203	X		
	LAKE ASBURY JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120030005468	X		
	TYNES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120030002092	X		
	FLEMING ISLAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120030003037	X		
	THUNDERBOLT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120030004328	X		
	RIDEOUT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120030003691	X		
	SWIMMING PEN CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120030004190	X		
	ARGYLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120030005469	X		
	COPPERGATE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120030005773	X		
	OAKLEAF JUNIOR HIGH	120030007174	X		
	OAKLEAF VILLAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120030007243	X		
	SHADOWLAWN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120030007389	X		
	PLANTATION OAKS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120030007450	X		
	CHARLES E. BENNETT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120030000319	X		
	BARRON COLLIER HIGH SCHOOL	120033000357	X		
	EVERGLADES CITY SCHOOL	120033000336	X		
	NAPLES HIGH SCHOOL	120033000343	X		
	PALMETTO RIDGE HIGH SCHOOL	120033003960	X		
	IMMOKALEE HIGH SCHOOL	120033000355	X		
	GOLDEN GATE HIGH SCHOOL	120033003959	X		
	LORENZO WALKER TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL	120033004488			X
	GULFVIEW MIDDLE SCHOOL	120033000337	X		
	TOMMIE BARFIELD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120033000341	X		
	SEA GATE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120033000345	X		
	EAST NAPLES MIDDLE SCHOOL	120033000349	X		
	NAPLES PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120033000352	X		
	PINE RIDGE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120033000353	X		
	BIG CYPRESS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120033002496	X		
	VINEYARDS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120033002730	X		
	LAUREL OAK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120033001382	X		
	OAKRIDGE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120033001383	X		
	PELICAN MARSH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120033003038	X		
	CORKSCREW MIDDLE SCHOOL	120033004329	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	NORTH NAPLES MIDDLE SCHOOL	120033003961	X		
	VETERANS MEMORIAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120033004490	X		
	MIKE DAVIS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120033007423	X		
	MARCO ISLAND CHARTER MIDDLE	120033003339	X		
	SHADOWLAWN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120033000342	X		
	IMMOKALEE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120033000269	X		
	MANATEE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120033002985	X		
	EDEN PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120033007371	X		
	IMMOKALEE COMMUNITY SCHOOL	120033004330	X		
	PINECREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120033000344			X
	LAKE TRAFFORD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120033000347			X
	GOLDEN GATE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120033000351			X
	GOLDEN TERRACE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120033002677			X
	PARKSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120033004495			X
A	COLUMBIA HIGH SCHOOL	120036000358	X		
A	MELROSE PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120036000360	X		
A	EASTSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120036000361	X		
A	FORT WHITE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120036000363	X		
A	SUMMERS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120036000364	X		
A	LAKE CITY MIDDLE SCHOOL	120036002732	X		
A	COLUMBIA CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120036002102	X		
A	WESTSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120036004332	X		
A	PINEMOUNT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120036007330	X		
A	NIBLACK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120036000365	X		
	INTERNATIONAL STUDIES CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL	120039003977	X		
	DORAL PERFORMING ARTS & ENTERTAINMENT ACADEMY	120039005493	X		
	DORAL ACADEMY CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL	120039003699	X		
	ACADEMY OF ARTS & MINDS	120039003973	X		
	YOUNG WOMENS PREPARATORY ACADEMY	120039007016	X		
	CORAL GABLES SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120039000590	X		
	DESIGN & ARCHITECTURE SENIOR HIGH	120039002736	X		
	CORAL REEF SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120039003052	X		
	DR MICHAEL M. KROP SENIOR HIGH	120039003345	X		
	MATER ACADEMY CHARTER HIGH	120039003838	X		
	MAST ACADEMY	120039002809	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	RONALD W. REAGAN/DORAL SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120039004726	X		
	ROBERT MORGAN EDUCATIONAL CENTER	120039004078	X		
	MIAMI LAKES EDUCATIONAL CENTER	120039004339	X		
	SOUTHWEST MIAMI SENIOR HIGH	120039000615	X		
	FELIX VARELA SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120039004340	X		
	NEW WORLD SCHOOL OF THE ARTS	120039002810	X		
	MATER ACADEMY EAST CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL	120039007242	X		
	WESTLAND HIALEAH SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120039005861	X		
	MIAMI KILLIAN SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120039000602	X		
	WILLIAM H. TURNER TECHNICAL ARTS HIGH SCHOOL	120039001478	X		
	SOUTH MIAMI SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120039000613	X		
	HIALEAH SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120039000591	X		
	HIALEAH-MIAMI LAKES SENIOR HIGH	120039000592	X		
	MIAMI CENTRAL SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120039000596	X		
	MIAMI EDISON SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120039000600	X		
	NORTH MIAMI BEACH SENIOR HIGH	120039000609	X		
	HOMESTEAD SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120039000593			X
	MIAMI CAROL CITY SENIOR HIGH	120039000595			X
	MIAMI CORAL PARK SENIOR HIGH	120039000599			X
	MIAMI JACKSON SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120039000601	X		X
	MIAMI NORLAND SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120039000603			X
	MIAMI NORTHWESTERN SENIOR HIGH	120039000604	X		X
	NORTH MIAMI SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120039000610			X
	SOUTH DADE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120039000612			X
	MIAMI SOUTHRIDGE SENIOR HIGH	120039000614	X		X
	BOOKER T. WASHINGTON SENIOR HIGH	120039003562		X	
	AIR BASE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000367	X		
	CORAL REEF MONTESSORI ACADEMY CHARTER	120039003340	X		
	EUGENIA B. THOMAS K-8 CENTER	120039003693	X		
	SUMMERVILLE ADVANTAGE ACADEMY	120039004541	X		
	BOB GRAHAM EDUCATION CENTER	120039003831	X		
	SUNNY ISLES BEACH COMMUNITY SCHOOL	120039007533	X		
	MATER ACADEMY	120039003341	X		
	BALERE LANGUAGE ACADEMY	120039003969	X		
	DR. ROLANDO ESPINOSA K-8 CENTER	120039007520	X		
	NORMA BUTLER BOSSARD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039006302	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	AVENTURA WATERWAYS K-8 CENTER	120039007241	X		
	RUTH K. BROAD BAY HARBOR K-8 CENTER	120039000373	X		
	ETHEL KOGER BECKHAM ELEMENTARY	120039003043	X		
	BENT TREE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039002291	X		
	GOULDS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039007290	X		
	MATER GARDENS ACADEMY	120039006019	X		
	SOMERSET ACADEMY CHARTER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (SOUTH HOMESTEAD)	120039007466	X		
	ARCHCREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039007515	X		
	PINECREST ACADEMY (SOUTH CAMPUS)	120039006171	X		
	RENAISSANCE ELEMENTARY CHARTER SCHOOL	120039003554	X		
	VAN E. BLANTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000378	X		
	BLUE LAKES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000379	X		
	DR. BOWMAN FOSTER ASHE ELEMENTARY	120039002805	X		
	JAMES H. BRIGHT ELEMENTARY	120039000381	X		
	ARCHIMEDEAN ACADEMY	120039003832	X		
	SOMERSET ACADEMY CHARTER	120039003971	X		
	PINECREST PREPARATORY ACADEMY	120039003696	X		
	CALUSA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039002292	X		
	FIENBERG/FISHER K-8 CENTER	120039000390	X		
	CLAUDE PEPPER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039002806	X		
	COCONUT GROVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000393	X		
	AVENTURA CITY OF EXCELLENCE SCHOOL	120039004068	X		
	CORAL GABLES PREPARATORY ACADEMY	120039000397	X		
	CORAL PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000398	X		
	THE CHARTER SCHOOL AT WATERSTONE	120039005476	X		
	ADVANCED LEARNING CHARTER SCHOOL	120039007572	X		
	YOUTH CO-OP CHARTER SCHOOL	120039004069	X		
	CORAL REEF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000399	X		
	CORAL TERRACE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000400	X		
	CORAL WAY K-8 CENTER	120039000401	X		
	CUTLER RIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000403	X		
	CYPRESS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000404	X		
	DEVON AIRE K-8 CENTER	120039002054	X		
	MARJORY STONEMAN DOUGLAS ELEM	120039002733	X		
	CHARLES R DREW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000406	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	JOHN G. DUPUIS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000408	X		
	AMELIA EARHART ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000409	X		
	EMERSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000412	X		
	LILLIE C. EVANS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000413	X		
	CHRISTINA M. EVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039003555	X		
	EVERGLADES K-8 CENTER	120039000414	X		
	DAVID FAIRCHILD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000415	X		
	FAIRLAWN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000416	X		
	DANTE B. FASCELL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039003044	X		
	FLAGAMI ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000417	X		
	HENRY M. FLAGLER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000418	X		
	FLAMINGO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000419	X		
	SOMERSET ACADEMY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SOUTH MIAMI CAMPUS	120039007511	X		
	SOMERSET ARTS ACADEMY	120039007487	X		
	GLORIA FLOYD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000422	X		
	HIALEAH GARDENS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039002114	X		
	JACK DAVID GORDON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039002115	X		
	JOELLA GOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039002699	X		
	SPANISH LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039007322	X		
	GREENGLADE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000429	X		
	CHARLES R HADLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039002498	X		
	JOE HALL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039002499	X		
	ENEIDA M. HARTNER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039003162	X		
	WEST HIALEAH GARDENS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039006435	X		
	VIRGINIA A BOONE-HIGHLAND OAKS SCHOOL	120039000434	X		
	ZORA NEALE HURSTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039003045	X		
	OLIVER HOOVER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039002147	X		
	MADIE IVES COMMUNITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000438	X		
	KENDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000440	X		
	KENDALE LAKES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000441	X		
	KENWOOD K-8 CENTER	120039000443	X		
	KEY BISCAYNE K-8 CENTER	120039000444	X		
	KINLOCH PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000446	X		
	LAKEVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000448	X		
	LEEWOOD K-8 CENTER	120039000450	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	WILLIAM H. LEHMAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039002987	X		
	LINDA LENTIN K-8 CENTER	120039003343	X		
	DORAL ACADEMY	120039004071	X		
	LUDLAM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000456	X		
	MATER ACADEMY EAST CHARTER	120039003833	X		
	FRANK CRAWFORD MARTIN K-8 CENTER	120039000457	X		
	WESLEY MATTHEWS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039003046	X		
	MEADOWLANE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000458	X		
	ADA MERRITT K-8 CENTER	120039004072	X		
	MIAMI LAKES K-8 CENTER	120039000463	X		
	MIAMI SHORES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000465	X		
	MIAMI SPRINGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000466	X		
	MORNINGSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000468	X		
	NATURAL BRIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000472	X		
	NORTH BEACH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000474	X		
	NORTH GLADE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000477	X		
	NORTH TWIN LAKES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000480	X		
	NORWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000481	X		
	OJUS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000483	X		
	PALMETTO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000488	X		
	PALM LAKES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000489	X		
	PALM SPRINGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000490	X		
	PALM SPRINGS NORTH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000491	X		
	PARKVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000492	X		
	PERRINE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000494	X		
	PINECREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000496	X		
	HENRY E.S. REEVES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039003047	X		
	DR. GILBERT L. PORTER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039002734	X		
	REDLAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000501	X		
	JANE S. ROBERTS K-8 CENTER	120039002711	X		
	ROCKWAY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000505	X		
	ROYAL GREEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000506	X		
	ROYAL PALM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000507	X		
	GERTRUDE K. EDLEMAN/SABAL PALM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000508	X		
	SCOTT LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000510	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	SEMINOLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000511	X		
	SHADOWLAWN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000512	X		
	DAVID LAWRENCE JR. K-8 CENTER	120039004654	X		
	LINCOLN-MARTI CHARTER SCHOOLS HIALEAH CAMPUS	120039007517	X		
	OXFORD ACADEMY OF MIAMI	120039005447	X		
	BEN SHEPPARD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039002500	X		
	PINECREST ACADEMY (NORTH CAMPUS)	120039007916	X		
	ERNEST R. GRAHAM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039002807	X		
	DR. CARLOS J. FINLAY ELEMENTARY	120039004335	X		
	SOUTH POINTE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039002808	X		
	JOHN I. SMITH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039003048	X		
	SNAPPER CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000516	X		
	N DADE CENTER FOR MODERN LANGUAGE	120039002713	X		
	SOUTH MIAMI K-8 CENTER	120039000518	X		
	SOUTH MIAMI HEIGHTS ELEMENTARY	120039000519	X		
	SOUTHSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000520	X		
	SPRINGVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000521	X		
	E.W.F. STIRRUP ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000522	X		
	SUNSET ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000523	X		
	SUNSET PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000524	X		
	SWEETWATER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039002468	X		
	SYLVANIA HEIGHTS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000525	X		
	TREASURE ISLAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000526	X		
	TROPICAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000527	X		
	FRANCES S. TUCKER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000528	X		
	TWIN LAKES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000529	X		
	VILLAGE GREEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000530	X		
	VINELAND K-8 CENTER	120039000531	X		
	MAE M. WALTERS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000532	X		
	HENRY S. WEST LABORATORY SCHOOL	120039000534	X		
	PHYLLIS WHEATLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000537	X		
	WHISPERING PINES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000538	X		
	WINSTON PARK K-8 CENTER	120039000539	X		
	HERBERT A. AMMONS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120039003163	X		
	SOMERSET ACADEMY CHARTER MIDDLE SCHOOL	120039003974	X		
	ARCHIMEDEAN MIDDLE CONSERVATORY	120039005485	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	MATER ACADEMY CHARTER MIDDLE	120039004074	X		
	SOMERSET ACADEMY CHARTER MIDDLE SCHOOL (SOUTH HOMESTEAD)	120039007387	X		
	ARVIDA MIDDLE SCHOOL	120039000542	X		
	PINECREST ACADEMY CHARTER MIDDLE SCHOOL	120039004075	X		
	RENAISSANCE MIDDLE CHARTER SCHOOL	120039005489	X		
	DORAL ACADEMY CHARTER MIDDLE SCHOOL	120039003558	X		
	INTERNATIONAL STUDIES CHARTER MIDDLE SCHOOL	120039007564	X		
	MATER ACADEMY MIDDLE SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES	120039007484	X		
	ZELDA GLAZER MIDDLE SCHOOL	120039007631	X		
	SOMERSET ACADEMY CHARTER MIDDLE SCHOOL SOUTH MIAMI	120039007554	X		
	ASPIRA SOUTH YOUTH LEADERSHIP CHARTER SCHOOL	120039004336	X		
	GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER MIDDLE SCHOOL	120039000546	X		
	RUBEN DARIO MIDDLE SCHOOL	120039002714	X		
	DORAL MIDDLE SCHOOL	120039004337	X		
	HENRY H. FILER MIDDLE SCHOOL	120039000551	X		
	GLADES MIDDLE SCHOOL	120039000553	X		
	HAMMOCKS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120039002429	X		
	HIGHLAND OAKS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120039000555	X		
	JOHN F. KENNEDY MIDDLE SCHOOL	120039000558	X		
	HOWARD D. MCMILLAN MIDDLE SCHOOL	120039000565	X		
	MIAMI LAKES MIDDLE SCHOOL	120039000568	X		
	PALM SPRINGS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120039000574	X		
	PALMETTO MIDDLE SCHOOL	120039000575	X		
	PONCE DE LEON MIDDLE SCHOOL	120039000577	X		
	HIALEAH GARDENS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120039007396	X		
	JORGE MAS CANOSA MIDDLE SCHOOL	120039007291	X		
	ROCKWAY MIDDLE SCHOOL	120039000581	X		
	SOUTHWOOD MIDDLE SCHOOL	120039000583	X		
	SOUTH MIAMI MIDDLE SCHOOL	120039000584	X		
	W. R. THOMAS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120039000585	X		
	LAMAR LOUISE CURRY MIDDLE SCHOOL	120039004076	X		
	DORAL PERFORMING ARTS & ENTERTAINMENT ACADEMY	120039005493	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	MATER PERFORMING ARTS & ENTERTAINMENT ACADEMY	120039005494	X		
	TERRA ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE	120039007634	X		
	LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS MEMORIAL HIGH SCHOOL	120039007496	X		
	CITY OF HIALEAH EDUCATION ACADEMY	120039007454	X		
	ARCHIMEDEAN UPPER CONSERVATORY CHARTER SCHOOL	120039007456	X		
	ARCOLA LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000369	X		
	BRENTWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000380	X		
	COLONIAL DRIVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000394	X		
	BENJAMIN FRANKLIN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000423	X		
	GRATIGNY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000428	X		
	GREYNOLDS PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000430	X		
	MIAMI GARDENS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000461	X		
	DOWNTOWN MIAMI CHARTER SCHOOL	120039003834	X		
	COCONUT PALM K-8 ACADEMY	120039000471	X		
	NORLAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000473	X		
	OAK GROVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000482	X		
	PARKWAY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000493	X		
	LINCOLN-MARTI CHARTER SCHOOL LITTLE HAVANA CAMPUS	120039007538	X		
	EXCELSIOR LANGUAGE ACADEMY OF HIALEAH	120039007416	X		
	EXCELSIOR CHARTER ACADEMY	120039007319	X		
	LAWRENCE ACADEMY	120039005486	X		
	ASPIRA RAUL ARNALDO MARTINEZ CHARTER SCHOOL	120039003557	X		
	LAKE STEVENS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120039000560	X		
	PINECREST PREPARATORY ACADEMY CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL	120039007453	X		
	FREDERICK R. DOUGLASS ELEMENTARY	120039000405	X		
	GOLDEN GLADES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000426	X		
	JESSE J. MCCRARY, JR. ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000454	X		
	NORTH COUNTY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000476	X		
	OLINDA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000484	X		
	ETHEL F. BECKFORD/RICHMOND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000503	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	DR. HENRY W. MACK/WEST LITTLE RIVER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000535	X		
	CITRUS GROVE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120039000548	X		
	JOSE DE DIEGO MIDDLE SCHOOL	120039003559	X		
	WESTVIEW MIDDLE SCHOOL	120039000588	X		
	MANDARIN LAKES K-8 ACADEMY	120039007377			X
	W. J. BRYAN ELEMENTARY	120039000383			X
	EARLINGTON HEIGHTS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000410			X
	EDISON PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000411			X
	FLORIDA CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000421			X
	THEODORE R. AND THELMA A. GIBSON CHARTER SCHOOL	120039004070	X		X
	LAURA C. SAUNDERS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000452			X
	MIAMI PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000464			X
	ROBERT RUSSA MOTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000469			X
	MYRTLE GROVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000470			X
	DR. ROBERT B. INGRAM/OPA-LOCKA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000486			X
	IRVING & BEATRICE PESKOE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039001441			X
	WEST HOMESTEAD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000533			X
	NATHAN B. YOUNG ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000540			X
	ALLAPATTAH MIDDLE SCHOOL	120039000541			X
	BROWNSVILLE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120039000543			X
	CAROL CITY MIDDLE SCHOOL	120039000544			X
	CAMPBELL DRIVE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120039000545			X
	CHARLES R. DREW MIDDLE SCHOOL	120039000550			X
	THOMAS JEFFERSON MIDDLE SCHOOL	120039000557			X
	MADISON MIDDLE SCHOOL	120039000562			X
	MIAMI EDISON MIDDLE SCHOOL	120039000567			X
	NORTH DADE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120039000572			X
	PARKWAY MIDDLE COMMUNITY SCHOOL	120039000576			X
	LENORA BRAYNON SMITH ELEMENTARY	120039000368		X	
	LAWRENCE ACADEMY ELEMENTARY CHARTER SCHOOL	120039006910		X	
	COMSTOCK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000395		X	
	FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL ELEMENTARY ACADEMY	120039007928		X	
	KELSEY L. PHARR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120039000495		X	

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	DESOTO COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL	120042000620	X		
	NOCATEE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120042000625	X		
	DIXIE COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL	120045000626			X
	OLD TOWN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120045000627	X		
	JAMES M. ANDERSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120045000628	X		
	RUTH RAINS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120045002154	X		
	PAXON SCHOOL/ADVANCED STUDIES	120048000671	X		
	DOUGLAS ANDERSON SCHOOL OF THE ARTS	120048002469	X		
	STANTON COLLEGE PREPARATORY	120048000706	X		
	SANDALWOOD HIGH SCHOOL	120048000759	X		
	BALDWIN MIDDLE-SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120048000651	X		
	ENGLEWOOD HIGH SCHOOL	120048000685	X		
	ROBERT E. LEE HIGH SCHOOL	120048000648			X
	ANDREW JACKSON HIGH SCHOOL	120048000649	X		X
	TERRY PARKER HIGH SCHOOL	120048000681			X
	JEAN RIBAUT HIGH SCHOOL	120048000691	X		X
	WILLIAM M. RAINES HIGH SCHOOL	120048000714	X		X
	SAMUEL W. WOLFSON HIGH SCHOOL	120048000749			X
	NATHAN B. FORREST HIGH SCHOOL	120048000762			X
	EDWARD H. WHITE HIGH SCHOOL	120048000767			X
	FIRST COAST HIGH SCHOOL	120048002745	X		X
	FRANK H. PETERSON ACADEMIES	120048000772			X
	A. PHILIP RANDOLPH ACADEMIES	120048000773		X	
	ORTEGA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000637	X		
	RUTH N. UPSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000639	X		
	KIRBY-SMITH MIDDLE SCHOOL	120048000645	X		
	LORETTO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000646	X		
	JULIA LANDON COLLEGE PREPARTORY & LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT SCHOOL	120048000647	X		
	THOMAS JEFFERSON ELEMENTARY	120048000654	X		
	DUNCAN U. FLETCHER MIDDLE SCHOOL	120048000660	X		
	ATLANTIC BEACH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000662	X		
	HENDRICKS AVENUE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000667	X		
	BILTMORE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000674	X		
	SAN PABLO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000676	X		
	JOHN STOCKTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000683	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	WOODLAND ACRES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000684	X		
	PINEDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000688	X		
	WINDY HILL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000689	X		
	RUTLEDGE H. PEARSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000690	X		
	LONG BRANCH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000695	X		
	SOMERSET ACADEMY-MIDDLE, EAGLE CAMPUS	120048007902	X		
	J. ALLEN AXSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048004197	X		
	CHAFFEE TRAIL ELEMENTARY	120048006904	X		
	JACKSONVILLE BEACH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000701	X		
	DARNELL COOKMAN MIDDLE/HIGH SCHOOL	120048002816	X		
	NEW BERLIN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048004820	X		
	JAMES WELDON JOHNSON COLLEGE PREPARTORY MIDDLE SCHOOL	120048000705	X		
	BARTRAM SPRINGS ELEMENTARY	120048007606	X		
	KINGS TRAIL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000729	X		
	BROOKVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000732	X		
	SAN MATEO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000743	X		
	SEABREEZE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000750	X		
	BEAUCLERC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000754	X		
	KERNAN TRAIL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048003844	X		
	CHIMNEY LAKES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048002739	X		
	LONE STAR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000755	X		
	SABAL PALM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048002740	X		
	ARLINGTON HEIGHTS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000761	X		
	LOUIS S. SHEFFIELD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000763	X		
	NEPTUNE BEACH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048002163	X		
	JOSEPH FINEGAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000766	X		
	GREENLAND PINES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048002817	X		
	TWIN LAKES ACADEMY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048003360	X		
	TWIN LAKES ACADEMY MIDDLE SCHOOL	120048003361	X		
	ALIMACANI ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048002742	X		
	MANDARIN OAKS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048002700	X		
	MANDARIN MIDDLE SCHOOL	120048002743	X		
	ABESS PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048003173	X		
	CHET'S CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048003363	X		
	BANK OF AMERICA LEARNING ACADEMY	120048000427	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	LAVILLA SCHOOL OF THE ARTS	120048004344	X		
	ANNIE R. MORGAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000641	X		
	HOGAN-SPRING GLEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000661	X		
	BAYVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000679	X		
	GLOBAL OUTREACH CHARTER ACADEMY	120048007658	X		
	SAINT CLAIR EVANS ACADEMY	120048000698	X		
	SMART POPE LIVINGSTON ELEMENTARY	120048000704	X		
	RUFUS E. PAYNE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000713	X		
	ARLINGTON MIDDLE SCHOOL	120048000739	X		
	FORT CAROLINE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000757	X		
	BISCAYNE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048004079	X		
	WESTVIEW K-8	120048007504	X		
	HENRY F. KITE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000650	X		
	SADIE T. TILLIS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000697	X		
	MATTHEW W. GILBERT MIDDLE SCHOOL	120048000702	X		
	JEAN RIBAUT MIDDLE SCHOOL	120048000738	X		
	HYDE GROVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000740	X		
	NORTH SHORE K-8	120048000666	X		X
	LAKE FOREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000670			X
	RAMONA BOULEVARD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000675			X
	SALLYE B. MATHIS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000686			X
	PAXON MIDDLE SCHOOL	120048000687			X
	CEDAR HILLS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000692			X
	SCHOOL OF SUCCESS ACADEMY-SOS	120048003172			X
	SUSIE E. TOLBERT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000699			X
	RICHARD L. BROWN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000703			X
	NORTHWESTERN MIDDLE SCHOOL	120048000708			X
	GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER ELEMENTARY	120048000710			X
	EUGENE J. BUTLER MIDDLE SCHOOL	120048000716			X
	OAK HILL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000736			X
	NORMANDY VILLAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000746			X
	HIGHLANDS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120048000765			X
	ANDREW A. ROBINSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048002818			X
	BRENTWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000636		X	
	JOHN LOVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000669		X	
	HIGHLANDS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000694		X	

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	KIPP IMPACT MIDDLE SCHOOL	120048007894		X	
	WEST JACKSONVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120048000700		X	
	WEST FLORIDA HIGH SCHOOL/TECHNICAL	120051003703	X		
	WASHINGTON SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120051002169	X		
	NORTHVIEW HIGH SCHOOL	120051002995	X		
	ESCAMBIA HIGH SCHOOL	120051000794			X
	PINE FOREST HIGH SCHOOL	120051000837			X
	HELLEN CARO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120051002746	X		
	JIM ALLEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120051000774	X		
	BELLVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120051000776	X		
	BRATT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120051000780	X		
	N. B. COOK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120051003581	X		
	RANSOM MIDDLE SCHOOL	120051002600	X		
	CORDOVA PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120051000790	X		
	FERRY PASS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120051000796	X		
	MONTCLAIR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120051000801	X		
	OAKCREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120051000804	X		
	PINE MEADOW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120051000806	X		
	SCENIC HEIGHTS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120051000808	X		
	A. K. SUTER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120051000811	X		
	ERNEST WARD MIDDLE SCHOOL	120051000813	X		
	C. A. WEIS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120051002819	X		
	BROWN BARGE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120051000824	X		
	L. D. MCARTHUR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120051000840	X		
	BEULAH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120051002164	X		
	R. C. LIPSCOMB ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120051000439	X		
	JIM C. BAILEY MIDDLE SCHOOL	120051002994	X		
	BLUE ANGELS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120051004346	X		
	MOLINO PARK ELEMENTARY	120051004081	X		
	BEULAH ACADEMY OF SCIENCE	120051003366	X		
	BYRNEVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, INC.	120051003847	X		
	PENSACOLA BEACH CHARTER SCHOOL	120051003848	X		
	ENSLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120051000793	X		
	MYRTLE GROVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120051000802	X		
	NAVY POINT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120051000803	X		
	SHERWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120051000810	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	LONGLEAF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120051000838	X		
	WEST PENSACOLA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120051000817	X		
	SPENCER BIBBS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120051000823	X		
	GEORGE S. HALLMARK ELEMENTARY	120051000797			X
	LINCOLN PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120051002063			X
	A.A. DIXON CHARTER SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE	120051007930		X	
CH	FAU/SLCSD PALM POINTE RESEARCH SCHOOL	120201207467	X		
	FLAGLER-PALM COAST HIGH SCHOOL	120054000842	X		
	HERITAGE ACADEMY PK-12	120054005532		X	
	BUDDY TAYLOR MIDDLE SCHOOL	120054002170	X		
	RYMFIRES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120054004841	X		
	LEWIS E. WADSWORTH ELEMENTARY	120054002558	X		
	OLD KINGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120054002747	X		
	BELLE TERRE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120054005534	X		
	INDIAN TRAILS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120054003064	X		
	FRANKLIN COUNTY SCHOOLS K-12	120057000845	X		
CH	THE PEMBROKE PINES FLORIDA	120201304147	X		
	WEST GADSDEN HIGH SCHOOL	120060000849	X		
	EAST GADSDEN HIGH SCHOOL	120060004082	X		X
	GADSDEN ELEMENTARY MAGNET SCHOOL	120060000853	X		
	GREENSBORO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120060000854	X		
	GRETNA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120060000856	X		
	STEWART STREET ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120060000858	X		
	CROSSROAD ACADEMY	120060003066	X		
	JAMES A. SHANKS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120060000859	X		
	GEORGE W. MUNROE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120060000848	X		
	CHATTAHOOCHEE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120060000855	X		
	ST. JOHNS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120060000857	X		
	HAVANA MIDDLE SCHOOL	120060000850			X
	TRENTON HIGH SCHOOL	120063000862	X		
	BELL HIGH SCHOOL	120063000863	X		
	BELL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120063002181	X		
	TRENTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120063002748	X		
	MOORE HAVEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120066002174	X		
	WEST GLADES SCHOOL	120066004187	X		
	PORT ST. JOE HIGH SCHOOL	120069000868	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	WEWAHITCHKA HIGH SCHOOL	120069000870	X		
	PORT ST. JOE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120069000867	X		
	PORT ST. JOE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120069002996	X		
N	HAMILTON COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL	120072000872	X		X
N	NORTH HAMILTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120072000873	X		
N	SOUTH HAMILTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120072000874	X		
N	CENTRAL HAMILTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120072000871		X	
	HARDEE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120075000877			X
	HILLTOP ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120075004853	X		
	BOWLING GREEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120075000879	X		
	WAUCHULA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120075000881	X		
	ZOLFO SPRINGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120075000880	X		
	LABELLE HIGH SCHOOL	120078000888	X		
	CLEWISTON HIGH SCHOOL	120078002663	X		X
	COUNTRY OAKS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120078002432	X		
	EDWARD A. UPTHEGROVE ELEMENTARY	120078003852	X		
O	CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL	120081002604	X		
O	NATURE COAST TECHNICAL HIGH	120081004083	X		X
O	HERNANDO HIGH SCHOOL	120081000890	X		
O	POWELL MIDDLE SCHOOL	120081002434	X		
O	JOHN D. FLOYD K-8 SCHOOL OF ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE	120081002503	X		
O	CHALLENGER K-8 SCHOOL OF SCIENCE AND MATH	120081005548	X		
O	GULF COAST ACADEMY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY	120081004084	X		
JS	SEBRING HIGH SCHOOL	120084000905	X		
JS	AVON PARK HIGH SCHOOL	120084000906			X
JS	LAKE PLACID HIGH SCHOOL	120084000907			X
JS	SEBRING MIDDLE SCHOOL	120084000898	X		
JS	PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120084002754	X		
JS	HILL-GUSTAT MIDDLE SCHOOL	120084003069	X		
JS	LAKE PLACID ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120084000904	X		
JS	SUN 'N LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120084002504	X		
JS	LAKE PLACID MIDDLE SCHOOL	120084002651	X		
JS	FRED WILD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120084000900	X		
JS	LAKE COUNTRY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120084002606			X
JS	AVON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120084000901			X

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
DUGH	BLAKE HIGH SCHOOL-MAGNET	120087003179	X		
DUGH	EAST BAY HIGH SCHOOL	120087000945	X		
DUGH	GAITHER HIGH SCHOOL	120087002437	X		
DUGH	KING HIGH SCHOOL	120087000965	X		
DUGH	NEWSOME HIGH SCHOOL	120087004091	X		
DUGH	RIVERVIEW HIGH SCHOOL	120087003379	X		
DUGH	PLANT HIGH SCHOOL	120087000999	X		
DUGH	SICKLES HIGH SCHOOL	120087003181	X		
DUGH	WHARTON HIGH SCHOOL	120087003185	X		
DUGH	BROOKS DEBARTOLO COLLEGIATE HIGH SCHOOL	120087006987	X		
DUGH	LENNARD HIGH SCHOOL	120087004872	X		
DUGH	BRANDON HIGH SCHOOL	120087000918	X		
DUGH	FREEDOM HIGH SCHOOL	120087003858	X		
DUGH	HILLSBOROUGH HIGH SCHOOL	120087000960	X		
DUGH	PLANT CITY HIGH SCHOOL	120087001000	X		
DUGH	JEFFERSON HIGH SCHOOL	120087001011	X		
DUGH	ARMWOOD HIGH SCHOOL	120087002505	X		
DUGH	CHAMBERLAIN HIGH SCHOOL	120087000930	X		
DUGH	LETO HIGH SCHOOL	120087000972	X		
DUGH	MIDDLETON HIGH SCHOOL	120087003862	X		
DUGH	SPOTO HIGH SCHOOL	120087004169			X
DUGH	ADAMS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120087000909	X		
DUGH	FISHHAWK CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087004170	X		
DUGH	MACFARLANE PARK ELEMENTARY MAGNET SCHOOL	120087004096	X		
DUGH	COLLINS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087004158	X		
DUGH	TURNER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087004168	X		
DUGH	SERGEANT PAUL R SMITH MIDDLE SCHOOL	120087007336	X		
DUGH	ALEXANDER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087000911	X		
DUGH	SUMMERFIELD CROSSINGS ELEMENTARY	120087004875	X		
DUGH	STOWERS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087007252	X		
DUGH	BARRINGTON MIDDLE SCHOOL	120087006912	X		
DUGH	DEER PARK ELEMENTARY	120087004883	X		
DUGH	HAMMOND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087004884	X		
DUGH	BARTELS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120087004885	X		
DUGH	REDDICK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087007494	X		
DUGH	BALLAST POINT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087000914	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
DUGH	BAY CREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087000915	X		
DUGH	BENITO MIDDLE SCHOOL	120087003178	X		
DUGH	ALAFIA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087002561	X		
DUGH	STEWART MIDDLE MAGNET SCHOOL	120087000917	X		
DUGH	BEVIS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087004350	X		
DUGH	BROOKER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087000921	X		
DUGH	BRYANT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087003854	X		
DUGH	BUCKHORN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087002069	X		
DUGH	BURNEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087003855	X		
DUGH	BURNS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120087002506	X		
DUGH	CAHOON ELEMENTARY MAGNET SCHOOL	120087000927	X		
DUGH	CANNELLA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087000566	X		
DUGH	CARROLLWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087000929	X		
DUGH	CHILES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087003713	X		
DUGH	CIMINO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087003856	X		
DUGH	CLARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087003375	X		
DUGH	CLAYWELL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087002187	X		
DUGH	COLEMAN MIDDLE SCHOOL	120087000936	X		
DUGH	DAVIDSEN MIDDLE SCHOOL	120087004351	X		
DUGH	DESOTO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087000941	X		
DUGH	DICKENSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087000942	X		
DUGH	EISENHOWER MIDDLE SCHOOL	120087000946	X		
DUGH	EGYPT LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087000948	X		
DUGH	ESSRIG ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087002507	X		
DUGH	FARNELL MIDDLE SCHOOL	120087003857	X		
DUGH	GORRIE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087000955	X		
DUGH	GRADY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087000956	X		
DUGH	BELLAMY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087000958	X		
DUGH	HILL MIDDLE SCHOOL	120087002508	X		
DUGH	HUNTER'S GREEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087000623	X		
DUGH	KINGSWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087000966	X		
DUGH	KNIGHTS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087000967	X		
DUGH	LAKE MAGDALENE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087000968	X		
DUGH	LANIER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087000969	X		
DUGH	LIMONA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087000973	X		
DUGH	LITHIA SPRINGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087000696	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
DUGH	LIBERTY MIDDLE SCHOOL	120087003860	X		
DUGH	LOWRY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087000723	X		
DUGH	LUTZ ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087000976	X		
DUGH	MABRY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087000977	X		
DUGH	MANISCALCO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087002702	X		
DUGH	MANN MIDDLE SCHOOL	120087000982	X		
DUGH	MARTINEZ MIDDLE SCHOOL	120087003861	X		
DUGH	MENDENHALL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087000987	X		
DUGH	MINTZ ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087002828	X		
DUGH	MCKITRICK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087003714	X		
DUGH	MULRENNAN MIDDLE SCHOOL	120087004089	X		
DUGH	NELSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087004090	X		
DUGH	NORTHWEST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087002510	X		
DUGH	OAK GROVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087000993	X		
DUGH	ORANGE GROVE MIDDLE MAGNET SCHOOL	120087003377	X		
DUGH	PRIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087004353	X		
DUGH	TOMLIN MIDDLE SCHOOL	120087001001	X		
DUGH	PROGRESS VILLAGE MIDDLE MAGNET SCHOOL	120087001003	X		
DUGH	RANDALL MIDDLE SCHOOL	120087004354	X		
DUGH	RIVERVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087001005	X		
DUGH	ROOSEVELT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087001012	X		
DUGH	SCHWARZKOPF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087000724	X		
DUGH	SEFFNER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087001014	X		
DUGH	SESSUMS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087004094	X		
DUGH	SHAW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087001016	X		
DUGH	SYMIMES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087003715	X		
DUGH	RAMPELLO K-8 MAGNET SCHOOL	120087003382	X		
DUGH	TAMPA PALMS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087002710	X		
DUGH	TOWN & COUNTRY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087001027	X		
DUGH	VALRICO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087003072	X		
DUGH	WALDEN LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087002830	X		
DUGH	WALKER MIDDLE SCHOOL	120087003184	X		
DUGH	WESTCHASE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087003387	X		
DUGH	WEST TAMPA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087002513	X		
DUGH	WILLIAMS MIDDLE MAGNET SCHOOL	120087001035	X		
DUGH	WILSON MIDDLE SCHOOL	120087001036	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
DUGH	WILSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087001037	X		
DUGH	TERRACE COMMUNITY MIDDLE SCHOOL	120087003404	X		
DUGH	TRINITY SCHOOL FOR CHILDREN - LOWER DIVISION	120087003591	X		
DUGH	LEARNING GATE COMMUNITY SCHOOL	120087004358	X		
DUGH	TAMPA CHARTER SCHOOL	120087004101	X		
DUGH	TRINITY UPPER SCHOOL	120087004167	X		
DUGH	LITERACY/LEADERSHIP/TECHNOLOGY ACADEMY	120087005577	X		
DUGH	ADVANTAGE ACADEMY MIDDLE SCHOOL	120087007556	X		
DUGH	SHILOH MIDDLE CHARTER SCHOOL	120087007645	X		
DUGH	FOSTER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087000949	X		
DUGH	IPPOLITO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087003859	X		
DUGH	MORGAN WOODS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087000991	X		
DUGH	TAMPA BAY BOULEVARD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087001022	X		
DUGH	WESTSHORE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087001033	X		
DUGH	MOSI PARTNERSHIP ELEMENTARY	120087007280	X		
DUGH	JUST ELEMENTARY	120087000916	X		
DUGH	GRAHAM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087000957	X		
DUGH	KENLY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087000964	X		
DUGH	WASHINGTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087004152	X		
DUGH	WALTON ACADEMY	120087004151	X		
DUGH	BROWARD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087000922			X
DUGH	LOCKHART ELEMENTARY MAGNET SCHOOL	120087004086			X
DUGH	SLIGH MIDDLE SCHOOL	120087000950			X
DUGH	MILES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087000989	X		X
DUGH	OAK PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087000994			X
DUGH	POTTER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087001002			X
DUGH	ROLAND PARK K-8 SCHOOL	120087001009			X
DUGH	JAMES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087003186			X
DUGH	ADVANTAGE ACADEMY OF HILLSBOROUGH	120087007633			X
DUGH	NEWPOINT HIGH OF TAMPA	120087007565			X
DUGH	RIVERHILLS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120087001004		X	
DUGH	MOUNT PLEASANT STANDARD BASE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120087004102		X	
	HOLMES COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL	120090001044	X		
	PONCE DE LEON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120090002071	X		
	BONIFAY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120090001050	X		
VER	INDIAN RIVER CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL	120093003408	X		
VER	ROSEWOOD MAGNET SCHOOL	120093001053	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
VER	OSCEOLA MAGNET SCHOOL	120093001054	X		
VER	BEACHLAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120093001055	X		
VER	GIFFORD MIDDLE SCHOOL	120093002193	X		
VER	FELLSMERE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120093001058	X		
VER	PELICAN ISLAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120093001059	X		
VER	GLENDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120093002563	X		
VER	HIGHLANDS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120093002564	X		
VER	LIBERTY MAGNET SCHOOL	120093003866	X		
VER	TREASURE COAST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120093004903	X		
VER	STORM GROVE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120093007588	X		
VER	ST. PETER'S ACADEMY	120093003409	X		
VER	NORTH COUNTY CHARTER SCHOOL	120093003410	X		
VER	SEBASTIAN CHARTER JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120093004361	X		
VER	IMAGINE SCHOOLS AT SOUTH VERO	120093007488	X		
VER	VERO BEACH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120093001063	X		
	GRACEVILLE HIGH SCHOOL	120096001078	X		
	MARIANNA HIGH SCHOOL	120096001065	X		
	COTTONDALE HIGH SCHOOL	120096001075	X		
	RIVERSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120096001067	X		
	MARIANNA MIDDLE SCHOOL	120096001068	X		
	SNEADS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120096001071	X		
	GRAND RIDGE SCHOOL	120096001072	X		
	COTTONDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120096001076	X		
	GRACEVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120096001077	X		
N	JEFFERSON COUNTY MIDDLE/HIGH SCHOOL	120099001082	X		X
E	LAFAYETTE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120102002329	X		
	TAVARES HIGH SCHOOL	120105001102	X		
	EUSTIS HIGH SCHOOL	120105001092	X		
	MT. DORA HIGH SCHOOL	120105001099	X		
	UMATILLA HIGH SCHOOL	120105001105	X		
	LEESBURG HIGH SCHOOL	120105001097	X		
	SOUTH LAKE HIGH SCHOOL	120105001714	X		
	CLERMONT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120105001088	X		
	GRASSY LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120105006998	X		
	EAST RIDGE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120105007239	X		
	FRUITLAND PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120105001093	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	GRAY MIDDLE SCHOOL	120105001095	X		
	THE VILLAGES ELEMENTARY OF LADY LAKE SCHOOL	120105003593	X		
	ROUND LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120105004364	X		
	TAVARES MIDDLE SCHOOL	120105001103	X		
	TREADWAY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120105001106	X		
	MINNEOLA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120105001108	X		
	ASTATULA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120105003594	X		
	LOST LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120105003595	X		
	CLERMONT MIDDLE SCHOOL	120105003867	X		
	TRIANGLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120105001116	X		
	MASCOTTE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120105001119	X		
	UMATILLA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120105004365	X		
	UMATILLA MIDDLE SCHOOL	120105001121	X		
	CYPRESS RIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120105003074	X		
	SPRING CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120105001702	X		
	ALTOONA SCHOOL	120105003984	X		
	IMAGINE SCHOOLS AT SOUTH LAKE	120105005598	X		
	BEVERLY SHORES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120105001087		X	
	CAPE CORAL HIGH SCHOOL	120108002075	X		
	DUNBAR HIGH SCHOOL	120108004368	X		
	IDA S. BAKER HIGH SCHOOL	120108003965	X		
	LEHIGH SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120108002398	X		
	ISLAND COAST HIGH SCHOOL	120108007353	X		
	SOUTH FORT MYERS HIGH SCHOOL	120108003952	X		
	RIVERDALE HIGH SCHOOL	120108001157	X		
	MARINER HIGH SCHOOL	120108002565	X		
	ESTERO HIGH SCHOOL	120108002566	X		
	EAST LEE COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL	120108003966	X		
	ALLEN PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120108001122	X		
	ALVA MIDDLE SCHOOL	120108001123	X		
	ALVA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120108001124	X		
	CAPE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120108001126	X		
	CHALLENGER MIDDLE SCHOOL	120108004919	X		
	CYPRESS LAKE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120108001127	X		
	PAUL LAURENCE DUNBAR MIDDLE SCHOOL	120108001128	X		
	HARNS MARSH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120108003953	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	VARSTY LAKES MIDDLE SCHOOL	120108003967	X		
	J. COLIN ENGLISH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120108001136	X		
	G WEAVER HIPPS	120108007539	X		
	LEHIGH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120108001138	X		
	ORANGEWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120108001141	X		
	PINE ISLAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120108001142	X		
	LEXINGTON MIDDLE SCHOOL	120108003964	X		
	THE SANIBEL SCHOOL	120108001143	X		
	MIRROR LAKES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120108003197	X		
	TROPIC ISLES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120108001145	X		
	VILLAS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120108001146	X		
	HEIGHTS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120108001148	X		
	PINEWOODS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120108002399	X		
	PATRIOT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120108007328	X		
	TREELINE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120108007321	X		
	BAYSHORE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120108001149	X		
	CALOOSA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120108001155	X		
	CALOOSA MIDDLE SCHOOL	120108001156	X		
	N. FORT MYERS ACADEMY FOR THE ARTS	120108001158	X		
	BONITA SPRINGS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120108001160	X		
	PELICAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120108002076	X		
	GULF MIDDLE SCHOOL	120108002333	X		
	GULF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120108002332	X		
	SPRING CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120108002337	X		
	SUNSHINE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120108002472	X		
	HECTOR A. CAFFERATA JR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120108003947	X		
	RAYMA C PAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120108003948	X		
	THREE OAKS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120108002613	X		
	SKYLINE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120108002614	X		
	TRAFALGAR MIDDLE SCHOOL	120108002683	X		
	TRAFALGAR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120108004108	X		
	DIPLOMAT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120108002833	X		
	DIPLOMAT MIDDLE SCHOOL	120108003417	X		
	DR CARRIE D. ROBINSON LITTLETON ELEM	120108000779	X		
	HANCOCK CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120108001758	X		
	GATEWAY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120108000783	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	THREE OAKS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120108001798	X		
	VETERANS PARK ACADEMY FOR THE ARTS	120108003950	X		
	BONITA SPRINGS CHARTER SCHOOL	120108003870	X		
	GATEWAY CHARTER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120108004109	X		
	OASIS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL K-5	120108003956	X		
	CHRISTA MCAULLIFFE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL K-5	120108004926	X		
	OASIS MIDDLE	120108004929	X		
	FORT MYERS PREPARATORY AND FITNESS ACADEMY	120108007463	X		
	GATEWAY INTERMEDIATE CHARTER SCHOOL 5-8	120108007470	X		
	BONITA SPRINGS PREPARATORY AND FITNESS ACADEMY	120108007768	X		
	OAK HAMMOCK MIDDLE SCHOOL	120108007395	X		
	LEHIGH ACRES MIDDLE SCHOOL	120108002335	X		
	COLONIAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120108002834	X		
	LEE CHARTER ACADEMY	120108003951		X	
	JAMES RICKARDS HIGH SCHOOL	120111001166	X		
	LINCOLN HIGH SCHOOL	120111001194	X		
	LAWTON CHILES HIGH SCHOOL	120111003598	X		
	LEON HIGH SCHOOL	120111001162	X		
	AMOS P. GODBY HIGH SCHOOL	120111001176	X		
	ELIZABETH COBB MIDDLE SCHOOL	120111001164	X		
	RAA MIDDLE SCHOOL	120111001171	X		
	WOODVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120111001173	X		
	GILCHRIST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120111001186	X		
	ASTORIA PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120111001188	X		
	KILLEARN LAKES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120111002473	X		
	CHAIRES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120111002567	X		
	DESOTO TRAIL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120111002679	X		
	BUCK LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120111002680	X		
	DEERLAKE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120111002763	X		
	HAWKS RISE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120111002999	X		
	SWIFT CREEK MIDDLE SCHOOL	120111003000	X		
	CANOPY OAKS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120111003419	X		
	WILLIAM J MONTFORD III MIDDLE SCHOOL	120111006856	X		
	J MICHAEL CONLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL AT SOUTHWOOD	120111006879	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	THE SCHOOL OF ARTS & SCIENCES	120111003599	X		
	STARS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120111006947	X		
	OAK RIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120111001177	X		
	JOHN G RILEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120111001181	X		
	SPRINGWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120111002568	X		
	FORT BRADEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120111001825	X		
	R. FRANK NIMS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120111001182	X		
	CEDAR KEY HIGH SCHOOL	120114001198	X		
	CHIEFLAND HIGH SCHOOL	120114001199	X		
	WILLISTON HIGH SCHOOL	120114001201	X		
	CHIEFLAND MIDDLE SCHOOL	120114002835	X		
	WILLISTON MIDDLE SCHOOL	120114001203	X		
	YANKEETOWN SCHOOL	120114001204	X		
	WHISPERING WINDS CHARTER SCHOOL	120114003606	X		
	LIBERTY COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL	120117001205	X		
	W. R. TOLAR K-8 SCHOOL	120117001206	X		
	HOSFORD ELEMENTARY JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120117001207	X		
	MADISON COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL	120120002212	X		
	PINETTA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120120001216	X		
	MADISON COUNTY CENTRAL SCHOOL	120120003731			X
	GREENVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120120001214	X		X
	BAYSHORE HIGH SCHOOL	120123001220	X		
	PALMETTO HIGH SCHOOL	120123001232	X		
	SOUTHEAST HIGH SCHOOL	120123001236			X
	ANNA MARIA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120123001217	X		
	ROBERT H. PRINE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120123001233	X		
	MARTHA B. KING MIDDLE SCHOOL	120123001245	X		
	FLORINE J ABEL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120123002082	X		
	IDA M. STEWART ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120123002083	X		
	WILLIAM H. BASHAW ELEMENTARY	120123002474	X		
	BRADEN RIVER MIDDLE SCHOOL	120123002838	X		
	TARA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120123000822	X		
	GENE WITT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120123002757	X		
	CARLOS E. HAILE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120123003198	X		
	KINNAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120123004374	X		
	R. DAN NOLAN MIDDLE SCHOOL	120123004205	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	GILBERT W MCNEAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120123004110	X		
	FREEDOM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120123004111	X		
	VIRGIL MILLS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120123004204	X		
	ROBERT WILLIS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120123005609	X		
	ANNIE LUCY WILLIAMS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120123007368	X		
	B.D. GULLETT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120123007315	X		
	STATE COLLEGE OF FLORIDA COLLEGIATE SCHOOL	120123007901	X		
	BALLARD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120123001218	X		
	BAYSHORE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120123001219	X		
	JESSIE P. MILLER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120123001225	X		
	PALMA SOLA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120123001230	X		
	BLACKBURN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120123001240	X		
	W. D. SUGG MIDDLE SCHOOL	120123001242	X		
	SEA BREEZE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120123002839	X		
	TEAM SUCCESS A SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE	120123003200	X		
	IMAGINE CHARTER SCHOOL AT NORTH MANATEE	120123007153	X		
	ORANGE RIDGE-BULLOCK ELEMENTARY	120123001228	X		
	SAMOSET ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120123001235	X		
	BRADENTON CHARTER SCHOOL	120123004384	X		
	OASIS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120123007193	X		
	BLANCHE H. DAUGHTREY ELEMENTARY	120123001234			X
	MANATEE SCHOOL OF ARTS/SCIENCES	120123003199			X
	G.D. ROGERS GARDEN ELEMENTARY	120123007636		X	
	LAKE WEIR HIGH SCHOOL	120126001280	X		
	FOREST HIGH SCHOOL	120126001271	X		
	VANGUARD HIGH SCHOOL	120126001277	X		
	DUNNELLON HIGH SCHOOL	120126002442	X		
	BELLEVUE HIGH SCHOOL	120126002914	X		
	NORTH MARION HIGH SCHOOL	120126001269	X		
	HOWARD MIDDLE SCHOOL	120126001251	X		
	EAST MARION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120126001259	X		
	EIGHTH STREET ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120126001260	X		
	FESSENDEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120126001261	X		
	MADISON STREET ACADEMY OF VISUAL AND PERFORMING ARTS	120126001267	X		
	DR N H JONES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120126001268	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	OSCEOLA MIDDLE SCHOOL	120126001272	X		
	STANTON-WEIRSDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120126001275	X		
	WYOMINA PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120126001276	X		
	FORT MCCOY SCHOOL	120126002618	X		
	OCALA SPRINGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120126002517	X		
	SHADY HILL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120126002518	X		
	HARBOUR VIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120126002767	X		
	MAPLEWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120126000830	X		
	BELLEVIEW MIDDLE SCHOOL	120126001876	X		
	DUNNELLON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120126001878	X		
	SADDLEWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120126003613	X		
	LIBERTY MIDDLE SCHOOL	120126004385	X		
	HAMMETT BOWEN JR. ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120126004985	X		
	HORIZON ACADEMY AT MARION OAKS	120126007398	X		
	BELLEVIEW-SANTOS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120126001254	X		
	NORTH MARION MIDDLE SCHOOL	120126001279	X		
	EVERGREEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120126002766	X		
	MARION CHARTER SCHOOL	120126004387			X
	SOUTH FORK HIGH SCHOOL	120129002344	X		
	JENSEN BEACH HIGH SCHOOL	120129004042	X		
	CLARK ADVANCED LEARNING CENTER	120129004044	X		
	STUART MIDDLE SCHOOL	120129001281	X		
	SEA WIND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120129003007	X		
	J. D. PARKER SCHOOL OF TECHNOLOGY	120129001284	X		
	PALM CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120129001285	X		
	MURRAY MIDDLE SCHOOL	120129001286	X		
	PORT SALERNO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120129001287	X		
	HOBBS SOUND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120129001288	X		
	WARFIELD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120129001289	X		
	JENSEN BEACH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120129001290	X		
	INDIANTOWN MIDDLE SCHOOL	120129001291	X		
	CRYSTAL LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120129002770	X		
	HIDDEN OAKS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120129000834	X		
	BESSEY CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120129003087	X		
	FELIX A WILLIAMS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120129002915	X		
	DR. DAVID L. ANDERSON MIDDLE SCHOOL	120129004989	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	CITRUS GROVE ELEMENTARY	120129007264	X		
	PINEWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120129002619	X		
	CORAL SHORES HIGH SCHOOL	120132001292	X		
	KEY WEST HIGH SCHOOL	120132001294	X		
	HORACE O'BRYANT MIDDLE SCHOOL	120132001295	X		
	POINCIANA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120132001299	X		
	SUGARLOAF SCHOOL	120132001301	X		
	STANLEY SWITLIK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120132001303	X		
	KEY LARGO SCHOOL	120132001304	X		
	PLANTATION KEY SCHOOL	120132001306	X		
	SIGSBEE CHARTER SCHOOL	120132007698	X		
	MONTESSORI ELEMENTARY CHARTER SCHOOL	120132003440	X		
	TREASURE VILLAGE MONTESSORI CHARTER SCHOOL	120132003619	X		
	BIG PINE ACADEMY	120132003875	X		
	WEST NASSAU COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL	120135001317	X		
	FERNANDINA BEACH HIGH SCHOOL	120135002851	X		
	FERNANDINA BEACH MIDDLE SCHOOL	120135001307	X		
	EMMA LOVE HARDEE ELEMENTARY	120135001310	X		
	YULEE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120135001311	X		
	CALLAHAN MIDDLE SCHOOL	120135001314	X		
	BRYCEVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120135001316	X		
	YULEE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120135004113	X		
	HILLIARD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120135001318	X		
	CALLAHAN INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL	120135001319	X		
A	BAKER SCHOOL	120138001321	X		
A	LAUREL HILL SCHOOL	120138001332	X		
A	NICEVILLE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120138001333	X		
A	CHOCTAWHATCHEE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120138001347	X		
A	CRESTVIEW HIGH SCHOOL	120138001348	X		
	COLLEGIATE HIGH SCHOOL AT NORTHWEST FLORIDA STATE COLLEGE	120138004392	X		
A	BOB SIKES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120138001322	X		
A	CLIFFORD MEIGS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120138001324	X		
A	SHOAL RIVER MIDDLE SCHOOL	120138001325	X		
A	C. W. RUCKEL MIDDLE SCHOOL	120138001327	X		
A	DESTIN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120138001328	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
A	LULA J. EDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120138001329	X		
A	NORTHWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120138001334	X		
A	W. C. PRYOR MIDDLE SCHOOL	120138001339	X		
A	WRIGHT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120138001340	X		
A	SHALIMAR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120138001341	X		
A	ELLIOTT POINT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120138001343	X		
A	MARY ESTHER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120138001345	X		
A	JAMES E PLEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120138001346	X		
A	KENWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120138001349	X		
A	FLOROSA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120138001350	X		
A	MAX BRUNER JUNIOR MIDDLE SCHOOL	120138001352	X		
A	ADDIE R. LEWIS SCHOOL	120138001353	X		
A	LONGWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120138001354	X		
A	WALKER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120138002682	X		
A	BLUEWATER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120138002774	X		
A	ANTIOCH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120138003209	X		
A	DAVIDSON MIDDLE SCHOOL	120138003210	X		
A	DESTIN MIDDLE SCHOOL	120138003211	X		
A	LIZA JACKSON PREPARATORY SCHOOL	120138003735	X		
A	NORTHWEST FLORIDA BALLET ACADEMIE	120138003880	X		
BEE	CENTRAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120141001357	X		
BEE	SOUTH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120141001359	X		
BEE	YEARLING MIDDLE SCHOOL	120141001360	X		
BEE	SEMINOLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120141002775	X		
BEE	EVERGLADES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120141002571	X		
	TIMBER CREEK HIGH	120144003745	X		
	OLYMPIA HIGH	120144003746	X		
	FREEDOM HIGH	120144004117	X		
	EDGEWATER HIGH	120144001364	X		
	COLONIAL HIGH	120144001403	X		
	UNIVERSITY HIGH	120144002779	X		
	APOPKA HIGH	120144001455	X		
	CYPRESS CREEK HIGH	120144000865	X		
	JONES HIGH	120144001459	X		
	OCOEE HIGH	120144005638	X		
	EVANS HIGH	120144001404			X

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	OAK RIDGE HIGH	120144001406			X
	WEKIVA HIGH	120144005017			X
	EAST RIVER HIGH	120144007614			X
	LAKE EOLA CHARTER	120144003450	X		
	HOPE CHARTER	120144003738	X		
	OAKLAND AVENUE CHARTER	120144004115	X		
	ORLANDO SCIENCE MIDDLE HIGH CHARTER	120144007458	X		
	LAKEVILLE ELEMENTARY	120144003451	X		
	CYPRESS SPRINGS ELEMENTARY	120144002919	X		
	FERN CREEK ELEMENTARY	120144001368	X		
	OAKSHIRE ELEMENTARY	120144003627	X		
	LAWTON CHILES ELEMENTARY	120144003628	X		
	ENDEAVOR ELEMENTARY	120144004396	X		
	CAMELOT ELEMENTARY	120144003743	X		
	LAKE COMO ELEMENTARY	120144001372	X		
	AVALON ELEMENTARY	120144003744	X		
	WEST CREEK ELEMENTARY	120144004008	X		
	THORNEBROOKE ELEMENTARY	120144003887	X		
	EAGLES NEST ELEMENTARY	120144004003	X		
	LAKE GEM ELEMENTARY	120144003452	X		
	LEGACY MIDDLE	120144005636	X		
	FREEDOM MIDDLE	120144005637	X		
	PRINCETON ELEMENTARY	120144001374	X		
	WEST OAKS ELEMENTARY	120144004004	X		
	EAST LAKE ELEMENTARY	120144005639	X		
	RIVERDALE ELEMENTARY	120144003453	X		
	LAKE GEORGE ELEMENTARY	120144003454	X		
	KILLARNEY ELEMENTARY	120144001378	X		
	ANDOVER ELEMENTARY	120144005641	X		
	WHISPERING OAK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120144005642	X		
	LAKEVIEW MIDDLE	120144001380	X		
	TILDENVILLE ELEMENTARY	120144001381	X		
	HUNTERS CREEK MIDDLE	120144002923	X		
	PINE CASTLE ELEMENTARY	120144001384	X		
	LOCKHART ELEMENTARY	120144001385	X		
	UNION PARK ELEMENTARY	120144001386	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	AUDUBON PARK ELEMENTARY	120144001391	X		
	DREAM LAKE ELEMENTARY	120144001392	X		
	LAKEMONT ELEMENTARY	120144001394	X		
	GLENRIDGE MIDDLE	120144001395	X		
	AZALEA PARK ELEMENTARY	120144001398	X		
	BLANKNER K-8	120144001400	X		
	LAKE WESTON ELEMENTARY	120144001402	X		
	MAITLAND MIDDLE	120144001410	X		
	BROOKSHIRE ELEMENTARY	120144001412	X		
	NORTHLAKE PARK COMMUNITY ELEMENTARY	120144003629	X		
	TANGELO PARK ELEMENTARY	120144001416	X		
	CHICKASAW ELEMENTARY	120144001418	X		
	SPRING LAKE ELEMENTARY	120144001419	X		
	MCCOY ELEMENTARY	120144001424	X		
	PERSHING ELEMENTARY	120144001425	X		
	CLARCONA ELEMENTARY	120144002522	X		
	PALM LAKE ELEMENTARY	120144002573	X		
	VENTURA ELEMENTARY	120144002574	X		
	ARBOR RIDGE K-8	120144002685	X		
	ROCK SPRINGS ELEMENTARY	120144002620	X		
	METROWEST ELEMENTARY	120144002621	X		
	SOUTHWEST MIDDLE	120144002858	X		
	MEADOW WOODS ELEMENTARY	120144002687	X		
	WATERBRIDGE ELEMENTARY	120144002859	X		
	WINDY RIDGE K-8	120144002780	X		
	BAY MEADOWS ELEMENTARY	120144002781	X		
	JOHN YOUNG ELEMENTARY	120144002782	X		
	WATERFORD ELEMENTARY	120144002860	X		
	DISCOVERY MIDDLE	120144003217	X		
	LITTLE RIVER ELEMENTARY	120144002861	X		
	DOMMERICH ELEMENTARY	120144001432	X		
	HUNTERS CREEK ELEMENTARY	120144002926	X		
	LAKE SYBELIA ELEMENTARY	120144001433	X		
	WINDERMERE ELEMENTARY	120144001434	X		
	ROSEMONT ELEMENTARY	120144003218	X		
	CORNER LAKE MIDDLE	120144003457	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	CHAIN OF LAKES MIDDLE	120144003630	X		
	MAXEY ELEMENTARY	120144001439	X		
	SOUTHWOOD ELEMENTARY	120144003219	X		
	HUNGERFORD ELEMENTARY	120144001442	X		
	SUNRISE ELEMENTARY	120144003220	X		
	CONWAY MIDDLE	120144001445	X		
	ALOMA ELEMENTARY	120144001446	X		
	COLUMBIA ELEMENTARY	120144001451	X		
	OCOE ELEMENTARY	120144002225	X		
	WESTBROOKE ELEMENTARY	120144005019	X		
	LAKE WHITNEY ELEMENTARY	120144003221	X		
	MOSS PARK ELEMENTARY	120144005021	X		
	DR. PHILLIPS ELEMENTARY	120144002220	X		
	DEERWOOD ELEMENTARY	120144002475	X		
	CASTLE CREEK ELEMENTARY	120144005022	X		
	GOTHA MIDDLE	120144002927	X		
	ODYSSEY MIDDLE	120144003747	X		
	SOUTH CREEK MIDDLE	120144005025	X		
	SAND LAKE ELEMENTARY	120144005026	X		
	WOLF LAKE ELEMENTARY	120144005028	X		
	VISTA LAKES ELEMENTARY	120144005029	X		
	BRIDGEWATER MIDDLE	120144005031	X		
	AVALON MIDDLE	120144005032	X		
	STONE LAKES ELEMENTARY	120144005033	X		
	SUNSET PARK ELEMENTARY	120144005034	X		
	LAKE NONA MIDDLE	120144007531	X		
	TIMBER LAKES ELEMENTARY	120144007434	X		
	LOVELL ELEMENTARY	120144001417	X		
	HIDDEN OAKS ELEMENTARY	120144002862	X		
	PALMETTO ELEMENTARY	120144001452	X		
	CATALINA ELEMENTARY	120144001407			X
	WHEATLEY ELEMENTARY	120144001444			X
	RIDGEWOOD PARK ELEMENTARY	120144001449			X
	WASHINGTON SHORES ELEMENTARY	120144001462			X
	CARVER MIDDLE	120144001463			X
	RICHMOND HEIGHTS ELEMENTARY	120144001464			X

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	RIO GRANDE CHARTER	120144003626		X	
	NAP FORD COMMUNITY CHARTER	120144003739		X	
	KALEY ELEMENTARY	120144001371		X	
	NEW DIMENSIONS HIGH SCHOOL	120147003467	X		
	PROFESSIONAL & TECHNICAL HIGH	120147003634	X		
	CELEBRATION HIGH SCHOOL	120147004118	X		
	OSCEOLA COUNTY SCHOOL OF ARTS	120147004119	X		
	OSCEOLA HIGH SCHOOL	120147001469	X		
	ST. CLOUD HIGH SCHOOL	120147001473	X		
	GATEWAY HIGH SCHOOL	120147002476	X		
	POINCIANA HIGH SCHOOL	120147002866	X		
	LIBERTY HIGH SCHOOL	120147007417	X		
	HARMONY COMMUNITY SCHOOL	120147007630	X		
	NARCOOSSEE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120147003632	X		
	NARCOOSSEE ELEMENTARY	120147007498	X		
	HIGHLANDS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120147001468	X		
	ST. CLOUD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120147001472	X		
	MICHIGAN AVENUE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120147001474	X		
	ST. CLOUD MIDDLE SCHOOL	120147001475	X		
	REEDY CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120147002231	X		
	WESTSIDE K-8	120147007628	X		
	NEPTUNE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120147002672	X		
	HORIZON MIDDLE SCHOOL	120147003008	X		
	BOGGY CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120147002357	X		
	HICKORY TREE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120147002448	X		
	CELEBRATION SCHOOL	120147003098	X		
	LAKEVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120147002576	X		
	PLEASANT HILL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120147002622	X		
	DEERWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120147002865	X		
	CYPRESS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120147000913	X		
	FOUR CORNERS CHARTER SCHOOL	120147004401	X		
	KISSIMMEE CHARTER ACADEMY	120147004402	X		
	PARTIN SETTLEMENT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120147003890	X		
	CANOE CREEK CHARTER ACADEMY	120147003892	X		
	NEPTUNE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120147007373	X		
	SUNRISE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120147005656	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	EAST LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120147007895	X		
	KISSIMMEE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120147004398	X		
	CENTRAL AVENUE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120147003749	X		
	KISSIMMEE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120147003097	X		
	MILL CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120147002575	X		
	POINCIANA ACADEMY OF FINE ARTS	120147003889	X		
	FLORA RIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120147005055	X		
CH	JUPITER HIGH SCHOOL	120150001477	X		
CH	SUNCOAST COMMUNITY HIGH SCHOOL	120150001484	X		
CH	ALEXANDER W DREYFOOS JUNIOR SCHOOL OF THE ARTS	120150002783	X		
CH	LAKE WORTH HIGH SCHOOL	120150001516	X		
CH	BOCA RATON COMMUNITY HIGH SCHOOL	120150001535	X		
CH	JOHN I. LEONARD HIGH SCHOOL	120150001548	X		
CH	SANTALUCES COMMUNITY HIGH	120150002233	X		
CH	SPANISH RIVER COMMUNITY HIGH SCHOOL	120150002383	X		
CH	PARK VISTA COMMUNITY HIGH SCHOOL	120150004020	X		
CH	OLYMPIC HEIGHTS COMMUNITY HIGH	120150002876	X		
CH	WELLINGTON HIGH SCHOOL	120150002631	X		
CH	PALM BEACH CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL	120150004121	X		
CH	WEST BOCA RATON HIGH SCHOOL	120150004026	X		
CH	G-STAR SCHOOL OF THE ARTS	120150004131	X		
CH	SEMINOLE RIDGE COMMUNITY HIGH SCHOOL	120150003944	X		
CH	FOREST HILL COMMUNITY HIGH SCHOOL	120150001507	X		
CH	INLET GROVE COMMUNITY HIGH SCHOOL	120150001557	X		
CH	SOUTH TECH ACADEMY	120150002234	X		
CH	PAHOKEE MIDDLE-SENIOR HIGH	120150002624	X		
CH	ROYAL PALM BEACH HIGH SCHOOL	120150003223	X		
CH	BOYNTON BEACH COMMUNITY HIGH	120150003755	X		
CH	PALM BEACH LAKES HIGH SCHOOL	120150002627	X		
CH	GLADES CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL	120150001541	X		
CH	RIVIERA BEACH MARITIME ACADEMY	120150005968			X
CH	HIDDEN OAKS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150003946	X		
CH	L C SWAIN MIDDLE SCHOOL	120150004024	X		
CH	WATERS EDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150003100	X		
CH	PINE JOG ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150007604	X		
CH	EVERGLADES ELEMENTARY	120150007925	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
CH	JUPITER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150001476	X		
CH	ALLAMANDA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150001479	X		
CH	NORTH PALM BEACH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150001482	X		
CH	LINCOLN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150001487	X		
CH	SUNSET PALMS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150007561	X		
CH	NORTHBORO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150001491	X		
CH	ROOSEVELT MIDDLE SCHOOL	120150001492	X		
CH	U. B. KINSEY/PALMVIEW ELEMENTARY	120150001495	X		
CH	PALM BEACH PUBLIC SCHOOL	120150001497	X		
CH	SOUTH OLIVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150001506	X		
CH	MEADOW PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150001508	X		
CH	BERKSHIRE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150001509	X		
CH	PALM SPRINGS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120150001510	X		
CH	FOREST HILL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150001511	X		
CH	GREENACRES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150001512	X		
CH	PALM SPRINGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150001513	X		
CH	MARSH POINTE ELEMENTARY	120150007552	X		
CH	ACADEMY FOR POSITIVE LEARNING	120150004022	X		
CH	NORTH GRADE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150001515	X		
CH	LANTANA MIDDLE SCHOOL	120150001521	X		
CH	STARLIGHT COVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150003009	X		
CH	POINCIANA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150001523	X		
CH	S. D. SPADY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150001529	X		
CH	J. C. MITCHELL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150001533	X		
CH	GLADE VIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150001545	X		
CH	WYNNEBROOK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150001550	X		
CH	ADDISON MIZNER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150001556	X		
CH	BOCA RATON COMMUNITY MIDDLE SCHOOL	120150001558	X		
CH	DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150001560	X		
CH	CONGRESS COMMUNITY MIDDLE SCHOOL	120150001561	X		
CH	JERRY THOMAS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150002232	X		
CH	VERDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150002386	X		
CH	WELLINGTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150002091	X		
CH	CRESTWOOD COMMUNITY MIDDLE	120150002365	X		
CH	WELLINGTON LANDINGS MIDDLE	120150002578	X		
CH	JUPITER MIDDLE SCHOOL	120150002375	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
CH	DEL PRADO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150002691	X		
CH	LOGGERS' RUN COMMUNITY MIDDLE SCHOOL	120150002378	X		
CH	H. L. JOHNSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150002370	X		
CH	WHISPERING PINES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150002450	X		
CH	CHRISTA MCAULIFFE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120150002523	X		
CH	LIBERTY PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150002784	X		
CH	LOXAHATCHEE GROVES ELEMENTARY	120150002524	X		
CH	CALUSA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150002579	X		
CH	WOODLANDS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120150003010	X		
CH	MORIKAMI PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150003468	X		
CH	SANDPIPER SHORES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150002694	X		
CH	WATSON B. DUNCAN MIDDLE SCHOOL	120150002870	X		
CH	OMNI MIDDLE SCHOOL	120150002785	X		
CH	TIMBER TRACE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150002871	X		
CH	LIMESTONE CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150002696	X		
CH	CARVER MIDDLE SCHOOL	120150002932	X		
CH	NEW HORIZONS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150002630	X		
CH	CITRUS COVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150002697	X		
CH	HAMMOCK POINTE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150000961	X		
CH	JUPITER FARMS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150002786	X		
CH	EGRET LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150002933	X		
CH	CRYSTAL LAKES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150002872	X		
CH	ACREAGE PINES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150002874	X		
CH	OKEEHEELEE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120150003101	X		
CH	PANTHER RUN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150002875	X		
CH	MANATEE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150002934	X		
CH	GOLDEN GROVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150003224	X		
CH	WESTERN PINES COMMUNITY MIDDLE	120150003225	X		
CH	EAGLES LANDING MIDDLE SCHOOL	120150003469	X		
CH	BAK MIDDLE SCHOOL OF THE ARTS	120150003226	X		
CH	BEACON COVE INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL	120150003756	X		
CH	FRONTIER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150003757	X		
CH	BINKS FOREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150003637	X		
CH	CORAL REEF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150003638	X		
CH	PLEASANT CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150003896	X		
CH	ODYSSEY MIDDLE SCHOOL	120150003758	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
CH	POLO PARK MIDDLE SCHOOL	120150004412	X		
CH	INDEPENDENCE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120150003897	X		
CH	FREEDOM SHORES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150003898	X		
CH	SUNRISE PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150003759	X		
CH	DON ESTRIDGE HIGH TECH MIDDLE SCHOOL	120150004015	X		
CH	DISCOVERY KEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150003760	X		
CH	CROSSPOINTE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150003899	X		
CH	ROYAL PALM BEACH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150003900	X		
CH	BENOIST FARMS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150003901	X		
CH	TRADEWINDS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120150004021	X		
CH	PALM BEACH MARITIME ACADEMY	120150004413	X		
CH	OSCEOLA CREEK MIDDLE SCHOOL	120150004030	X		
CH	PIERCE HAMMOCK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150004025	X		
CH	WESTERN ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL	120150004125	X		
CH	EQUESTRIAN TRAILS ELEMENTARY	120150004129	X		
CH	ELBRIDGE GALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150005687	X		
CH	EMERALD COVE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120150007400	X		
CH	IMAGINE SCHOOLS CHANCELLOR CAMPUS	120150003768	X		
CH	GLADES ACADEMY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL INC	120150003769	X		
CH	BRIGHT FUTURES INTERNATIONAL	120150003771	X		
CH	JFK MEDICAL CENTER CHARTER SCHOOL	120150003907	X		
CH	K-8 FLVA VIRTUAL SCHOOL CONTINUITY PROGRAM	120150007706	X		
CH	HOWELL L. WATKINS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120150001481	X		
CH	LAKE PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150001483	X		
CH	PLUMOSA SCHOOL OF THE ARTS	120150001528	X		
CH	PAHOKEE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150001538	X		
CH	CYPRESS TRAILS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150002693	X		
CH	BEAR LAKES MIDDLE SCHOOL	120150002695	X		
CH	ROOSEVELT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150001493	X		
CH	ROSENWALD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150001547	X		
CH	GROVE PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150001552	X		
CH	PIONEER PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150003012	X		
CH	BARTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150001519			X
CH	GALAXY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150001525			X
CH	WEST RIVIERA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150001551	X		X
CH	K. E. CUNNINGHAM/CANAL POINT ELEMENTARY	120150002626			X

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
CH	BELLE GLADE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120150003102	X		X
CH	DR. MARY MCLEOD BETHUNE ELEMENTARY	120150004410			X
CH	JOSEPH LITTLES-NGUZO SABA	120150003641		X	
	JAMES W. MITCHELL HIGH SCHOOL	120153004423	X		
	LAND O' LAKES HIGH SCHOOL	120153001586	X		
	PASCO HIGH SCHOOL	120153001563	X		
	WESLEY CHAPEL HIGH SCHOOL	120153003650	X		
	ZEPHYRHILLS HIGH SCHOOL	120153001569	X		
	GULF HIGH SCHOOL	120153001578	X		
	RIVER RIDGE HIGH SCHOOL	120153002882	X		
	RIDGEWOOD HIGH SCHOOL	120153001590	X		
	HUDSON HIGH SCHOOL	120153001583			X
	ANCLOTE HIGH SCHOOL	120153007618		X	
	TRINITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120153003911	X		
	SEVEN SPRINGS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120153003106	X		
	DENHAM OAKS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120153003013	X		
	CHASCO MIDDLE SCHOOL	120153003775	X		
	CENTENNIAL MIDDLE SCHOOL	120153003776	X		
	OAKSTEAD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120153006561	X		
	TRINITY OAKS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120153006755	X		
	DR. JOHN LONG MIDDLE SCHOOL	120153006898	X		
	WEST ZEPHYRHILLS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120153001567	X		X
	CHARLES S. RUSHE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120153007326	X		
	CREWS LAKE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120153007339	X		
	VETERANS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120153007385	X		
	WATERGRASS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120153007610	X		
	ODESSA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120153007744	X		
	WOODLAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120153001570	X		
	CONNERTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120153001572	X		
	MITTYE P. LOCKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120153001573	X		
	RICHEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120153001575	X		
	COTEE RIVER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120153002937	X		
	BAYONET POINT MIDDLE SCHOOL	120153001580	X		
	THOMAS E. WEIGHTMAN MIDDLE SCHOOL	120153002881	X		
	RIVER RIDGE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120153005308	X		
	SHADY HILLS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120153001584	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	PINE VIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120153004132	X		
	PINE VIEW MIDDLE SCHOOL	120153001589	X		
	LAKE MYRTLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120153002451	X		
	SAND PINE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120153003476	X		
	WESLEY CHAPEL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120153003912	X		
	LONGLEAF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120153005692	X		
	SEVEN OAKS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120153005693	X		
	DAYSPRING ACADEMY	120153004426	X		
	ACADEMY AT THE FARM	120153003913	X		
	COUNTRYSIDE MONTESSORI ACADEMY	120153003916	X		
	IMAGINE SCHOOL AT LAND O' LAKES	120153007452	X		
	CHASCO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120153004421	X		
	PASCO MIDDLE SCHOOL	120153001565	X		
	CALUSA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120153002239	X		
	JAMES M. MARLOWE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120153003651			X
	HUDSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120153001576			X
	LACOCHEE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120153001577			X
	GULF HIGHLANDS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120153006288		X	
	NORTHEAST HIGH SCHOOL	120156001647	X		
	ST. PETERSBURG HIGH SCHOOL	120156001675	X		
	SEMINOLE HIGH SCHOOL	120156001680	X		
	TARPON SPRINGS HIGH SCHOOL	120156001693	X		
	PALM HARBOR UNIVERSITY HIGH	120156003014	X		
	EAST LAKE HIGH SCHOOL	120156003110	X		
	ST. PETERSBURG COLLEGIATE HIGH SCHOOL	120156004033	X		
	CLEARWATER HIGH SCHOOL	120156001610	X		
	COUNTRYSIDE HIGH SCHOOL	120156002242	X		
	DUNEDIN HIGH SCHOOL	120156001616	X		
	GIBBS HIGH SCHOOL	120156001624	X		
	LAKELWOOD HIGH SCHOOL	120156001633	X		
	PINELLAS PARK HIGH SCHOOL	120156001667	X		
	BOCA CIEGA HIGH SCHOOL	120156001605			X
	DIXIE M. HOLLINS HIGH SCHOOL	120156001614			X
	LARGO HIGH SCHOOL	120156001635			X
	ANONA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156001592	X		
	AZALEA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156001593	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	BARDMOOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156001595	X		
	BAUDER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156001597	X		
	BAY POINT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156001598	X		
	BAY VISTA FUNDAMENTAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156001600	X		
	BLANTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156001604	X		
	BROOKER CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156003252	X		
	JOSEPH L. CARWISE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120156001978	X		
	CLEARWATER FUNDAMENTAL MIDDLE SCHOOL	120156003108	X		
	CROSS BAYOU ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156001612	X		
	LEILA DAVIS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156002244	X		
	JOHN M. SEXTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156003253	X		
	FOREST LAKES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156002938	X		
	FRONTIER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156002939	X		
	FUGUITT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156001621	X		
	PERKINS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156001623	X		
	GARRISON-JONES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156002789	X		
	HIGHLAND LAKES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156002884	X		
	DOUG JAMERSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156004133	X		
	LAKEVIEW FUNDAMENTAL ELEMENTARY	120156001631	X		
	MADEIRA BEACH FUNDAMENTAL K-8	120156001640	X		
	NORTHWEST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156001651	X		
	OAKHURST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156001654	X		
	OLDSMAR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156001655	X		
	ORANGE GROVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156001656	X		
	OSCEOLA MIDDLE SCHOOL	120156002478	X		
	OZONA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156001657	X		
	CURTIS FUNDAMENTAL ELEMENTARY	120156001658	X		
	PALM HARBOR MIDDLE SCHOOL	120156002453	X		
	PASADENA FUNDAMENTAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156001661	X		
	SAFETY HARBOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156001673	X		
	SAFETY HARBOR MIDDLE SCHOOL	120156001674	X		
	SEMINOLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156001679	X		
	SEMINOLE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120156001681	X		
	SHORE ACRES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156001683	X		
	SKYCREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156001685	X		
	STARKEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156001689	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	MARJORIE KINNAN RAWLINGS ELEM	120156000984	X		
	SUNSET HILLS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156001690	X		
	TARPON SPRINGS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120156002400	X		
	THURGOOD MARSHALL FUNDAMENTAL	120156004135	X		
	TARPON SPRINGS FUNDAMENTAL ELE	120156001697	X		
	WALSINGHAM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156001698	X		
	SOUTHERN OAK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156002582	X		
	CYPRESS WOODS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156002479	X		
	SUTHERLAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156002528	X		
	ACADEMIE DA VINCI CHARTER SCHOOL	120156003255	X		
	PINELLAS PREPARATORY ACADEMY	120156003917	X		
	PLATO ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL	120156004036	X		
	PINELLAS CENTRAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156001663	X		
	JOHN HOPKINS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120156001684	X		
	GULFPORT MONTESSOURI ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156001626	X		
	PINELLAS PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156001665	X		
	NEW HEIGHTS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156001695	X		
	WOODLAWN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156001700	X		
	AZALEA MIDDLE SCHOOL	120156001594			X
	FAIRMOUNT PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156001619	X		X
	LAKWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156001632	X		X
	PINELLAS PARK MIDDLE SCHOOL	120156001666			X
	JAMES B. SANDERLIN ELEMENTARY	120156004134			X
	SANDY LANE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156001678			X
	IMAGINE CHARTER SCHOOL	120156007471	X		X
	IMAGINE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120156007765			X
	MAXIMO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156001641		X	
	MELROSE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120156001643		X	
	MCKEEL ACADEMY OF TECHNOLOGY	120159001785	X		
	LAKELAND SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120159001703	X		
	FORT MEADE MIDDLE/SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120159001743	X		
	GEORGE W. JENKINS SENIOR HIGH	120159001985	X		
	LAKE REGION HIGH SCHOOL	120159003016	X		
	RIDGE COMMUNITY HIGH SCHOOL	120159004179	X		
	KATHLEEN SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120159001766	X		
	LAKE WALES SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120159001790	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	HAINES CITY SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120159001795	X		
	WINTER HAVEN SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120159001726			X
	TENOROC HIGH SCHOOL	120159007310			X
	MULBERRY SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120159001762			X
	LAWTON CHILES MIDDLE ACADEMY	120159003015	X		
	CLEVELAND COURT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120159001708	X		
	CRYSTAL LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120159001710	X		
	DIXIELAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120159001712	X		
	PHILIP O'BRIEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120159001713	X		
	SOUTHWEST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120159001717	X		
	LINCOLN AVENUE ACADEMY	120159001718	X		
	ROCHELLE SCHOOL OF THE ARTS	120159001719	X		
	DANIEL JENKINS ACADEMY OF TECHNOLOGY MIDDLE SCHOOL	120159004435	X		
	BETHUNE ACADEMY	120159001724	X		
	RIDGEVIEW GLOBAL STUDIES ACADEMY	120159004437	X		
	FRANK E. BRIGHAM ACADEMY	120159001728	X		
	LAKE ALFRED ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120159001735	X		
	JEWETT MIDDLE ACADEMY MAGNET	120159001739	X		
	CHAIN OF LAKES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120159005714	X		
	BARTOW ELEMENTARY ACADEMY	120159001755	X		
	FLORAL AVENUE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120159001756	X		
	UNION ACADEMY	120159002457	X		
	PURCELL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120159001763	X		
	WINSTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120159001771	X		
	SLEEPY HILL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120159005337	X		
	HIGHLANDS GROVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120159005338	X		
	HILLCREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120159001775	X		
	JANIE HOWARD WILSON SCHOOL	120159001778	X		
	DALE R FAIR BABSON PARK ELEMENTARY	120159001779	X		
	BOK ACADEMY	120159006968	X		
	SCOTT LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120159001786	X		
	MCKEEL ELEMENTARY ACADEMY	120159004137	X		
	SOUTH MCKEEL ACADEMY	120159005341	X		
	GARDEN GROVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120159001789	X		
	PINEWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120159004440	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	LAKELAND HIGHLANDS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120159001793	X		
	JAMES W. SIKES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120159002404	X		
	DR. NE ROBERTS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120159003926	X		
	ROSABELLE W. BLAKE ACADEMY	120159003927	X		
	WENDELL WATSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120159002893	X		
	VALLEYVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120159002894	X		
	SOCRUM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120159002895	X		
	BERKLEY ACCELERATED MIDDLE SCHOOL	120159004188	X		
	CARLTON PALMORE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120159001706	X		
	ELBERT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120159001730	X		
	LAKE SHIPP ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120159001733	X		
	GIBBONS STREET ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120159001759	X		
	HIGHLAND CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120159001761	X		
	CRYSTAL LAKE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120159001782	X		
	OSCAR J. POPE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120159001783	X		
	SPESSARD L HOLLAND ELEMENTARY	120159007262	X		
	BEN HILL GRIFFIN JR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120159001982	X		
	LOUGHMAN OAKS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120159001043	X		
	JAMES E. STEPHENS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120159001791	X		
	SHELLEY S. BOONE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120159001721			X
	ALTA VISTA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120159001722			X
	WALTER CALDWELL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120159001750			X
	KINGSFORD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120159001764			X
	LAKE ALFRED-ADDAIR MIDDLE SCHOOL	120159007029			X
	EAGLE LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120159001788			X
	R. CLEM CHURCHWELL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120159002480			X
	CRESCENT CITY JUNIOR/SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120162001810	X		
	PALATKA HIGH SCHOOL	120162001811	X		
	INTERLACHEN HIGH SCHOOL	120162001802			X
	THE CHILDREN'S READING CENTER	120162004139	X		
	MELLON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120162001799	X		
	KELLEY SMITH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120162001800	X		
	MELROSE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120162001804	X		
	Q. I. ROBERTS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120162004140	X		
	INTERLACHEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120162002664	X		
	BROWNING-PEARCE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120162002667	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	W. H. BEASLEY MIDDLE SCHOOL	120162001797			X
	WILLIAM D. MOSELEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120162003791			X
SA	GULF BREEZE HIGH SCHOOL	120165001821	X		
SA	JAY HIGH SCHOOL	120165001823	X		
SA	MILTON HIGH SCHOOL	120165001826	X		
SA	PACE HIGH SCHOOL	120165001830	X		
SA	BERRYHILL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120165001814	X		
SA	BAGDAD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120165001815	X		
SA	CHUMUCKLA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120165001816	X		
SA	GULF BREEZE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120165001819	X		
SA	GULF BREEZE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120165001820	X		
SA	JAY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120165001824	X		
SA	W. H. RHODES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120165002098	X		
SA	HOBBS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120165001832	X		
SA	MARTIN LUTHER KING MIDDLE SCHOOL	120165001833	X		
SA	HOLLEY-NAVARRÉ INTERMEDIATE	120165001834	X		
SA	HOLLEY-NAVARRÉ MIDDLE SCHOOL	120165002670	X		
SA	PEA RIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120165002097	X		
SA	AVALON MIDDLE SCHOOL	120165003664	X		
SA	ORIOLE BEACH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120165002258	X		
SA	BENNETT C RUSSELL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120165005376	X		
SA	S. S. DIXON INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL	120165002959	X		
SA	THOMAS L SIMS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120165003504	X		
SA	WEST NAVARRÉ INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL	120165003665	X		
SA	WOODLAWN BEACH MIDDLE SCHOOL	120165004446	X		
A	PINE VIEW SCHOOL	120168001836	X		
A	SARASOTA MILITARY ACADEMY	120168003933	X		
A	BOOKER HIGH SCHOOL	120168002461	X		
A	VENICE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120168001851	X		
A	SARASOTA HIGH SCHOOL	120168001838	X		
A	NORTH PORT HIGH SCHOOL	120168003800	X		
A	ALTA VISTA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120168001835	X		
A	SARASOTA MIDDLE SCHOOL	120168001837	X		
A	BAY HAVEN SCHOOL OF BASICS PLUS	120168002458	X		
A	SUNCOAST SCHOOL FOR INNOVATIVE STUDIES	120168003508	X		
A	SARASOTA SCHOOL OF ARTS/SCIENCES	120168003265	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	ISLAND VILLAGE MONTESSORI SCHOOL	120168003799	X		
	SARASOTA SUNCOAST ACADEMY	120168004199	X		
	STUDENT LEADERSHIP ACADEMY	120168004203	X		
	IMAGINE SCHOOL AT NORTH PORT	120168007469	X		
	BROOKSIDE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120168001841	X		
	FRUITVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120168001843	X		
	MCINTOSH MIDDLE SCHOOL	120168001844	X		
	PHILLIPPI SHORES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120168001846	X		
	SOUTHSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120168001848	X		
	TUTTLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120168001849	X		
	VENICE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120168001850	X		
	GOCIO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120168001853	X		
	GULF GATE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120168001854	X		
	WILKINSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120168001855	X		
	ASHTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120168001859	X		
	VENICE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120168002462	X		
	GLENALLEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120168002463	X		
	LAKEVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120168002583	X		
	TAYLOR RANCH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120168002792	X		
	LAUREL NOKOMIS SCHOOL	120168001154	X		
	TOLEDO BLADE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120168001175	X		
	ATWATER ELEMENTARY	120168007758	X		
	HERON CREEK MIDDLE SCHOOL	120168003935	X		
	CRANBERRY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120168004142	X		
	TATUM RIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120168005734	X		
	WOODLAND MIDDLE SCHOOL	120168007410	X		
	SUNCOAST POLYTECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL	120168007003	X		
	BOOKER MIDDLE SCHOOL	120168002460	X		
	LAKE MARY HIGH SCHOOL	120171002261	X		
	OVIEDO HIGH SCHOOL	120171001886	X		
	LAKE BRANTLEY HIGH SCHOOL	120171001888	X		
	LAKE HOWELL HIGH SCHOOL	120171001895	X		
	WINTER SPRINGS HIGH SCHOOL	120171003270	X		
	SEMINOLE HIGH SCHOOL	120171001872	X		
	BEAR LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120171001862	X		
	GENEVA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120171001864	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	LAKE MARY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120171001866	X		
	LONGWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120171001867	X		
	EVANS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120171004449	X		
	LAWTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120171001869	X		
	SANFORD MIDDLE SCHOOL	120171001871	X		
	WALKER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120171004009	X		
	MILLENNIUM MIDDLE SCHOOL	120171001873	X		
	SOUTH SEMINOLE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120171001874	X		
	WILSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120171001877	X		
	GOLDSBORO ELEMENTARY MAGNET	120171001879	X		
	JACKSON HEIGHTS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120171001881	X		
	HIGHLANDS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120171003125	X		
	RAINBOW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120171001997	X		
	WINTER SPRINGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120171001884	X		
	SPRING LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120171001885	X		
	CARILLON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120171003126	X		
	TEAGUE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120171001889	X		
	FOREST CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120171001890	X		
	RED BUG ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120171001891	X		
	IDYLLWILDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120171001892	X		
	EASTBROOK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120171001893	X		
	TUSKAWILLA MIDDLE SCHOOL	120171001894	X		
	ALTAMONTE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120171001896	X		
	SABAL POINT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120171001897	X		
	WOODLANDS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120171001898	X		
	LAKE ORIENTA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120171001899	X		
	STERLING PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120171001900	X		
	ROCK LAKE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120171002103	X		
	WEKIVA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120171001901	X		
	KEETH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120171002410	X		
	GREENWOOD LAKES MIDDLE SCHOOL	120171002534	X		
	STENSTROM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120171002636	X		
	HEATHROW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120171002905	X		
	PARTIN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120171002906	X		
	INDIAN TRAILS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120171001179	X		
	CHILES MIDDLE SCHOOL	120171004450	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	MARKHAM WOODS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120171005390	X		
	BENTLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120171003801	X		
	CRYSTAL LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120171005391	X		
	CHOICES IN LEARNING CHARTER	120171003803	X		
	THE WEBSTER SCHOOL	120174001918	X		
	ALLEN D NEASE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	120174002262	X		
	BARTRAM TRAIL HIGH SCHOOL	120174004445	X		
	PONTE VEDRA HIGH SCHOOL	120174007246	X		
	CREEKSIDE HIGH SCHOOL	120174007388	X		
	PEDRO MENENDEZ HIGH SCHOOL	120174004444	X		
	ACADEMY FOR BUSINESS AND LEADERSHIP EDUCATION	120174007189	X		
	KETTERLINUS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120174001909	X		
	R. B. HUNT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120174001914	X		
	R J MURRAY MIDDLE SCHOOL	120174001915	X		
	JULINGTON CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120174001920	X		
	W. DOUGLAS HARTLEY ELEMENTARY	120174002263	X		
	SEBASTIAN MIDDLE SCHOOL	120174002896	X		
	ALICE B. LANDRUM MIDDLE SCHOOL	120174002897	X		
	SWITZERLAND POINT MIDDLE SCHOOL	120174002898	X		
	OSCEOLA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120174002899	X		
	MILL CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120174002900	X		
	PONTE VEDRA PALM VALLEY- RAWLINGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120174001057	X		
	OTIS A. MASON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120174001060	X		
	GAMBLE ROGERS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120174002956	X		
	CUNNINGHAM CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120174003018	X		
	OCEAN PALMS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120174003120	X		
	DURBIN CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120174004141	X		
	TIMBERLIN CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120174005723	X		
	SOUTH WOODS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120174005724	X		
	LIBERTY PINES ACADEMY	120174007576	X		
	PACETTI BAY MIDDLE SCHOOL	120174007334	X		
	WARDS CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120174007272	X		
	FRUIT COVE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120174003794	X		
	HICKORY CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120174005725	X		
	LINCOLN PARK ACADEMY	120177001932	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	TREASURE COAST HIGH SCHOOL	120177004148	X		
	FORT PIERCE CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL	120177001933	X		
	PORT ST. LUCIE HIGH SCHOOL	120177002671	X		
	FORT PIERCE WESTWOOD HIGH SCHOOL	120177002104			X
	WHITE CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120177001922	X		
	FAIRLAWN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120177001923	X		
	LAWNWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120177001925	X		
	ST. LUCIE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120177001926	X		
	FRANCES K. SWEET ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120177001928	X		
	SAVANNA RIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120177003501	X		
	ST. LUCIE WEST K-8 SCHOOL	120177003502	X		
	ALLAPATTAH FLATS K-8	120177006839	X		
	MORNINGSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120177002266	X		
	FLORESTA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120177002264	X		
	BAYSHORE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120177002638	X		
	VILLAGE GREEN ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES SCHOOL	120177002537	X		
	PARKWAY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120177002673	X		
	SOUTHPORT MIDDLE SCHOOL	120177002901	X		
	MARIPOSA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120177001081	X		
	OAK HAMMOCK K-8 SCHOOL	120177003943	X		
	MANATEE ACADEMY K-8	120177001111	X		
	SOUTHERN OAKS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120177003020	X		
	WEST GATE K-8 SCHOOL	120177005371	X		
	RENAISSANCE CHARTER SCHOOL OF ST. LUCIE	120177007685	X		
	NAU CHARTER SCHOOL	120177007574	X		
	SOUTH SUMTER HIGH SCHOOL	120180001942	X		
	VILLAGES CHARTER SCHOOL	120180004452	X		
	BUSHNELL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120180001935	X		
	SOUTH SUMTER MIDDLE SCHOOL	120180001936	X		
	WEBSTER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120180001937	X		
	WILDWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120180001940	X		
	LAKE PANASOFFKEE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120180002639	X		
EE	SUWANNEE HIGH SCHOOL	120183001946			X
EE	BRANFORD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120183004454	X		
EE	SUWANNEE INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL	120183001945	X		
	TAYLOR COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL	120186002002	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	TAYLOR COUNTY MIDDLE SCHOOL	120186001949	X		
	STEINHATCHEE SCHOOL	120186001952	X		
	LAKE BUTLER MIDDLE SCHOOL	120189001957	X		
	LAKE BUTLER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120189001958	X		
	NEW SMYRNA BEACH HIGH SCHOOL	120192001990	X		
	DELAND HIGH SCHOOL	120192001969	X		
	ATLANTIC HIGH SCHOOL	120192002968	X		
	DELTONA HIGH SCHOOL	120192002641	X		
	MAINLAND HIGH SCHOOL	120192001986			X
	PINE RIDGE HIGH SCHOOL	120192002970			X
	BLUE LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120192002415	X		
	TOMOKA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120192001962	X		
	PINE TRAIL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120192002269	X		
	ORMOND BEACH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120192001966	X		
	CORONADO BEACH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120192001967	X		
	OSTEEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120192002267	X		
	SILVER SANDS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120192002417	X		
	HORIZON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120192002709	X		
	INDIAN RIVER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120192002795	X		
	ORMOND BEACH MIDDLE SCHOOL	120192001993	X		
	SPRUCE CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120192002105	X		
	SUGAR MILL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120192002271	X		
	OSCEOLA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120192001996	X		
	PORT ORANGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120192001999	X		
	SWEETWATER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120192002969	X		
	READ-PATTILLO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120192002000	X		
	DISCOVERY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120192002640	X		
	SUNRISE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120192001208	X		
	FRIENDSHIP ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120192002004	X		
	RIVER SPRINGS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120192006999	X		
	FOREST LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120192003129	X		
	DEBARY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120192003130	X		
	HERITAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120192003670	X		
	FREEDOM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120192004455	X		
	CREEKSIDE MIDDLE SCHOOL	120192003808	X		
	DAVID C HINSON SR MIDDLE SCHOOL	120192005747	X		

Name	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY (INTERVENE) SCHOOL	FOCUS (CORRECT) SCHOOL
	SPIRIT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120192003990	X		
	MANATEE COVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120192007034	X		
	CYPRESS CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120192005404	X		
	PRIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120192007444	X		
	PALM TERRACE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120192001196	X		
	CHAMPION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120192001979	X		
	TURIE T. SMALL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120192002007	X		
	EDITH I. STARKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120192002010	X		
	EDGEWATER PUBLIC SCHOOL	120192001988			X
	COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTER WEST	120192005748	X		X
	BOSTON AVENUE CHARTER SCHOOL	120192007483	X		X
	COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTER EAST	120192007347		X	
	WAKULLA HIGH SCHOOL	120195002017	X		
	MEDART ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120195003137	X		
	RIVERSPRINGS MIDDLE SCHOOL	120195004457	X		
	CRAWFORDVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120195002015	X		
	WAKULLA MIDDLE SCHOOL	120195002273	X		
	SHADEVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120195002657	X		
	WAKULLA COAST CHARTER SCHOOL OF ARTS SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	120195003673			X
	PAXTON SCHOOL	120198002020	X		
	SOUTH WALTON HIGH SCHOOL	120198003941	X		
	WALTON HIGH SCHOOL	120198002025			X
	WEST DEFUNIAK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120198002018	X		
	FREEPORT MIDDLE SCHOOL	120198003524	X		
	VAN R. BUTLER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120198002023	X		
	EMERALD COAST MIDDLE SCHOOL	120198004175	X		
	BAY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120198004144	X		
	MOSSY HEAD SCHOOL	120198007324	X		
	MAUDE SAUNDERS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120198002026	X		
	FREEPORT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120198002541	X		
	SEASIDE NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOL	120198003138	X		
TON	CHIPLEY HIGH SCHOOL	120201002027	X		
TON	VERNON HIGH SCHOOL	120201002029	X		
TON	KATE M. SMITH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120201002028	X		
TON	VERNON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	120201002033	X		

Attachment 10

A copy of any guidelines that the SEA has already developed and adopted for local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems

Attachment 10a

Senate Bill 736

2011736er

1
2 An act relating to education personnel; providing a
3 short title; amending s. 1012.34, F.S.; revising
4 provisions relating to the evaluation of instructional
5 personnel and school administrators; requiring the
6 Department of Education to approve each school
7 district's instructional personnel and school
8 administrator evaluation systems; requiring reporting
9 by the Commissioner of Education relating to the
10 evaluation systems; providing requirements and
11 revising procedures and criteria for the evaluation
12 systems; requiring the commissioner to approve or
13 select and the State Board of Education to adopt
14 formulas for school districts to use in measuring
15 student learning growth; requiring the state board to
16 adopt rules relating to standards and measures for
17 implementation of the evaluation systems; amending s.
18 1008.22, F.S.; requiring school districts to
19 administer assessments for each course offered in the
20 district; amending s. 1012.22, F.S.; revising
21 provisions relating to instructional personnel and
22 school administrator compensation and salary
23 schedules; providing requirements for a performance
24 salary schedule, a grandfathered salary schedule,
25 adjustments, and supplements; revising criteria for
26 the promotion of instructional personnel; creating s.
27 1012.335, F.S.; providing employment criteria for
28 instructional personnel hired on or after July 1,
29 2011; providing definitions; providing grounds for

2011736er

30 suspension or dismissal; requiring rules to define the
31 term "just cause"; providing that certain individuals
32 who are hired as instructional personnel are
33 ineligible for contracts issued under s. 1012.33,
34 F.S.; amending s. 1002.33, F.S.; requiring charter
35 schools to comply with provisions relating to
36 compensation and salary schedules, workforce
37 reductions, contracts with instructional personnel
38 hired on or after July 1, 2011, and certain
39 requirements for performance evaluations; amending s.
40 1003.621, F.S.; requiring academically high-performing
41 school districts to comply with additional
42 requirements for personnel; amending s. 1006.09, F.S.;
43 conforming provisions to changes made by the act;
44 amending s. 1012.07, F.S.; revising the methodology
45 for determining critical teacher shortage areas;
46 amending s. 1012.2315, F.S.; providing reporting
47 requirements relating to instructional personnel and
48 school administrator performance; amending s. 1012.27,
49 F.S.; revising the criteria for transferring a
50 teacher; conforming provisions to changes made by the
51 act; amending s. 1012.28, F.S.; authorizing a
52 principal to refuse to accept the placement or
53 transfer of instructional personnel under certain
54 circumstances; amending s. 1012.33, F.S.; revising
55 provisions relating to contracts with certain
56 education personnel; revising just cause grounds for
57 dismissal; deleting provisions to conform to changes
58 made by the act; revising the criteria for renewing a

2011736er

59 professional service contract; requiring that a
60 district school board's decision to retain personnel
61 be primarily based on the employee's performance;
62 repealing s. 1012.52, F.S., relating to legislative
63 intent and findings to improve student achievement and
64 teacher quality; amending s. 1012.795, F.S.;
65 conforming provisions to changes made by the act;
66 authorizing an exemption from requirements for
67 performance evaluation systems and compensation and
68 salary schedules for certain school districts;
69 providing that specified provisions of law do not
70 apply to rulemaking required to administer the act;
71 providing for the repeal of certain special acts or
72 general laws of local application relating to
73 contracts for instructional personnel or school
74 administrators; providing for application of specified
75 provisions of the act; providing for severability;
76 providing effective dates.

77
78 Be It Enacted by the Legislature of the State of Florida:

79
80 Section 1. This act may be cited as the "Student Success
81 Act."

82 Section 2. Effective upon this act becoming a law, section
83 1012.34, Florida Statutes, is amended to read:

84 1012.34 Personnel evaluation ~~Assessment~~ procedures and
85 criteria.-

86 (1) EVALUATION SYSTEM APPROVAL AND REPORTING.-

87 (a) For the purpose of increasing student learning growth

2011736er

88 by improving the quality of instructional, administrative, and
89 supervisory services in the public schools of the state, the
90 district school superintendent shall establish procedures for
91 evaluating ~~assessing~~ the performance of duties and
92 responsibilities of all instructional, administrative, and
93 supervisory personnel employed by the school district. The
94 district school superintendent shall annually report the
95 evaluation results of instructional personnel and school
96 administrators to the Department of Education in addition to the
97 information required under subsection (5).

98 (b) The department ~~of Education~~ must approve each school
99 district's instructional personnel and school administrator
100 evaluation systems ~~assessment system~~. The department shall
101 monitor each district's implementation of its instructional
102 personnel and school administrator evaluation systems for
103 compliance with the requirements of this section.

104 (c) By December 1, 2012, the Commissioner of Education
105 shall report to the Governor, the President of the Senate, and
106 the Speaker of the House of Representatives the approval and
107 implementation status of each school district's instructional
108 personnel and school administrator evaluation systems. The
109 report shall include performance evaluation results for the
110 prior school year for instructional personnel and school
111 administrators using the four levels of performance specified in
112 paragraph (2)(e). The performance evaluation results for
113 instructional personnel shall be disaggregated by classroom
114 teachers, as defined in s. 1012.01(2)(a), excluding substitute
115 teachers, and all other instructional personnel, as defined in
116 s. 1012.01(2)(b)-(d). The commissioner shall continue to report,

2011736er

117 by December 1 each year thereafter, each school district's
118 performance evaluation results and the status of any evaluation
119 system revisions requested by a school district pursuant to
120 subsection (6).

121 (2) EVALUATION SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS.—The evaluation systems
122 for instructional personnel and school administrators must
123 ~~following conditions must be considered in the design of the~~
124 ~~district's instructional personnel assessment system:~~

125 (a) ~~The system must~~ Be designed to support effective
126 instruction and student learning growth, and performance
127 evaluation results must be used when developing district and
128 school level improvement plans.

129 (b) ~~The system must~~ Provide appropriate instruments,
130 procedures, and criteria for continuous quality improvement of
131 the professional skills of instructional personnel and school
132 administrators, and performance evaluation results must be used
133 when identifying professional development.

134 (c) ~~The system must~~ Include a mechanism to examine
135 performance data from multiple sources, including opportunities
136 for give parents an opportunity to provide input into employee
137 performance evaluations assessments when appropriate.

138 (d) Identify ~~In addition to addressing generic teaching~~
139 ~~competencies, districts must determine those teaching fields for~~
140 which special evaluation procedures and criteria are necessary
141 will be developed.

142 (e) Differentiate among four levels of performance as
143 follows:

- 144 1. Highly effective.
145 2. Effective.

2011736er

146 3. Needs improvement or, for instructional personnel in the
147 first 3 years of employment who need improvement, developing.

148 4. Unsatisfactory.

149
150 The Commissioner of Education shall consult with experts,
151 instructional personnel, school administrators, and education
152 stakeholders in developing the criteria for the performance
153 levels. ~~Each district school board may establish a peer~~
154 ~~assistance process. The plan may provide a mechanism for~~
155 ~~assistance of persons who are placed on performance probation as~~
156 ~~well as offer assistance to other employees who request it.~~

157 (f) ~~The district school board shall~~ Provide for training
158 programs that are based upon guidelines provided by the
159 department ~~of Education~~ to ensure that all individuals with
160 evaluation responsibilities understand the proper use of the
161 evaluation ~~assessment~~ criteria and procedures.

162 (g) Include a process for monitoring and evaluating the
163 effective and consistent use of the evaluation criteria by
164 employees with evaluation responsibilities.

165 (h) Include a process for monitoring and evaluating the
166 effectiveness of the system itself in improving instruction and
167 student learning.

168
169 In addition, each district school board may establish a peer
170 assistance process. This process may be a part of the regular
171 evaluation system or used to assist employees placed on
172 performance probation, newly hired classroom teachers, or
173 employees who request assistance.

174 (3) EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA. ~~The assessment~~

2011736er

175 ~~procedure for~~ Instructional personnel and school administrator
176 performance evaluations ~~administrators~~ must be ~~primarily~~ based
177 upon ~~on~~ the performance of students assigned to their classrooms
178 or schools, as provided in this section ~~appropriate~~. Pursuant to
179 this section, a school district's performance evaluation
180 ~~assessment~~ is not limited to basing unsatisfactory performance
181 of instructional personnel and school administrators solely upon
182 student performance, but may include other criteria approved to
183 evaluate ~~asses~~ instructional personnel and school
184 administrators' performance, or any combination of student
185 performance and other approved criteria. Evaluation ~~The~~
186 procedures and criteria must comply with, but are not limited
187 to, the following ~~requirements~~:

188 (a) A performance evaluation ~~An assessment~~ must be
189 conducted for each employee at least once a year, except that a
190 classroom teacher, as defined in s. 1012.01(2)(a), excluding
191 substitute teachers, who is newly hired by the district school
192 board must be observed and evaluated at least twice in the first
193 year of teaching in the school district. The performance
194 evaluation ~~assessment~~ must be based upon sound educational
195 principles and contemporary research in effective educational
196 practices. ~~The assessment must primarily use data and indicators~~
197 ~~of improvement in student performance assessed annually as~~
198 ~~specified in s. 1008.22 and may consider results of peer reviews~~
199 ~~in evaluating the employee's performance. Student performance~~
200 ~~must be measured by state assessments required under s. 1008.22~~
201 ~~and by local assessments for subjects and grade levels not~~
202 ~~measured by the state assessment program. The~~ evaluation
203 ~~assessment~~ criteria must include, ~~but are not limited to,~~

2011736er

204 ~~indicators that relate to the following:~~

205 1. Performance of students. At least 50 percent of a
206 performance evaluation must be based upon data and indicators of
207 student learning growth assessed annually by statewide
208 assessments or, for subjects and grade levels not measured by
209 statewide assessments, by school district assessments as
210 provided in s. 1008.22(8). Each school district must use the
211 formula adopted pursuant to paragraph (7)(a) for measuring
212 student learning growth in all courses associated with statewide
213 assessments and must select an equally appropriate formula for
214 measuring student learning growth for all other grades and
215 subjects, except as otherwise provided in subsection (7).

216 a. For classroom teachers, as defined in s. 1012.01(2)(a),
217 excluding substitute teachers, the student learning growth
218 portion of the evaluation must include growth data for students
219 assigned to the teacher over the course of at least 3 years. If
220 less than 3 years of data are available, the years for which
221 data are available must be used and the percentage of the
222 evaluation based upon student learning growth may be reduced to
223 not less than 40 percent.

224 b. For instructional personnel who are not classroom
225 teachers, the student learning growth portion of the evaluation
226 must include growth data on statewide assessments for students
227 assigned to the instructional personnel over the course of at
228 least 3 years, or may include a combination of student learning
229 growth data and other measureable student outcomes that are
230 specific to the assigned position, provided that the student
231 learning growth data accounts for not less than 30 percent of
232 the evaluation. If less than 3 years of student growth data are

2011736er

233 available, the years for which data are available must be used
234 and the percentage of the evaluation based upon student learning
235 growth may be reduced to not less than 20 percent.

236 c. For school administrators, the student learning growth
237 portion of the evaluation must include growth data for students
238 assigned to the school over the course of at least 3 years. If
239 less than 3 years of data are available, the years for which
240 data are available must be used and the percentage of the
241 evaluation based upon student learning growth may be reduced to
242 not less than 40 percent.

243 2. Instructional practice. Evaluation criteria used when
244 annually observing classroom teachers, as defined in s.
245 1012.01(2)(a), excluding substitute teachers, must include
246 indicators based upon each of the Florida Educator Accomplished
247 Practices adopted by the State Board of Education. For
248 instructional personnel who are not classroom teachers,
249 evaluation criteria must be based upon indicators of the Florida
250 Educator Accomplished Practices and may include specific job
251 expectations related to student support.

252 3. Instructional leadership. For school administrators,
253 evaluation criteria must include indicators based upon each of
254 the leadership standards adopted by the State Board of Education
255 under s. 1012.986, including performance measures related to the
256 effectiveness of classroom teachers in the school, the
257 administrator's appropriate use of evaluation criteria and
258 procedures, recruitment and retention of effective and highly
259 effective classroom teachers, improvement in the percentage of
260 instructional personnel evaluated at the highly effective or
261 effective level, and other leadership practices that result in

2011736er

262 student learning growth. The system may include a means to give
263 parents and instructional personnel an opportunity to provide
264 input into the administrator's performance evaluation.

265 4. Professional and job responsibilities. For instructional
266 personnel and school administrators, other professional and job
267 responsibilities must be included as adopted by the State Board
268 of Education. The district school board may identify additional
269 professional and job responsibilities.

270 ~~2. Ability to maintain appropriate discipline.~~

271 ~~3. Knowledge of subject matter. The district school board~~
272 ~~shall make special provisions for evaluating teachers who are~~
273 ~~assigned to teach out-of-field.~~

274 ~~4. Ability to plan and deliver instruction and the use of~~
275 ~~technology in the classroom.~~

276 ~~5. Ability to evaluate instructional needs.~~

277 ~~6. Ability to establish and maintain a positive~~
278 ~~collaborative relationship with students' families to increase~~
279 ~~student achievement.~~

280 ~~7. Other professional competencies, responsibilities, and~~
281 ~~requirements as established by rules of the State Board of~~
282 ~~Education and policies of the district school board.~~

283 (b) All personnel must be fully informed of the criteria
284 and procedures associated with the evaluation assessment process
285 before the evaluation assessment takes place.

286 (c) The individual responsible for supervising the employee
287 must evaluate ~~asses~~ the employee's performance. The evaluation
288 system may provide for the evaluator to consider input from
289 other personnel trained under paragraph (2)(f). The evaluator
290 must submit a written report of the evaluation assessment to the

2011736er

291 district school superintendent for the purpose of reviewing the
292 employee's contract. The evaluator must submit the written
293 report to the employee no later than 10 days after the
294 evaluation assessment takes place. The evaluator must discuss
295 the written evaluation report ~~of assessment~~ with the employee.
296 The employee shall have the right to initiate a written response
297 to the evaluation assessment, and the response shall become a
298 permanent attachment to his or her personnel file.

299 (d) The evaluator may amend an evaluation based upon
300 assessment data from the current school year if the data becomes
301 available within 90 days after the close of the school year. The
302 evaluator must then comply with the procedures set forth in
303 paragraph (c).

304 (4) NOTIFICATION OF UNSATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE.—If an
305 employee who holds a professional service contract as provided
306 in s. 1012.33 is not performing his or her duties in a
307 satisfactory manner, the evaluator shall notify the employee in
308 writing of such determination. The notice must describe such
309 unsatisfactory performance and include notice of the following
310 procedural requirements:

311 (a) ~~1.~~ Upon delivery of a notice of unsatisfactory
312 performance, the evaluator must confer with the employee who
313 holds a professional service contract, make recommendations with
314 respect to specific areas of unsatisfactory performance, and
315 provide assistance in helping to correct deficiencies within a
316 prescribed period of time.

317 (b) ~~1.2.a.~~ If The employee who holds a professional service
318 contract ~~as provided in s. 1012.33~~, the employee shall be placed
319 on performance probation and governed by the provisions of this

2011736er

320 section for 90 calendar days following the receipt of the notice
321 of unsatisfactory performance to demonstrate corrective action.
322 School holidays and school vacation periods are not counted when
323 calculating the 90-calendar-day period. During the 90 calendar
324 days, the employee who holds a professional service contract
325 must be evaluated periodically and apprised of progress achieved
326 and must be provided assistance and inservice training
327 opportunities to help correct the noted performance
328 deficiencies. At any time during the 90 calendar days, the
329 employee who holds a professional service contract may request a
330 transfer to another appropriate position with a different
331 supervising administrator; however, if a transfer is granted
332 pursuant to ss. 1012.27(1) and 1012.28(6), it does not extend
333 the period for correcting performance deficiencies.

334 2.b. Within 14 days after the close of the 90 calendar
335 days, the evaluator must evaluate ~~assess~~ whether the performance
336 deficiencies have been corrected and forward a recommendation to
337 the district school superintendent. Within 14 days after
338 receiving the evaluator's recommendation, the district school
339 superintendent must notify the employee who holds a professional
340 service contract in writing whether the performance deficiencies
341 have been satisfactorily corrected and whether the district
342 school superintendent will recommend that the district school
343 board continue or terminate his or her employment contract. If
344 the employee wishes to contest the district school
345 superintendent's recommendation, the employee must, within 15
346 days after receipt of the district school superintendent's
347 recommendation, submit a written request for a hearing. The
348 hearing shall be conducted at the district school board's

2011736er

349 election in accordance with one of the following procedures:

350 a.~~++~~ A direct hearing conducted by the district school
351 board within 60 days after receipt of the written appeal. The
352 hearing shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of
353 ss. 120.569 and 120.57. A majority vote of the membership of the
354 district school board shall be required to sustain the district
355 school superintendent's recommendation. The determination of the
356 district school board shall be final as to the sufficiency or
357 insufficiency of the grounds for termination of employment; or

358 b.~~++~~ A hearing conducted by an administrative law judge
359 assigned by the Division of Administrative Hearings of the
360 Department of Management Services. The hearing shall be
361 conducted within 60 days after receipt of the written appeal in
362 accordance with chapter 120. The recommendation of the
363 administrative law judge shall be made to the district school
364 board. A majority vote of the membership of the district school
365 board shall be required to sustain or change the administrative
366 law judge's recommendation. The determination of the district
367 school board shall be final as to the sufficiency or
368 insufficiency of the grounds for termination of employment.

369 (5)~~++~~ ADDITIONAL NOTIFICATIONS.—The district school
370 superintendent shall annually notify the department of any
371 instructional personnel or school administrators who receive two
372 consecutive unsatisfactory evaluations. The district school
373 superintendent shall also notify the department of any
374 instructional personnel or school administrators ~~and~~ who are
375 ~~have been~~ given written notice by the district of intent to
376 terminate or not renew ~~that~~ their employment ~~is being terminated~~
377 ~~or is not being renewed or that the district school board~~

2011736er

378 ~~intends to terminate, or not renew, their employment. The~~
379 ~~department shall conduct an investigation to determine whether~~
380 ~~action shall be taken against the certificateholder pursuant to~~
381 ~~s. 1012.795(1)(e).~~

382 ~~(5) The district school superintendent shall develop a~~
383 ~~mechanism for evaluating the effective use of assessment~~
384 ~~criteria and evaluation procedures by administrators who are~~
385 ~~assigned responsibility for evaluating the performance of~~
386 ~~instructional personnel. The use of the assessment and~~
387 ~~evaluation procedures shall be considered as part of the annual~~
388 ~~assessment of the administrator's performance. The system must~~
389 ~~include a mechanism to give parents and teachers an opportunity~~
390 ~~to provide input into the administrator's performance~~
391 ~~assessment, when appropriate.~~

392 ~~(6) Nothing in this section shall be construed to grant a~~
393 ~~probationary employee a right to continued employment beyond the~~
394 ~~term of his or her contract.~~

395 ~~(6)~~ (7) ANNUAL REVIEW OF AND REVISIONS TO THE SCHOOL
396 DISTRICT EVALUATION SYSTEMS.—The district school board shall
397 establish a procedure for annually reviewing instructional
398 personnel and school administrator evaluation assessment systems
399 to determine compliance with this section. All substantial
400 revisions to an approved system must be reviewed and approved by
401 the district school board before being used to evaluate assess
402 instructional personnel or school administrators. Upon request
403 by a school district, the department shall provide assistance in
404 developing, improving, or reviewing an evaluation assessment
405 system.

406 (7) MEASUREMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING GROWTH.—

2011736er

407 (a) By June 1, 2011, the Commissioner of Education shall
408 approve a formula to measure individual student learning growth
409 on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) administered
410 under s. 1008.22(3)(c)1. The formula must take into
411 consideration each student's prior academic performance. The
412 formula must not set different expectations for student learning
413 growth based upon a student's gender, race, ethnicity, or
414 socioeconomic status. In the development of the formula, the
415 commissioner shall consider other factors such as a student's
416 attendance record, disability status, or status as an English
417 language learner. The commissioner shall select additional
418 formulas as appropriate for the remainder of the statewide
419 assessments included under s. 1008.22 and continue to select
420 formulas as new assessments are implemented in the state system.
421 After the commissioner approves the formula to measure
422 individual student learning growth on the FCAT and as additional
423 formulas are selected by the commissioner for new assessments
424 implemented in the state system, the State Board of Education
425 shall adopt these formulas by rule.

426 (b) Beginning in the 2011-2012 school year, each school
427 district shall measure student learning growth using the formula
428 approved by the commissioner under paragraph (a) for courses
429 associated with the FCAT. Each school district shall implement
430 the additional student learning growth measures selected by the
431 commissioner under paragraph (a) for the remainder of the
432 statewide assessments included under s. 1008.22 as they become
433 available. Beginning in the 2014-2015 school year, for grades
434 and subjects not assessed by statewide assessments but otherwise
435 assessed as required under s. 1008.22(8), each school district

2011736er

436 shall measure student learning growth using an equally
437 appropriate formula. The department shall provide models for
438 measuring student learning growth which school districts may
439 adopt.

440 (c) For a course that is not measured by a statewide
441 assessment, a school district may request, through the
442 evaluation system approval process, to use a student achievement
443 measure rather than a student learning growth measure if
444 achievement is demonstrated to be a more appropriate measure of
445 classroom teacher performance. A school district may also
446 request to use a combination of student learning growth and
447 achievement, if appropriate.

448 (d) If the student learning growth in a course is not
449 measured by a statewide assessment but is measured by a school
450 district assessment, a school district may request, through the
451 evaluation system approval process, that the performance
452 evaluation for the classroom teacher assigned to that course
453 include the learning growth of his or her students on FCAT
454 Reading or FCAT Mathematics. The request must clearly explain
455 the rationale supporting the request. However, the classroom
456 teacher's performance evaluation must give greater weight to
457 student learning growth on the district assessment.

458 (e) For classroom teachers of courses for which the
459 district has not implemented appropriate assessments under s.
460 1008.22(8) or for which the school district has not adopted an
461 equally appropriate measure of student learning growth under
462 paragraphs (b)-(d), student learning growth must be measured by
463 the growth in learning of the classroom teacher's students on
464 statewide assessments, or, for courses in which enrolled

2011736er

465 students do not take the statewide assessments, measurable
466 learning targets must be established based upon the goals of the
467 school improvement plan and approved by the school principal. A
468 district school superintendent may assign to instructional
469 personnel in an instructional team the student learning growth
470 of the instructional team's students on statewide assessments.
471 This paragraph expires July 1, 2015.

472 (8) RULEMAKING.—The State Board of Education shall adopt
473 rules pursuant to ss. 120.536(1) and 120.54 which, that
474 establish uniform procedures guidelines for the submission,
475 review, and approval of district evaluation systems and
476 reporting requirements procedures for the annual evaluation
477 assessment of instructional personnel and school administrators;
478 specific, discrete standards for each performance level required
479 under subsection (2) to ensure clear and sufficient
480 differentiation in the performance levels and to provide
481 consistency in meaning across school districts; the measurement
482 of student learning growth and associated implementation
483 procedures required under subsection (7); a process to permit
484 instructional personnel to review the class roster for accuracy
485 and to correct any mistakes relating to the identity of students
486 for whom the individual is responsible; and a process for
487 monitoring school district implementation of evaluation systems
488 in accordance with this section that include criteria for
489 evaluating professional performance. Specifically, the rules
490 shall establish a student learning growth standard that if not
491 met will result in the employee receiving an unsatisfactory
492 performance evaluation rating. In like manner, the rules shall
493 establish a student learning growth standard that must be met in

2011736er

494 order for an employee to receive a highly effective rating and a
495 student learning growth standard that must be met in order for
496 an employee to receive an effective rating.

497 Section 3. Subsection (8) of section 1008.22, Florida
498 Statutes, is amended to read:

499 1008.22 Student assessment program for public schools.—

500 (8) LOCAL ASSESSMENTS.—

501 (a) Measurement of the learning gains of students in all
502 subjects and grade levels other than subjects and grade levels
503 required for the state student achievement testing program is
504 the responsibility of the school districts.

505 (b) Beginning with the 2014-2015 school year, each school
506 district shall administer for each course offered in the
507 district a student assessment that measures mastery of the
508 content, as described in the state-adopted course description,
509 at the necessary level of rigor for the course. Such assessments
510 may include:

511 1. Statewide assessments.

512 2. Other standardized assessments, including nationally
513 recognized standardized assessments.

514 3. Industry certification examinations.

515 4. District-developed or district-selected end-of-course
516 assessments.

517 (c) The Commissioner of Education shall identify methods to
518 assist and support districts in the development and acquisition
519 of assessments required under this subsection. Methods may
520 include developing item banks, facilitating the sharing of
521 developed tests among school districts, acquiring assessments
522 from state and national curriculum-area organizations, and

2011736er

523 providing technical assistance in best professional practices of
524 test development based upon state-adopted curriculum standards,
525 administration, and security.

526 Section 4. Paragraphs (c) and (e) of subsection (1) of
527 section 1012.22, Florida Statutes, are amended to read:

528 1012.22 Public school personnel; powers and duties of the
529 district school board.—The district school board shall:

530 (1) Designate positions to be filled, prescribe
531 qualifications for those positions, and provide for the
532 appointment, compensation, promotion, suspension, and dismissal
533 of employees as follows, subject to the requirements of this
534 chapter:

535 (c) Compensation and salary schedules.—

536 1. Definitions.—As used in this paragraph:

537 a. "Adjustment" means an addition to the base salary
538 schedule that is not a bonus and becomes part of the employee's
539 permanent base salary and shall be considered compensation under
540 s. 121.021(22).

541 b. "Grandfathered salary schedule" means the salary
542 schedule or schedules adopted by a district school board before
543 July 1, 2014, pursuant to subparagraph 4.

544 c. "Instructional personnel" means instructional personnel
545 as defined in s. 1012.01(2)(a)-(d), excluding substitute
546 teachers.

547 d. "Performance salary schedule" means the salary schedule
548 or schedules adopted by a district school board pursuant to
549 subparagraph 5.

550 e. "Salary schedule" means the schedule or schedules used
551 to provide the base salary for district school board personnel.

2011736er

552 f. "School administrator" means a school administrator as
553 defined in s. 1012.01(3)(c).

554 g. "Supplement" means an annual addition to the base salary
555 for the term of the negotiated supplement as long as the
556 employee continues his or her employment for the purpose of the
557 supplement. A supplement does not become part of the employee's
558 continuing base salary but shall be considered compensation
559 under s. 121.021(22).

560 2. Cost-of-living adjustment.—A district school board may
561 provide a cost-of-living salary adjustment if the adjustment:

562 a. Does not discriminate among comparable classes of
563 employees based upon the salary schedule under which they are
564 compensated.

565 b. Does not exceed 50 percent of the annual adjustment
566 provided to instructional personnel rated as effective.

567 3. Advanced degrees.—A district school board may not use
568 advanced degrees in setting a salary schedule for instructional
569 personnel or school administrators hired on or after July 1,
570 2011, unless the advanced degree is held in the individual's
571 area of certification and is only a salary supplement.

572 4. Grandfathered salary schedule.—

573 a. The district school board shall adopt a salary schedule
574 or salary schedules to be used as the basis for paying all
575 school employees hired before July 1, 2014. Instructional
576 personnel on annual contract as of July 1, 2014, shall be placed
577 on the performance salary schedule adopted under subparagraph 5.
578 Instructional personnel on continuing contract or professional
579 service contract may opt into the performance salary schedule if
580 the employee relinquishes such contract and agrees to be

2011736er

581 employed on an annual contract under s. 1012.335. Such an
582 employee shall be placed on the performance salary schedule and
583 may not return to continuing contract or professional service
584 contract status. Any employee who opts into the performance
585 salary schedule may not return to the grandfathered salary
586 schedule.

587 b. In determining the grandfathered salary schedule for
588 instructional personnel, a district school board must base a
589 portion of each employee's compensation upon performance
590 demonstrated under s. 1012.34 and shall provide differentiated
591 pay for both instructional personnel and school administrators
592 based upon district-determined factors, including, but not
593 limited to, additional responsibilities, school demographics,
594 critical shortage areas, and level of job performance
595 difficulties.

596 5. Performance salary schedule.—By July 1, 2014, the
597 district school board shall adopt a performance salary schedule
598 that provides annual salary adjustments for instructional
599 personnel and school administrators based upon performance
600 determined under s. 1012.34. Employees hired on or after July 1,
601 2014, or employees who choose to move from the grandfathered
602 salary schedule to the performance salary schedule shall be
603 compensated pursuant to the performance salary schedule once
604 they have received the appropriate performance evaluation for
605 this purpose. However, a classroom teacher whose performance
606 evaluation utilizes student learning growth measures established
607 under s. 1012.34(7)(e) shall remain under the grandfathered
608 salary schedule until his or her teaching assignment changes to
609 a subject for which there is an assessment or the school

2011736er

610 district establishes equally appropriate measures of student
611 learning growth as defined under s. 1012.34 and rules of the
612 State Board of Education.

613 a. Base salary.—The base salary shall be established as
614 follows:

615 (I) The base salary for instructional personnel or school
616 administrators who opt into the performance salary schedule
617 shall be the salary paid in the prior year, including
618 adjustments only.

619 (II) Beginning July 1, 2014, instructional personnel or
620 school administrators new to the district, returning to the
621 district after a break in service without an authorized leave of
622 absence, or appointed for the first time to a position in the
623 district in the capacity of instructional personnel or school
624 administrator shall be placed on the performance salary
625 schedule.

626 b. Salary adjustments.—Salary adjustments for highly
627 effective or effective performance shall be established as
628 follows:

629 (I) The annual salary adjustment under the performance
630 salary schedule for an employee rated as highly effective must
631 be greater than the highest annual salary adjustment available
632 to an employee of the same classification through any other
633 salary schedule adopted by the district.

634 (II) The annual salary adjustment under the performance
635 salary schedule for an employee rated as effective must be equal
636 to at least 50 percent and no more than 75 percent of the annual
637 adjustment provided for a highly effective employee of the same
638 classification.

2011736er

639 (III) The performance salary schedule shall not provide an
640 annual salary adjustment for an employee who receives a rating
641 other than highly effective or effective for the year.

642 c. Salary supplements.-In addition to the salary
643 adjustments, each district school board shall provide for salary
644 supplements for activities that must include, but are not
645 limited to:

646 (I) Assignment to a Title I eligible school.

647 (II) Assignment to a school in the bottom two categories of
648 the school improvement system under s. 1008.33 such that the
649 supplement remains in force for at least 1 year following
650 improved performance in that school.

651 (III) Certification and teaching in critical teacher
652 shortage areas. Statewide critical teacher shortage areas shall
653 be identified by the State Board of Education under s. 1012.07.
654 However, the district school board may identify other areas of
655 critical shortage within the school district for purposes of
656 this sub-sub-paragraph and may remove areas identified by the
657 state board which do not apply within the school district.

658 (IV) Assignment of additional academic responsibilities.

659
660 If budget constraints in any given year limit a district school
661 board's ability to fully fund all adopted salary schedules, the
662 performance salary schedule shall not be reduced on the basis of
663 total cost or the value of individual awards in a manner that is
664 proportionally greater than reductions to any other salary
665 schedules adopted by the district. ~~The district school board~~
666 ~~shall adopt a salary schedule or salary schedules designed to~~
667 ~~furnish incentives for improvement in training and for continued~~

2011736er

668 ~~efficient service to be used as a basis for paying all school~~
669 ~~employees and fix and authorize the compensation of school~~
670 ~~employees on the basis thereof.~~

671 ~~2. A district school board, in determining the salary~~
672 ~~schedule for instructional personnel, must base a portion of~~
673 ~~each employee's compensation on performance demonstrated under~~
674 ~~s. 1012.34, must consider the prior teaching experience of a~~
675 ~~person who has been designated state teacher of the year by any~~
676 ~~state in the United States, and must consider prior professional~~
677 ~~experience in the field of education gained in positions in~~
678 ~~addition to district level instructional and administrative~~
679 ~~positions.~~

680 ~~3. In developing the salary schedule, the district school~~
681 ~~board shall seek input from parents, teachers, and~~
682 ~~representatives of the business community.~~

683 ~~4. Beginning with the 2007-2008 academic year, each~~
684 ~~district school board shall adopt a salary schedule with~~
685 ~~differentiated pay for both instructional personnel and school-~~
686 ~~based administrators. The salary schedule is subject to~~
687 ~~negotiation as provided in chapter 447 and must allow~~
688 ~~differentiated pay based on district-determined factors,~~
689 ~~including, but not limited to, additional responsibilities,~~
690 ~~school demographics, critical shortage areas, and level of job~~
691 ~~performance difficulties.~~

692 ~~(e) Transfer and promotion.~~-The district school board shall
693 act on recommendations of the district school superintendent
694 regarding transfer and promotion of any employee. The district
695 school superintendent's primary consideration in recommending an
696 individual for a promotion must be the individual's demonstrated

2011736er

697 effectiveness under s. 1012.34.

698 Section 5. Section 1012.335, Florida Statutes, is created
699 to read:

700 1012.335 Contracts with instructional personnel hired on or
701 after July 1, 2011.-

702 (1) DEFINITIONS.-As used in this section, the term:

703 (a) "Annual contract" means an employment contract for a
704 period of no longer than 1 school year which the district school
705 board may choose to award or not award without cause.

706 (b) "Instructional personnel" means instructional personnel
707 as defined in s. 1012.01(2)(a)-(d), excluding substitute
708 teachers.

709 (c) "Probationary contract" means an employment contract
710 for a period of 1 school year awarded to instructional personnel
711 upon initial employment in a school district. Probationary
712 contract employees may be dismissed without cause or may resign
713 without breach of contract. A district school board may not
714 award a probationary contract more than once to the same
715 employee unless the employee was rehired after a break in
716 service for which an authorized leave of absence was not
717 granted. A probationary contract shall be awarded regardless of
718 previous employment in another school district or state.

719 (2) EMPLOYMENT.-

720 (a) Beginning July 1, 2011, each individual newly hired as
721 instructional personnel by the district school board shall be
722 awarded a probationary contract. Upon successful completion of
723 the probationary contract, the district school board may award
724 an annual contract pursuant to paragraph (c).

725 (b) Beginning July 1, 2011, an annual contract may be

2011736er

726 awarded pursuant to paragraph (c) for instructional personnel
727 who have successfully completed a probationary contract with the
728 district school board and have received one or more annual
729 contracts from the district school board.

730 (c) An annual contract may be awarded only if the employee:

731 1. Holds an active professional certificate or temporary
732 certificate issued pursuant to s. 1012.56 and rules of the State
733 Board of Education.

734 2. Has been recommended by the district school
735 superintendent for the annual contract based upon the
736 individual's evaluation under s. 1012.34 and approved by the
737 district school board.

738 3. Has not received two consecutive annual performance
739 evaluation ratings of unsatisfactory, two annual performance
740 evaluation ratings of unsatisfactory within a 3-year period, or
741 three consecutive annual performance evaluation ratings of needs
742 improvement or a combination of needs improvement and
743 unsatisfactory under s. 1012.34.

744 (3) VIOLATION OF ANNUAL CONTRACT.—Instructional personnel
745 who accept a written offer from the district school board and
746 who leave their positions without prior release from the
747 district school board are subject to the jurisdiction of the
748 Education Practices Commission.

749 (4) SUSPENSION OR DISMISSAL OF INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL ON
750 ANNUAL CONTRACT.—Any instructional personnel with an annual
751 contract may be suspended or dismissed at any time during the
752 term of the contract for just cause as provided in subsection
753 (5). The district school board shall notify the employee in
754 writing whenever charges are made and may suspend such person

2011736er

755 without pay. However, if the charges are not sustained, the
756 employee shall be immediately reinstated and his or her back pay
757 shall be paid. If the employee wishes to contest the charges, he
758 or she must, within 15 days after receipt of the written notice,
759 submit a written request for a hearing to the district school
760 board. A direct hearing shall be conducted by the district
761 school board or a subcommittee thereof within 60 days after
762 receipt of the written appeal. The hearing shall be conducted in
763 accordance with ss. 120.569 and 120.57. A majority vote of the
764 membership of the district school board shall be required to
765 sustain the district school superintendent's recommendation. The
766 district school board's determination is final as to the
767 sufficiency or insufficiency of the grounds for suspension
768 without pay or dismissal. Any such decision adverse to the
769 employee may be appealed by the employee pursuant to s. 120.68.

770 (5) JUST CAUSE.—The State Board of Education shall adopt
771 rules pursuant to ss. 120.536(1) and 120.54 to define the term
772 "just cause." Just cause includes, but is not limited to:

- 773 (a) Immorality.
774 (b) Misconduct in office.
775 (c) Incompetency.
776 (d) Gross insubordination.
777 (e) Willful neglect of duty.
778 (f) Being convicted or found guilty of, or entering a plea
779 of guilty to, regardless of adjudication of guilt, any crime
780 involving moral turpitude.

781 (6) LIMITATION.—An individual newly hired as instructional
782 personnel by a school district in this state under this section
783 is ineligible for any contract issued under s. 1012.33.

2011736er

784 Section 6. Paragraph (b) of subsection (16) of section
785 1002.33, Florida Statutes, is amended to read:

786 1002.33 Charter schools.—

787 (16) EXEMPTION FROM STATUTES.—

788 (b) Additionally, a charter school shall be in compliance
789 with the following statutes:

790 1. Section 286.011, relating to public meetings and
791 records, public inspection, and criminal and civil penalties.

792 2. Chapter 119, relating to public records.

793 3. Section 1003.03, relating to the maximum class size,
794 except that the calculation for compliance pursuant to s.
795 1003.03 shall be the average at the school level.

796 4. Section 1012.22(1)(c), relating to compensation and
797 salary schedules.

798 5. Section 1012.33(5), relating to workforce reductions.

799 6. Section 1012.335, relating to contracts with
800 instructional personnel hired on or after July 1, 2011.

801 7. Section 1012.34, relating to the substantive
802 requirements for performance evaluations for instructional
803 personnel and school administrators.

804 Section 7. Paragraph (h) of subsection (2) of section
805 1003.621, Florida Statutes, is amended to read:

806 1003.621 Academically high-performing school districts.—It
807 is the intent of the Legislature to recognize and reward school
808 districts that demonstrate the ability to consistently maintain
809 or improve their high-performing status. The purpose of this
810 section is to provide high-performing school districts with
811 flexibility in meeting the specific requirements in statute and
812 rules of the State Board of Education.

2011736er

813 (2) COMPLIANCE WITH STATUTES AND RULES.—Each academically
814 high-performing school district shall comply with all of the
815 provisions in chapters 1000-1013, and rules of the State Board
816 of Education which implement these provisions, pertaining to the
817 following:

818 (h) Sections 1012.22(1)(c) and 1012.27(2), relating to
819 public school personnel compensation and salary schedules; s.
820 1012.34, relating to personnel evaluation procedures and
821 criteria; and ss. 1012.33 and 1012.335, relating to contracts
822 with instructional personnel, staff, supervisors, and school
823 administrators ~~differentiated pay and performance pay policies~~
824 ~~for school administrators and instructional personnel.~~
825 ~~Professional service contracts are subject to the provisions of~~
826 ~~ss. 1012.33 and 1012.34.~~

827 Section 8. Subsection (4) of section 1006.09, Florida
828 Statutes, is amended to read:

829 1006.09 Duties of school principal relating to student
830 discipline and school safety.—

831 (4) When a student has been the victim of a violent crime
832 perpetrated by another student who attends the same school, the
833 school principal shall make full and effective use of the
834 provisions of subsection (2) and s. 1006.13(6). A school
835 principal who fails to comply with this subsection shall be
836 ineligible for any portion of the performance pay ~~policy~~
837 ~~incentive~~ or the differentiated pay under s. 1012.22. However,
838 if any party responsible for notification fails to properly
839 notify the school, the school principal shall be eligible for
840 the performance pay ~~incentive~~ or differentiated pay.

841 Section 9. Section 1012.07, Florida Statutes, is amended to

2011736er

842 read:

843 1012.07 Identification of critical teacher shortage areas.-

844 ~~(1) As used in ss. 1009.57, 1009.58, and 1009.59, The term~~
845 "critical teacher shortage area" means high-need content areas
846 ~~applies to mathematics, science, career education, and high-~~
847 priority high priority location areas identified by, the State
848 Board of Education ~~may identify career education programs having~~
849 ~~critical teacher shortages.~~ The State Board of Education shall
850 adopt rules pursuant to ss. 120.536(1) and 120.54 necessary to
851 annually identify ~~other~~ critical teacher shortage areas ~~and high~~
852 ~~priority location areas.~~ The state board must ~~shall also~~
853 consider current and emerging educational requirements and
854 workforce demands ~~teacher characteristics such as ethnic~~
855 ~~background, race, and sex~~ in determining critical teacher
856 shortage areas. School grade levels may also be designated
857 critical teacher shortage areas. Individual district school
858 boards may identify and submit other critical teacher shortage
859 areas. Such submissions ~~shortages~~ must be aligned to current and
860 emerging educational requirements and workforce demands in order
861 to be certified to and approved by the State Board of Education.
862 High-priority High priority location areas shall be in high-
863 density, low-economic urban schools, and low-density, low-
864 economic rural schools, and schools identified as lowest
865 performing under s. 1008.33(4)(b) shall include schools which
866 ~~meet criteria which include, but are not limited to, the~~
867 ~~percentage of free lunches, the percentage of students under~~
868 ~~Chapter I of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of~~
869 ~~1981, and the faculty attrition rate.~~

870 ~~(2) This section shall be implemented only to the extent as~~

2011736er

871 ~~specifically funded and authorized by law.~~

872 Section 10. Subsection (5) of section 1012.2315, Florida
873 Statutes, is amended to read:

874 1012.2315 Assignment of teachers.-

875 (5) REPORT.-

876 (a) By July 1, 2012, the Department of Education shall
877 annually report on its website, in a manner that is accessible
878 to the public, the performance rating data reported by district
879 school boards under s. 1012.34. The report must include the
880 percentage of classroom teachers, instructional personnel, and
881 school administrators receiving each performance rating
882 aggregated by school district and by school.

883 (b) Notwithstanding the provisions of s. 1012.31(3)(a)2.,
884 each school district shall annually report to the parent of any
885 student who is assigned to a classroom teacher or school
886 administrator having two consecutive annual performance
887 evaluation ratings of unsatisfactory under s. 1012.34, two
888 annual performance evaluation ratings of unsatisfactory within a
889 3-year period under s. 1012.34, or three consecutive annual
890 performance evaluation ratings of needs improvement or a
891 combination of needs improvement and unsatisfactory under s.
892 1012.34. Schools graded "D" or "F" shall annually report their
893 teacher retention rate. Included in this report shall be reasons
894 listed for leaving by each teacher who left the school for any
895 reason.

896 Section 11. Subsections (1) and (2) of section 1012.27,
897 Florida Statutes, are amended to read:

898 1012.27 Public school personnel; powers and duties of
899 district school superintendent.-The district school

2011736er

900 superintendent is responsible for directing the work of the
901 personnel, subject to the requirements of this chapter, and in
902 addition the district school superintendent shall perform the
903 following:

904 (1) POSITIONS, QUALIFICATIONS, AND NOMINATIONS.—

905 (a) Recommend to the district school board duties and
906 responsibilities which need to be performed and positions which
907 need to be filled to make possible the development of an
908 adequate school program in the district.

909 (b) Recommend minimum qualifications of personnel for these
910 various positions, and nominate in writing persons to fill such
911 positions.

912

913 The district school superintendent's recommendations for filling
914 instructional positions at the school level must consider
915 nominations received from school principals of the respective
916 schools. Before transferring a teacher who holds a professional
917 teaching certificate from one school to another, the district
918 school superintendent shall consult with the principal of the
919 receiving school and allow the principal to review the teacher's
920 records, including student performance demonstrated under s.
921 1012.34, and interview the teacher. If, in the judgment of the
922 principal, students would not benefit from the placement, an
923 alternative placement may be sought. A principal may refuse the
924 placement in accordance with s. 1012.28(6).

925 (2) COMPENSATION AND SALARY SCHEDULES.—Prepare and
926 recommend to the district school board for adoption a salary
927 schedule or salary schedules in accordance with s. 1012.22. ~~The~~
928 ~~district school superintendent must recommend a salary schedule~~

2011736er

929 ~~for instructional personnel which bases a portion of each~~
930 ~~employee's compensation on performance demonstrated under s.~~
931 ~~1012.34. In developing the recommended salary schedule, the~~
932 ~~district school superintendent shall include input from parents,~~
933 ~~teachers, and representatives of the business community.~~
934 ~~Beginning with the 2007-2008 academic year, the recommended~~
935 ~~salary schedule for classroom teachers shall be consistent with~~
936 ~~the district's differentiated pay policy based upon s. 1012.22.~~

937 Section 12. Subsection (3) of section 1012.28, Florida
938 Statutes, is amended, present subsection (6) is renumbered and
939 amended, and a new subsection (6) is added to that section, to
940 read:

941 1012.28 Public school personnel; duties of school
942 principals.—

943 (3) Each school principal is responsible for the
944 performance of all personnel employed by the district school
945 board and assigned to the school to which the principal is
946 assigned. The school principal shall faithfully and effectively
947 apply the personnel evaluation ~~assessment~~ system approved by the
948 ~~district school board~~ pursuant to s. 1012.34.

949 (6) A principal may refuse to accept the placement or
950 transfer of instructional personnel by the district school
951 superintendent to his or her school unless the instructional
952 personnel has a performance rating of effective or highly
953 effective under s. 1012.34.

954 (7) ~~(6)~~ A school principal who fails to comply with this
955 section shall be ineligible for any portion of the performance
956 pay ~~policy incentive~~ and differentiated pay under s. 1012.22.

957 Section 13. Paragraph (a) of subsection (1) and subsections

2011736er

958 (3) and (5) of section 1012.33, Florida Statutes, are amended to
959 read:

960 1012.33 Contracts with instructional staff, supervisors,
961 and school principals.—

962 (1)(a) Each person employed as a member of the
963 instructional staff in any district school system shall be
964 properly certified pursuant to s. 1012.56 or s. 1012.57 or
965 employed pursuant to s. 1012.39 and shall be entitled to and
966 shall receive a written contract as specified in this section.
967 All such contracts, except continuing contracts as specified in
968 subsection (4), shall contain provisions for dismissal during
969 the term of the contract only for just cause. Just cause
970 includes, but is not limited to, the following instances, as
971 defined by rule of the State Board of Education: immorality,
972 misconduct in office, incompetency, two consecutive annual
973 performance evaluation ratings of unsatisfactory under s.
974 1012.34, two annual performance evaluation ratings of
975 unsatisfactory within a 3-year period under s. 1012.34, three
976 consecutive annual performance evaluation ratings of needs
977 improvement or a combination of needs improvement and
978 unsatisfactory under s. 1012.34, gross insubordination, willful
979 neglect of duty, or being convicted or found guilty of, or
980 entering a plea of guilty to, regardless of adjudication of
981 guilt, any crime involving moral turpitude.

982 (3)(a) Each district school board shall provide a
983 professional service contract as prescribed herein. Each member
984 of the instructional staff who completed the following
985 requirements prior to July 1, 1984, shall be entitled to and
986 shall be issued a continuing contract in the form prescribed by

2011736er

987 rules of the state board pursuant to s. 231.36, Florida Statutes
988 (1981). Each member of the instructional staff who completes the
989 following requirements on or after July 1, 1984, shall be
990 entitled to and shall be issued a professional service contract
991 in the form prescribed by rules of the state board as provided
992 herein:

993 1. The member must hold a professional certificate as
994 prescribed by s. 1012.56 and rules of the State Board of
995 Education.

996 2. The member must have completed 3 years of probationary
997 service in the district during a period not in excess of 5
998 successive years, except for leave duly authorized and granted.

999 3. The member must have been recommended by the district
1000 school superintendent for such contract and reappointed by the
1001 district school board based on successful performance of duties
1002 and demonstration of professional competence.

1003 4. For any person newly employed as a member of the
1004 instructional staff after June 30, 1997, the initial annual
1005 contract shall include a 97-day probationary period during which
1006 time the employee's contract may be terminated without cause or
1007 the employee may resign without breach of contract.

1008 (b) The professional service contract shall be effective at
1009 the beginning of the school fiscal year following the completion
1010 of all requirements therefor.

1011 (c) The period of service provided herein may be extended
1012 to 4 years when prescribed by the district school board and
1013 agreed to in writing by the employee at the time of
1014 reappointment.

1015 ~~(d) A district school board may issue a continuing contract~~

2011736er

1016 ~~prior to July 1, 1984, and may issue a professional service~~
1017 ~~contract subsequent to July 1, 1984, to any employee who has~~
1018 ~~previously held a professional service contract or continuing~~
1019 ~~contract in the same or another district within this state. Any~~
1020 ~~employee who holds a continuing contract may, but is not~~
1021 ~~required to, exchange such continuing contract for a~~
1022 ~~professional service contract in the same district.~~

1023 (d) ~~(e)~~ A professional service contract shall be renewed
1024 each year unless:

1025 1. The district school superintendent, after receiving the
1026 recommendations required by s. 1012.34, charges the employee
1027 with unsatisfactory performance and notifies the employee of
1028 performance deficiencies as required by s. 1012.34; or

1029 2. The employee receives two consecutive annual performance
1030 evaluation ratings of unsatisfactory under s. 1012.34, two
1031 annual performance evaluation ratings of unsatisfactory within a
1032 3-year period under s. 1012.34, or three consecutive annual
1033 performance evaluation ratings of needs improvement or a
1034 combination of needs improvement and unsatisfactory under s.
1035 1012.34. An employee who holds a professional service contract
1036 on July 1, 1997, is subject to the procedures set forth in
1037 paragraph (f) during the term of the existing professional
1038 service contract. The employee is subject to the procedures set
1039 forth in s. 1012.34(3)(d) upon the next renewal of the
1040 professional service contract; however, if the employee is
1041 notified of performance deficiencies before the next contract
1042 renewal date, the procedures of s. 1012.34(3)(d) do not apply
1043 until the procedures set forth in paragraph (f) have been
1044 exhausted and the professional service contract is subsequently

2011736er

1045 ~~renewed.~~

1046 ~~(f) The district school superintendent shall notify an~~
1047 ~~employee who holds a professional service contract on July 1,~~
1048 ~~1997, in writing, no later than 6 weeks prior to the end of the~~
1049 ~~postschool conference period, of performance deficiencies which~~
1050 ~~may result in termination of employment, if not corrected during~~
1051 ~~the subsequent year of employment (which shall be granted for an~~
1052 ~~additional year in accordance with the provisions in subsection~~
1053 ~~(1)). Except as otherwise hereinafter provided, this action~~
1054 ~~shall not be subject to the provisions of chapter 120, but the~~
1055 ~~following procedures shall apply:~~

1056 ~~1. On receiving notice of unsatisfactory performance, the~~
1057 ~~employee, on request, shall be accorded an opportunity to meet~~
1058 ~~with the district school superintendent, or his or her designee,~~
1059 ~~for an informal review of the determination of unsatisfactory~~
1060 ~~performance.~~

1061 ~~2. An employee notified of unsatisfactory performance may~~
1062 ~~request an opportunity to be considered for a transfer to~~
1063 ~~another appropriate position, with a different supervising~~
1064 ~~administrator, for the subsequent year of employment. If the~~
1065 ~~request for the transfer is granted, the district school~~
1066 ~~superintendent shall annually report to the department the total~~
1067 ~~number of employees transferred pursuant to this subparagraph,~~
1068 ~~where they were transferred, and what, if any, remediation was~~
1069 ~~implemented to remediate the unsatisfactory performance.~~

1070 ~~3. During the subsequent year, the employee shall be~~
1071 ~~provided assistance and inservice training opportunities to help~~
1072 ~~correct the noted performance deficiencies. The employee shall~~
1073 ~~also be evaluated periodically so that he or she will be kept~~

2011736er

1074 ~~apprised of progress achieved.~~

1075 ~~4. Not later than 6 weeks prior to the close of the~~
1076 ~~postschool conference period of the subsequent year, the~~
1077 ~~district school superintendent, after receiving and reviewing~~
1078 ~~the recommendation required by s. 1012.34, shall notify the~~
1079 ~~employee, in writing, whether the performance deficiencies have~~
1080 ~~been corrected. If so, a new professional service contract shall~~
1081 ~~be issued to the employee. If the performance deficiencies have~~
1082 ~~not been corrected, the district school superintendent may~~
1083 ~~notify the district school board and the employee, in writing,~~
1084 ~~that the employee shall not be issued a new professional service~~
1085 ~~contract; however, if the recommendation of the district school~~
1086 ~~superintendent is not to issue a new professional service~~
1087 ~~contract, and if the employee wishes to contest such~~
1088 ~~recommendation, the employee will have 15 days from receipt of~~
1089 ~~the district school superintendent's recommendation to demand,~~
1090 ~~in writing, a hearing. In such hearing, the employee may raise~~
1091 ~~as an issue, among other things, the sufficiency of the district~~
1092 ~~school superintendent's charges of unsatisfactory performance.~~
1093 ~~Such hearing shall be conducted at the district school board's~~
1094 ~~election in accordance with one of the following procedures:~~
1095 ~~a. A direct hearing conducted by the district school board~~
1096 ~~within 60 days of receipt of the written appeal. The hearing~~
1097 ~~shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of ss.~~
1098 ~~120.569 and 120.57. A majority vote of the membership of the~~
1099 ~~district school board shall be required to sustain the district~~
1100 ~~school superintendent's recommendation. The determination of the~~
1101 ~~district school board shall be final as to the sufficiency or~~
1102 ~~insufficiency of the grounds for termination of employment; or~~

2011736er

1103 ~~b. A hearing conducted by an administrative law judge~~
1104 ~~assigned by the Division of Administrative Hearings of the~~
1105 ~~Department of Management Services. The hearing shall be~~
1106 ~~conducted within 60 days of receipt of the written appeal in~~
1107 ~~accordance with chapter 120. The recommendation of the~~
1108 ~~administrative law judge shall be made to the district school~~
1109 ~~board. A majority vote of the membership of the district school~~
1110 ~~board shall be required to sustain or change the administrative~~
1111 ~~law judge's recommendation. The determination of the district~~
1112 ~~school board shall be final as to the sufficiency or~~
1113 ~~insufficiency of the grounds for termination of employment.~~

1114 ~~(g) Beginning July 1, 2001, for each employee who enters~~
1115 ~~into a written contract, pursuant to this section, in a school~~
1116 ~~district in which the employee was not employed as of June 30,~~
1117 ~~2001, or was employed as of June 30, 2001, but has since broken~~
1118 ~~employment with that district for 1 school year or more, for~~
1119 ~~purposes of pay, a district school board must recognize and~~
1120 ~~accept each year of full-time public school teaching service~~
1121 ~~earned in the State of Florida for which the employee received a~~
1122 ~~satisfactory performance evaluation; however, an employee may~~
1123 ~~voluntarily waive this provision. Instructional personnel~~
1124 ~~employed pursuant to s. 121.091(9)(b) and (c) are exempt from~~
1125 ~~the provisions of this paragraph.~~

1126 (5) If workforce reduction is needed, a district school
1127 board must retain employees at a school or in the school
1128 district based upon educational program needs and the
1129 performance evaluations of employees within the affected program
1130 areas. Within the program areas requiring reduction, the
1131 employee with the lowest performance evaluations must be the

2011736er

1132 first to be released; the employee with the next lowest
1133 performance evaluations must be the second to be released; and
1134 reductions shall continue in like manner until the needed number
1135 of reductions has occurred. A district school board may not
1136 prioritize retention of employees based upon seniority. Should a
1137 ~~district school board have to choose from among its personnel~~
1138 ~~who are on continuing contracts or professional service~~
1139 ~~contracts as to which should be retained, such decisions shall~~
1140 ~~be made pursuant to the terms of a collectively bargained~~
1141 ~~agreement, when one exists. If no such agreement exists, the~~
1142 ~~district school board shall prescribe rules to handle reductions~~
1143 ~~in workforce.~~

1144 Section 14. Section 1012.52, Florida Statutes, is repealed.

1145 Section 15. Paragraph (h) of subsection (1) of section
1146 1012.795, Florida Statutes, is amended to read:

1147 1012.795 Education Practices Commission; authority to
1148 discipline.-

1149 (1) The Education Practices Commission may suspend the
1150 educator certificate of any person as defined in s. 1012.01(2)
1151 or (3) for up to 5 years, thereby denying that person the right
1152 to teach or otherwise be employed by a district school board or
1153 public school in any capacity requiring direct contact with
1154 students for that period of time, after which the holder may
1155 return to teaching as provided in subsection (4); may revoke the
1156 educator certificate of any person, thereby denying that person
1157 the right to teach or otherwise be employed by a district school
1158 board or public school in any capacity requiring direct contact
1159 with students for up to 10 years, with reinstatement subject to
1160 the provisions of subsection (4); may revoke permanently the

2011736er

1161 educator certificate of any person thereby denying that person
1162 the right to teach or otherwise be employed by a district school
1163 board or public school in any capacity requiring direct contact
1164 with students; may suspend the educator certificate, upon an
1165 order of the court or notice by the Department of Revenue
1166 relating to the payment of child support; or may impose any
1167 other penalty provided by law, if the person:

1168 (h) Has breached a contract, as provided in s. 1012.33(2)
1169 or s. 1012.335.

1170 Section 16. (1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this
1171 act, a school district that received an exemption under
1172 Florida's Race to the Top Memorandum of Understanding for Phase
1173 2, as provided in section (D)(2)(ii) of the memorandum, is
1174 allowed to base 40 percent, instead of 50 percent, of
1175 instructional personnel and school administrator performance
1176 evaluations upon student learning growth under s. 1012.34,
1177 Florida Statutes, as amended by this act. The school district is
1178 also exempt from the amendments to s. 1012.22(1)(c), Florida
1179 Statutes, made by this act. The exemptions described in this
1180 subsection are effective for the 2011-2012 school year and are
1181 effective for each school year thereafter if the school district
1182 receives annual approval by the State Board of Education.

1183 (2) The State Board of Education shall base its approval
1184 upon demonstration by the school district of the following:

1185 (a) The instructional personnel and school administrator
1186 evaluation systems base at least 40 percent of an employee's
1187 performance evaluation upon student performance and that student
1188 performance is the single greatest component of an employee's
1189 evaluation.

2011736er

1190 (b) The instructional personnel and school administrator
1191 evaluation systems adopt the Commissioner of Education's student
1192 learning growth formula for statewide assessments as provided
1193 under s. 1012.34(7), Florida Statutes.

1194 (c) The school district's instructional personnel and
1195 school administrator compensation system awards salary increases
1196 based upon sustained student performance.

1197 (d) The school district's contract system awards
1198 instructional personnel and school administrators based upon
1199 student performance and removes ineffective employees.

1200 (e) Beginning with the 2014-2015 school year and each
1201 school year thereafter, student learning growth based upon
1202 performance on statewide assessments under s. 1008.22, Florida
1203 Statutes, must have significantly improved compared to student
1204 learning growth in the district in 2011-2012 and significantly
1205 improved compared to other school districts.

1206 (3) The State Board of Education shall annually renew a
1207 school district's exemptions if the school district demonstrates
1208 that it meets the requirements of subsection (2). If the
1209 exemptions are not renewed, the school district must comply with
1210 the requirements and laws described in subsection (1) by the
1211 beginning of the next school year immediately following the loss
1212 of the exemptions.

1213 (4) The State Board of Education shall adopt rules pursuant
1214 to ss. 120.536(1) and 120.54, Florida Statutes, to establish the
1215 procedures for applying for the exemptions and the criteria for
1216 renewing the exemptions.

1217
1218 This section shall be repealed August 1, 2017, unless reviewed

2011736er

1219 and reenacted by the Legislature.

1220 Section 17. Chapter 2010-279, Laws of Florida, does not
1221 apply to any rulemaking required to administer this act.

1222 Section 18. The provisions of any special act or general
1223 law of local application relating to contracts for instructional
1224 personnel or school administrators in public schools or school
1225 districts in effect on or before the effective date of this act
1226 are repealed.

1227 Section 19. The amendments made by this act to s. 1012.33,
1228 Florida Statutes, apply to contracts newly entered into,
1229 extended, or readopted on or after July 1, 2011, and to all
1230 contracts entered into on or after July 1, 2014.

1231 Section 20. If any provision of this act or its application
1232 to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the invalidity
1233 does not affect other provisions or applications of the act
1234 which can be given effect without the invalid provision or
1235 application, and to this end the provisions of this act are
1236 severable.

1237 Section 21. Except as otherwise expressly provided in this
1238 act and except for this section, which shall take effect upon
1239 this act becoming a law, this act shall take effect July 1,
1240 2011.

Attachment 10b
Race to the Top Phase II MOU

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

T. WILLARD FAIR, *Chairman*

Members

DR. AKSHAY DESAI

MARK KAPLAN

ROBERTO MARTÍNEZ

JOHN R. PADGET

KATHLEEN SHANAHAN

SUSAN STORY

Dr. Eric J. Smith
Commissioner of Education



MEMORANDUM

TO: District School Superintendents

FROM: Commissioner Eric Smith

DATE: May 3, 2010

SUBJECT: FLORIDA'S RACE TO THE TOP MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
FOR PHASE 2

Please find attached Florida's Race to the Top Phase 2 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). There are two compelling reasons why I am confident that our application for Phase 2 funding in the federal Race to the Top competition will be successful. First is Florida's demonstrated reform history and nationally acclaimed progress which helped drive our high score and positive reception of our Phase 1 Race to the Top application (fourth out of 41 applicants). Second is the dedication of those who came together as the Governor's Working Group on April 28 with a charge to develop consensus around Florida's MOU. This group was well-rounded with representation from our superintendents, board members, and unions representing teachers, as well as teachers, parents, and the business community. The positive discussions reinforced the shared belief that collaboration is critical for district ownership and implementation. Therefore, we approach Phase 2 with a stronger MOU and the united spirit necessary to earn the highest amount of funding available for our students.

The signed MOU is due back to the Department of Education May 25, 2010. Please e-mail a signed copy to Holly.Edenfield@fldoe.org by May 25, and mail the original in hard copy to:

Holly Edenfield
325 West Gaines Street
Suite 1502
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0400

The Phase 2 MOU process gives me high expectations that we can work together to develop strong district plans if Florida receives a Phase 2 award. Thank you in advance for the work required on your part to take this important next step.

EJS/hre

cc: Governor Crist
State Board of Education Members

PARTICIPATING LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY (LEA)

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU)

- I. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF WORK:** An award of Race to the Top grant funds would position Florida to weave a common core of rigorous standards and assessments into a pioneering data system that will serve as a foundation to attract, retain, and support top notch teachers and school leaders who will, in turn, improve student achievement in Florida's schools. By entering into this "Memorandum of Understanding" ("MOU"), Local Education Agencies ("LEAs") will indicate their commitment to these principles and their ability to ensure that these principles are implemented through their LEA plan.

This MOU is entered into by and between the Florida Department of Education ("Department") and _____ ("Participating LEA"). The purpose of this agreement is to establish a framework of collaboration, as well as articulate specific roles and responsibilities in support of the Department in its implementation of an approved Race to the Top grant application. Exhibit I, the Preliminary Scope of Work, indicates which portions of the State's proposed reform plans ("State Plan") the Participating LEA is agreeing to implement should the State's application be approved by the United States Department of Education ("ED").

In order to participate, the LEA must agree to implement all applicable portions of the State Plan and return the executed MOU on or before May 25, 2010, to Holly.Edenfield@fldoe.org.

Nothing herein should be construed to obviate the responsibility of an LEA to comply with class size requirements.

II. PROJECT ADMINISTRATION:

A. PARTICIPATING LEA RESPONSIBILITIES: The Participating LEA will assist the Department in implementing the tasks and activities described in the State's Race to the Top application, should the State's application be approved by the U.S. Department of Education and if the LEA is approved for a subgrant by the Department. Approval of the subgrant will be based upon the scope and quality of the LEA's proposed work plans and its capacity to implement the plans. To this end, the Participating LEA sub grantee will:

- 1) Implement the LEA plan as identified in Exhibit I of this agreement.
- 2) Actively participate in all relevant convenings, communities of practice, or other practice-sharing events that are organized or sponsored by the Department or by ED.
- 3) Post to any website specified by the Department or ED, in a timely manner, all non-proprietary products and lessons developed using funds associated with the Race to the Top grant.

- 4) Participate, as requested, in evaluations of this grant conducted by the Department or ED.
- 5) Be responsive to Department or ED requests for information including the status of the project, project implementation, outcomes, and any problems anticipated or encountered.
- 6) Participate in meetings and telephone conferences with the Department to discuss (a) progress of the project, (b) potential dissemination of resulting non-proprietary products and lessons learned, (c) plans for subsequent years of the Race to the Top grant period, and (d) other matters related to the Race to the Top grant and associated plans.

B. DEPARTMENT RESPONSIBILITIES: In assisting the Participating LEA in implementing its tasks and activities described in the State's Race to the Top application, the Department grantee will:

- 1) Work collaboratively with and support the Participating LEA in carrying out the LEA Plan as identified in Exhibit 1 of this agreement.
- 2) Timely distribute the Participating LEA's portion of Race to the Top grant funds during the course of the project period and in accordance with the LEA Plan.
- 3) Provide feedback on the Participating LEA's status updates, annual reports, any interim reports, and project plans and products.
- 4) Identify sources of technical assistance for the project.

C. JOINT RESPONSIBILITIES:

- 1) The Department and the Participating LEA will each appoint a key contact person for the Race to the Top grant.
- 2) These key contacts from the Department and the Participating LEA will maintain frequent communication to facilitate cooperation under this MOU.
- 3) Department and Participating LEA grant personnel will work together to determine appropriate timelines for project updates and status reports throughout the whole grant period.
- 4) Department and Participating LEA grant personnel will negotiate in good faith to continue to achieve the overall goals of the State's Race to the Top grant, even when the State Plan requires modifications that affect the Participating LEA, or when the LEA Plan requires modifications.

D. COLLECTIVE BARGAINING RESPONSIBILITIES: The parties to any applicable collective bargaining agreement will use their best efforts to negotiate any terms and conditions

in the agreement necessary for the full implementation of the State Plan. The parties understand that the failure to negotiate any term or condition in a collective bargaining agreement necessary for full implementation of the State Plan will result in termination of the grant.

Only the elements of this MOU which are contained in existing law are subject to the provisions of section 447.403, Florida Statutes.

E. DEPARTMENT RECOURSE FOR LEA NON-PERFORMANCE: If the Department determines that the LEA is not meeting its goals, timelines, budget, or annual targets or is not fulfilling other applicable requirements, the Department grantee will take appropriate enforcement action, which could include a collaborative process between the Department and the LEA, or any of the enforcement measures that are detailed in 34 CFR section 80.43 including putting the LEA on reimbursement payment status, temporarily withholding funds, or disallowing costs.

III. ASSURANCES: The Participating LEA hereby certifies and represents that it:

- 1) Has all requisite power and authority to execute this MOU.
- 2) Is familiar with the State's Race to the Top grant application and is supportive of the goals and plans for implementation and is committed to working on all applicable portions of the State Plan.
- 3) Agrees to be a Participating LEA and will implement those portions of the State Plan indicated in Exhibit I, if the State application is funded.
- 4) Will provide a Final Scope of Work in a format provided by the Department. The Final Scope of Work will describe the LEA's specific goals, activities, timelines, budgets, key personnel, and annual targets for key performance measures ("LEA Plan ") in a manner that is consistent with the Preliminary Scope of Work (Exhibit I) and with the State Plan. The Final Scope of Work is due and must be submitted no later than 90 days after the grant is awarded to the State of Florida, should the State be awarded the grant.
- 5) Will propose a comprehensive, interconnected plan that will drive continuous improvement of students, teachers, and principals based upon specific goals and benchmarks. This comprehensive LEA plan will align all federal, state, and local resources and support systems, as appropriate, to maximize the LEA's capacity to implement the plan.
- 6) Will comply with all of the terms of the Grant, the Department's sub grant, and all applicable Federal and State laws and regulations, including laws and regulations applicable to the Program, and the applicable provisions of EDGAR (34 CFR Parts 75, 77, 79, 80, 82, 84, 85, 86, 97, 98 and 99).

IV. DEFINITIONS: The definitions found in the Race to the Top Application for Initial Funding apply to this MOU. In addition:

- 1) "High-minority school" means a school with a minority population that is within the top quartile of minority student membership in the state.
- 2) "High-poverty school" means a school in the top quartile as measured by the percentage of students receiving free and reduced lunch.

V. MODIFICATIONS: This MOU may be amended only by written agreement signed by each of the parties to the MOU, and in consultation with ED.

VI. DURATION/TERMINATION: This Memorandum of Understanding shall be effective beginning with the date of the last signature hereon and, if a grant is received, ending upon the expiration of the grant project period, or upon mutual agreement of the parties, whichever occurs first.

VII. INABILITY TO IMPLEMENT: The parties acknowledge that certain LEA undertakings in the MOU are subject to school board consideration and action at a duly noticed public meeting in accordance with Section 120.525, Florida Statutes. The parties further agree that if the LEA is unable to implement any of the mandatory terms of the MOU despite its good faith efforts to do so, resulting in termination of this MOU, such termination shall be without prejudice to the LEA. The LEA has not received the full State Plan, which is not yet complete. In executing this MOU and making the representations and warranties herein contained, the LEA is relying on the materials and representations provided to date by the Department with the understanding that the State Plan, once complete, will not be materially inconsistent with such materials and representations.

VIII. GOVERNOR'S TASK FORCE: The parties hereby recommend to the Governor, the creation of a task force to monitor the implementation of the grant and the Memorandum of Understanding. Such a task force should be made up of similar stakeholders represented in Florida's Race to the Top Working Group, established by Executive Order 10-94, and should hold its initial meeting thirty days after Florida receives notification that it has been awarded its grant. The parties recommend such task force operate as an advisory body regarding assessments and make advisory recommendations to the Governor, the local education agencies, and the State Board of Education relating to implementing the Race to the Top Grant. Additionally, the task force could make recommendations for legislation. The parties further recommend the task force be required to issue its first report by January 1, 2011, and submit quarterly reports thereafter to the Governor, the State Board of Education, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

IX. SIGNATURES

Superintendent for the LEA:

Signature/Date

Print Name/Title

Chair of School Board for the LEA:

Signature/Date

Print Name/Title

Authorized Representative of Local Teachers' Union:

Signature/Date

Print Name/Title

Commissioner of Education:

Signature/Date

Print Name/Title

EXHIBIT I – PRELIMINARY SCOPE OF WORK

The LEA hereby agrees to participate in implementing the State Plan in each of the areas identified below.

Elements of State Reform Plans	Comments from LEA (optional)
<p>Through Race to the Top, the Department is poised to weave a common core of rigorous standards and assessments into a pioneering data system that will serve as a foundation to attract, retain, and support top notch teachers and school leaders who will, in turn, improve student achievement in our schools.</p>	
<p>B. Standards and Assessments</p>	
<p><u>(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Persistently lowest-achieving schools (schools in the lowest 5%) must modify the school schedules to accommodate lesson study. The LEA may modify school schedules for other schools to allow for common planning time by grade level (elementary) or subject area (secondary). Such planning time may be dedicated to lesson study focused on instructional quality, student work, and outcomes, without reducing time devoted to student instruction. Where lesson study is implemented, the LEA will devote a minimum of one lesson study per month for each grade level or subject area. • The LEA will ensure that professional development programs in all schools focus on the new common core standards, including assisting students with learning challenges to meet those standards (such as through accommodations and assistive technology). Such professional development will employ formative assessment and the principles of lesson study. • The LEA will implement a system to evaluate the 	

Elements of State Reform Plans	Comments from LEA (optional)
<p>fidelity of lesson study and formative assessment implementation that is tied to interim and summative student assessments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LEA will implement at least one additional high school career and technical program that provides training for occupations requiring science, technology, engineering, and/or math (STEM). The LEA will pay, or secure payment for the industry certification examination for graduates of such programs. These programs must lead to a high-wage, high-skill career for a majority of graduates that supports one of the eight targeted sectors identified by Enterprise Florida and result in an industry certification. The LEA will ensure that these programs will include at least one Career and Technical Education course that has significant integration of math or science that will satisfy core credit requirements with the passing of the course and related end-of-course exam. • The LEA will increase the number of STEM-related accelerated courses, such as Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, AICE, dual enrollment, and industry certification. • The LEA will ensure that each school possesses the technology, including hardware, connectivity, and other necessary infrastructure, to provide teachers and students sufficient access to strategic tools for improved classroom instruction and computer-based assessment. 	
<p>C. Data Systems to Support Instruction</p>	
<p><u>(C)(2) Accessing and using State data</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LEA will assist in the design, testing, and 	

Elements of State Reform Plans	Comments from LEA (optional)
<p>implementation of initiatives to improve customer-friendly access and information to district leaders, teachers, principals, parents, students, community members, unions, researchers, and policymakers to effectively use state data systems. Examples of areas where the LEA will be required to assist the Department include providing assistance on defining state-level educational data that can be used to augment local data systems, implementing a single sign-on to access state resources, providing data to the Department, and testing other mechanisms that will enhance the usability of existing state-level applications to improve instruction and student learning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA will use state-level data that is published for use, along with local instructional improvement systems, to improve instruction. 	
<p><u>(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction:</u> <u>(i) Use of local instructional improvement systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA will use customer-friendly front end systems that are easy for students, teachers, parents, and principals to use and that show growth of students, teachers, schools, and districts disaggregated by subject and demographics. An LEA that has an instructional improvement system will ensure that the system is being fully utilized; an LEA that does not have an instructional improvement system will acquire one. 	
<p><u>(ii) Professional development on use of data</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA will provide effective professional development to teachers and administrators on 	

Elements of State Reform Plans	Comments from LEA (optional)
<p>the use of its instructional improvement system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA will provide effective professional development to teachers and administrators on the use of state level data systems developed during the term of the grant. 	
<p><u>(iii) Availability and accessibility of data to researchers</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA will provide requested data from local instructional improvement and longitudinal data systems to the Department to support the Department's efforts to make data available to researchers for the purpose of evaluating the effectiveness of instructional materials, strategies, and approaches for educating different types of students and to help drive educational decisions and policies. 	
<p><u>D. Great Teachers and Leaders</u></p>	
<p><u>(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals</u></p>	
<p><u>(ii) Alternative routes to certification that are in use</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA will coordinate with institution preparation programs to provide effective district personnel to supervise pre-service teacher and educational leadership candidates. Such district supervising personnel will be highly effective teachers. The LEA will use data from student performance and other continued approval standards in Rule 6A-5.066, F.A.C., to annually review and improve its alternative certification program and will deliver any professional development associated with the program in accordance with the state's 	

Elements of State Reform Plans	Comments from LEA (optional)
protocol standards for professional development.	
<u>(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance</u>	
<p><u>(i) Measure student growth</u></p> <p>The LEA will measure student growth based upon the performance of students on state-required assessments and, for content areas and grade levels not assessed on state-required assessments, the LEA will use state assessments or district-selected assessments that are aligned to state standards and developed or selected in collaboration with LEA stakeholders, or will use valid, rigorous national assessments.</p> <p>The Department will collaborate with an advisory body representing all stakeholders to develop a fair and transparent student growth model that takes into consideration unique student characteristics, challenges, and other factors that affect student performance.</p>	
<p><u>(ii) Design and implement evaluation systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LEA will design and implement a teacher evaluation system with teacher and principal involvement that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Utilizes the state-adopted teacher-level student growth measure cited in (D)(2)(i) as the primary factor of the teacher and principal evaluation systems. <p>Student achievement or growth data as defined in the grant must account for at least 50% of the teacher's evaluation as follows:</p> 	

Elements of State Reform Plans	Comments from LEA (optional)
<p>By the end of the grant, the LEA shall include student growth as defined in (D)(2)(i), for at least 40% of the evaluation, and student growth or achievement as determined by the LEA for 10% of the evaluation. The LEA may phase-in the evaluation system but will use, at a minimum, student growth as defined in (D)(2)(i) for at least 35% of the evaluation and student growth or achievement as determined by the LEA for 15% of the evaluation. Implementation of the requirements for the LEA evaluation systems beginning in the 2011-12 school years applies, at a minimum, to teachers in grades and subjects for which student growth measures have been developed by the Department in collaboration with the advisory body as described in (D)(2)(i).</p> <p>The 2010-11 school year will be considered a development year for the evaluation systems.</p> <p>However, an LEA that completed renegotiation of its collective bargaining agreement between July 1, 2009, and December 1, 2009, for the purpose of determining a weight for student growth as the primary component of its teacher and principal evaluations, is eligible for this grant as long as the student growth component is at least 40% and is greater than any other single component of the evaluation.</p> <p>2. Includes the core of effective practices, developed in collaboration with stakeholders, that have been strongly linked to increased student achievement for the observation</p>	

Elements of State Reform Plans	Comments from LEA (optional)
<p>portion of the teacher evaluation. The principal, direct supervisor, and any other individual performing observation will use, at a minimum, this same core of effective practices.</p> <p>3. Includes at least one additional metric to combine with the student performance and principal observation components to develop a “multi-metric” evaluation system for, at a minimum, the teachers who are in the year prior to a milestone career event, such as being awarded a multi-year contract, a promotion, or a significant increase in salary. Examples of additional metrics include, but are not limited to, observations by master teachers or instructional coaches, student input, peer input, and parental input.</p> <p>4. Includes a comprehensive range of ratings beyond a simple satisfactory or unsatisfactory, that must include “effective” and “highly effective.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LEA will design and implement a principal evaluation system with teacher and principal involvement that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Utilizes the state-adopted teacher-level student growth measure cited in (D)(2)(i) as the primary factor of the teacher and principal evaluation systems. <p>Student achievement or growth data as defined in the grant must account for at least 50% of the principal’s evaluation as follows:</p> <p>By the end of the grant, the LEA shall include</p> 	

Elements of State Reform Plans	Comments from LEA (optional)
<p>student growth as defined in (D)(2)(i), for at least 40% of the evaluation, and student growth or achievement as determined by the LEA for 10% of the evaluation. The LEA may phase-in the evaluation system but will use, at a minimum, student growth as defined in (D)(2)(i) for at least 35% of the evaluation and student growth or achievement as determined by the LEA for 15% of the evaluation. Implementation of the requirements for the LEA evaluation systems applies, at a minimum, to grades and subjects for which student growth measures have been developed by the Department in collaboration with the advisory body as described in (D)(2)(i).</p> <p>The 2010-11 school year will be considered a development year for the evaluation systems.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Utilizes for the remaining portion of the evaluation the Florida Principal Leadership Standards with an emphasis on recruiting and retaining effective teachers, improving effectiveness of teachers, and removing ineffective teachers. 3. Includes a comprehensive range of ratings beyond a simple satisfactory or unsatisfactory, that must include "effective" and "highly effective." <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LEA will submit teacher and principal evaluation systems to the Department for review and approval. • The LEA will utilize student performance data on statewide assessments as a significant factor in the 	

Elements of State Reform Plans	Comments from LEA (optional)
<p>annual evaluations of district-level staff with supervisory responsibilities over principals, curriculum, instruction, or any other position directly related to student learning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA will report the results of evaluations of each teacher, principal, and district-level supervisor [as described in (D)(2)(ii)] to the Department during Survey 5. 	
<p><u>(ii) Conduct annual evaluations</u></p> <p>For Teachers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA will conduct multiple evaluations for each first-year teacher that are integrated with the district's beginning teacher support program and include observations on the core effective practices described in (D)(2)(ii)2. and reviews of student performance data. The LEA will conduct "multi-metric" evaluations as described in (D)(2)(ii) for teachers who are in the year prior to a milestone career event, such as being awarded a multi-year contract, a promotion, or a significant increase in salary. The LEA plan will include a definition of milestone career event. The LEA will conduct evaluations as described in (D)(2)(ii)1, 2, and 4. for all other teachers at least once per year. <p>For Principals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA will conduct evaluations as described in (D)(2)(ii) for principals at least once per year. 	
<p><u>(iv)(a) Use evaluations to inform professional</u></p>	

Elements of State Reform Plans	Comments from LEA (optional)
<p><u>development.</u></p> <p>The LEA will use results from teacher and principal evaluations as described in (D)(2)(ii) in its professional development system as follows:</p> <p>For Teachers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish an Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP) for each teacher that is, in part, based on an analysis of student performance data and results of prior evaluations. • Individualize the support and training provided to first- and second-year teachers and determine the effective teachers who will provide coaching/mentoring in the district's beginning teacher support program. <p>For Principals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish an Individual Leadership Development Plan (ILDLP) for each principal that is based, in part, on an analysis of student performance data and results of prior evaluations. 	
<p><u>(iv)(b) Use evaluations to inform compensation, promotion, and retention</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LEA will implement a compensation system for teachers that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ties the most significant gains in salary to effectiveness demonstrated by annual evaluations as described in (D)(2)(ii). 2. Implements statutory requirements of 	

Elements of State Reform Plans	Comments from LEA (optional)
<p>differentiated pay in s. 1012.22(1)(c)4., F.S., through bonuses or salary supplements. Categories for differentiated pay are additional academic responsibilities, school demographics, critical shortage areas (including STEM areas and Exceptional Student Education), and level of job performance difficulties (including working in high-poverty, high-minority, or persistently lowest-achieving schools).</p> <p>3. Provides promotional opportunities for effective teachers to remain teaching in addition to moving into school leadership positions and bases promotions on effectiveness as demonstrated on annual evaluations as described in (D)(2)(ii), including a multi-metric evaluation in the year prior to promotion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LEA will implement a compensation system for principals that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ties the most significant gains in salary to effectiveness demonstrated by annual evaluations as described in (D)(2)(ii). 2. Implements statutory requirements of differentiated pay in s. 1012.22(1)(c)4., F.S., through bonuses or salary supplements. Categories for differentiated pay are additional academic responsibilities, school demographics, critical shortage areas, and level of job performance difficulties (including working in high-poverty, high-minority, or persistently lowest-achieving schools). • The LEA may scale up the compensation system 	

Elements of State Reform Plans	Comments from LEA (optional)
<p>beginning with a cohort of schools, such as those that are considered persistently low-performing (the lowest 5% of schools in the state), as long as by the end of the grant, the compensation system applies district-wide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA will provide annually to the Department its salary schedule indicating how this requirement has been met. 	
<p><u>(iv)(c) Use evaluations to inform tenure and/or full certification</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA will base decisions to award employment contracts to teachers and principals on effectiveness as demonstrated through annual evaluations as described in (D)(2)(ii). 	
<p><u>(iv)(d) Use evaluations to inform removal</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA will base decisions surrounding reductions in staff, including teachers and principals holding employment contracts, on their level of effectiveness demonstrated on annual evaluations as described in (D)(2)(ii). When this factor yields equal results, seniority and other factors may be used in decisions. The LEA will hold principals, their supervisors, and all LEA staff who have a responsibility in the dismissal process accountable for utilizing the process and timeline in statute (ss. 1012.33 and 1012.34, F.S.) to remove ineffective teachers from the classroom. The LEA will report annually to the Department through Survey 5 the teachers and principals who were dismissed for ineffective performance as 	

Elements of State Reform Plans	Comments from LEA (optional)
<p>demonstrated through the district's evaluation system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LEA will report annually to the Department through Survey 5 the highly effective teachers and principals who have resigned or who are no longer employed by the District. 	
<p><u>(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals:</u></p>	
<p><u>(i) High-poverty and/or high-minority schools</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LEA will develop a plan, with timetables and goals, that uses effectiveness data from annual evaluations as described in (D)(2)(ii) to attract and retain highly effective teachers and principals to schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, and persistently lowest-achieving. The LEA plan may also be designed to attract and retain new teachers from high performing teacher preparation programs as defined by the Department in the grant to these schools. • The LEA will implement a compensation system as described in (D)(2)(iv)(b) to provide incentives for encouraging effective teachers and principals to work in these schools. • The LEA will present a plan that includes strategies in addition to compensation to staff these schools with a team of highly effective teachers led by a highly effective principal, including how the success of these individuals will be supported by the district. • The LEA will report the effectiveness data of all teachers and principals annually during Survey 5. 	

Elements of State Reform Plans	Comments from LEA (optional)
<p><u>(ii) Hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LEA will implement a compensation system as described in (D)(2)(iv)(b) to provide incentives for the recruitment of effective teachers in these subjects and areas. • The LEA will implement recruitment and professional development strategies to increase the pool of teachers available in the district in these subject areas. 	
<p><u>(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals:</u></p>	
<p><u>(i) Quality professional development</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LEA will implement a district professional development system that utilizes the state's protocol standards for effective professional development as follows: <p>For Teachers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Persistently lowest-achieving schools (schools in the lowest 5%) must modify the school schedules to accommodate lesson study. The LEA may modify school schedules for other schools to allow for common planning time by grade level (elementary) or subject area (secondary). Such planning time may be dedicated to lesson study focused on instructional quality, student work, and outcomes, without reducing time devoted to student instruction. Where lesson study is implemented, the LEA will devote a minimum 	

Elements of State Reform Plans	Comments from LEA (optional)
<p>s. 1008.33, F.S., and set forth in proposed Rule 6A-1.099811, F.A.C. (see Appendices B and C to the MOU).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An LEA with more than nine persistently lowest-achieving schools will not select the transformational option for more than one-half of the schools. • All actions undertaken by the LEA under this element of the grant will be in accordance with the requirements of s. 1008.33, F.S. (Differentiated Accountability). • The LEA will submit a plan for the Department's approval that implements one or more of the following programs in each persistently lowest-achieving school and within the feeder pattern of each persistently lowest-achieving high school: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In Intervene schools, the LEA will implement a schedule that provides increased learning time beyond the minimum 180 days and/or implement an extended school day, beyond the current hours of instruction. 2. The LEA will offer prekindergarten on a full day basis using the Department's Title I Full Day PreK model, for children residing in the attendance zone of such schools. 3. The LEA will expand opportunities for students to attend career and professional academies, especially STEM academies, under s. 1003.493, F.S. 4. The LEA will expand or introduce proven programs to encourage advanced classes, 	

Elements of State Reform Plans	Comments from LEA (optional)
<p>positive behavior support systems, mentoring, and curriculum that provide high-need students with college-ready, career-ready, or other postsecondary skills.</p> <p>5. The Department may approve other programs that demonstrate a strong record of improving student achievement in these district schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LEA will use effectiveness data from annual evaluations to determine incentives for the most effective teachers to work in the district's elementary, middle, and high schools that are the persistently lowest-achieving. • The LEA will only assign new teachers (those in their first and second year) in the district's schools that are the persistently lowest-achieving if these teachers have completed or are participating in a high-performing teacher preparation program, as defined in the grant application. The LEA will ensure that such teachers are provided additional support by staffing a mix of new and proven teachers across all content areas and grade levels in the school. <p><u>F. General</u></p> <p><u>(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LEA will offer charter schools located within their district the opportunity to participate in the grant on the same terms as any other district school. • Consistent with federal requirements, the LEA will ensure that participating charter schools 	

Elements of State Reform Plans	Comments from LEA (optional)
<p>receive a commensurate share of any grant funds and services funded by the grant.</p> <p>The LEA will provide data and reports necessary for the evaluation of the grant conducted by the Department's evaluation team and will require charter schools to provide the LEA with the data necessary for such evaluations.</p>	

For the Participating LEA

For the Florida Department of Education

Authorized LEA Signature/Date

Authorized State Signature/Date

Print Name/Title

Print Name/Title

APPENDIX A – SCHOOL INTERVENTION MODELS

(Appendix C in the Notice of Final Priorities, Requirements, Definitions, and Selection Criteria; and in the Notice Inviting Applications)

There are four school intervention models referred to in Selection Criterion (E)(2): turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model. Each is described below.

- (a) Turnaround model. (1) A turnaround model is one in which an LEA must--
- (i) Replace the principal and grant the principal sufficient operational flexibility (including in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach in order to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates;
 - (ii) Use locally adopted competencies to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within the turnaround environment to meet the needs of students,
 - (A) Screen all existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent; and
 - (B) Select new staff;
 - (iii) Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school;
 - (iv) Provide staff with ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure that they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies;
 - (v) Adopt a new governance structure, which may include, but is not limited to, requiring the school to report to a new "turnaround office" in the LEA or SEA, hire a "turnaround leader" who reports directly to the Superintendent or Chief Academic Officer, or enter into a multi-year contract with the LEA or SEA to obtain added flexibility in exchange for greater accountability;
 - (vi) Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and "vertically aligned" from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards;
 - (vii) Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students;
 - (viii) Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time (as defined in this notice); and
 - (ix) Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.
- (2) A turnaround model may also implement other strategies such as—
- (i) Any of the required and permissible activities under the transformation model; or
 - (ii) A new school model (e.g., themed, dual language academy).

(b) Restart model. A restart model is one in which an LEA converts a school or closes and reopens a school under a charter school operator, a charter management organization (CMO), or an education management organization (EMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process. (A CMO is a non-profit organization that operates or manages charter schools by centralizing or sharing certain functions and resources among schools. An EMO is a for-profit or non-profit organization that provides "whole-school operation" services to an LEA.) A restart model must enroll, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend the school.

(c) School closure. School closure occurs when an LEA closes a school and enrolls the students who attended that school in other schools in the LEA that are higher achieving. These other schools should be within reasonable proximity to the closed school and may include, but are not limited to, charter schools or new schools for which achievement data are not yet available.

(d) Transformation model. A transformation model is one in which an LEA implements each of the following strategies:

(1) Developing and increasing teacher and school leader effectiveness.

(i) Required activities. The LEA must--

(A) Replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation model;

(B) Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that--

(1) Take into account data on student growth (as defined in this notice) as a significant factor as well as other factors such as multiple observation-based assessments of performance and ongoing collections of professional practice reflective of student achievement and increased high-school graduations rates; and

(2) Are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement;

(C) Identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing this model, have increased student achievement and high-school graduation rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice, have not done so;

(D) Provide staff with ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development (e.g., regarding subject-specific pedagogy, instruction that reflects a deeper understanding of the community served by the school, or differentiated instruction) that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies; and

(E) Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation school.

(ii) Permissible activities. An LEA may also implement other strategies to develop teachers' and school leaders' effectiveness, such as--

(A) Providing additional compensation to attract and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation school;

(B) Instituting a system for measuring changes in instructional practices resulting from professional development; or

(C) Ensuring that the school is not required to accept a teacher without the mutual consent of the teacher and principal, regardless of the teacher's seniority.

(2) Comprehensive instructional reform strategies.

(i) Required activities. The LEA must--

(A) Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and "vertically aligned" from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards; and

(B) Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students.

(ii) Permissible activities. An LEA may also implement comprehensive instructional reform strategies, such as--

(A) Conducting periodic reviews to ensure that the curriculum is being implemented with fidelity, is having the intended impact on student achievement, and is modified if ineffective;

(B) Implementing a schoolwide “response-to-intervention” model;

(C) Providing additional supports and professional development to teachers and principals in order to implement effective strategies to support students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment and to ensure that limited English proficient students acquire language skills to master academic content;

(D) Using and integrating technology-based supports and interventions as part of the instructional program; and

(E) In secondary schools--

(1) Increasing rigor by offering opportunities for students to enroll in advanced coursework (such as Advanced Placement or International Baccalaureate; or science, technology, engineering, and mathematics courses, especially those that incorporate rigorous and relevant project-, inquiry-, or design-based contextual learning opportunities), early-college high schools, dual enrollment programs, or thematic learning academies that prepare students for college and careers, including by providing appropriate supports designed to ensure that low-achieving students can take advantage of these programs and coursework;

(2) Improving student transition from middle to high school through summer transition programs or freshman academies;

(3) Increasing graduation rates through, for example, credit-recovery programs, re-engagement strategies, smaller learning communities, competency-based instruction and performance-based assessments, and acceleration of basic reading and mathematics skills; or

(4) Establishing early-warning systems to identify students who may be at risk of failing to achieve to high standards or graduate.

(3) Increasing learning time and creating community-oriented schools.

(i) Required activities. The LEA must--

(A) Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time (as defined in this notice); and

(B) Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.

(ii) Permissible activities. An LEA may also implement other strategies that extend learning time and create community-oriented schools, such as--

(A) Partnering with parents and parent organizations, faith- and community-based organizations, health clinics, other State or local agencies, and others to create safe school environments that meet students’ social, emotional, and health needs;

(B) Extending or restructuring the school day so as to add time for such strategies as advisory periods that build relationships between students, faculty, and other school staff;

(C) Implementing approaches to improve school climate and discipline, such as implementing a system of positive behavioral supports or taking steps to eliminate bullying and student harassment; or

(D) Expanding the school program to offer full-day kindergarten or pre-kindergarten.

(4) Providing operational flexibility and sustained support.

(i) Required activities. The LEA must--

(A) Give the school sufficient operational flexibility (such as staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates; and

(B) Ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an EMO).

(ii) Permissible activities. The LEA may also implement other strategies for providing operational flexibility and intensive support, such as--

(A) Allowing the school to be run under a new governance arrangement, such as a turnaround division within the LEA or SEA; or

(B) Implementing a per-pupil school-based budget formula that is weighted based on student needs.

If a school identified as a persistently lowest-achieving school has implemented, in whole or in part within the last two years, an intervention that meets the requirements of the turnaround, restart, or transformation models, the school may continue or complete the intervention being implemented.

APPENDIX B – LOWEST 5% OF TITLE I SCHOOLS (51)

District Name	School Name	DA 2008	DA 2009
ALACHUA	CHARLES W. DUVAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	PREVENT I	CORRECT II
ALACHUA	MARJORIE KINNAN RAWLINGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	CORRECT I	CORRECT II
BROWARD	COCONUT CREEK HIGH SCHOOL*	CORRECT II	CORRECT II
BROWARD	LARKDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	INTERVENE	INTERVENE
BROWARD	SUNLAND PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	CORRECT II	CORRECT II
COLLIER	EDEN PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL*	NA	CORRECT II
COLLIER	IMMOKALEE HIGH SCHOOL	CORRECT II	CORRECT II
DADE	BOOKER T. WASHINGTON SENIOR HIGH	CORRECT II	CORRECT II
DADE	CHARLES R. DREW MIDDLE SCHOOL	CORRECT II	CORRECT II
DADE	DR. HENRY W. MACK/WEST LITTLE RIVER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	CORRECT I	CORRECT II
DADE	FREDERICK R. DOUGLASS ELEMENTARY	CORRECT II	CORRECT II
DADE	HOLMES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	INTERVENE	INTERVENE
DADE	HOMESTEAD SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	CORRECT II	CORRECT II
DADE	LITTLE RIVER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	CORRECT II	CORRECT II
DADE	MIAMI CAROL CITY SENIOR HIGH	CORRECT II	CORRECT II
DADE	MIAMI CENTRAL SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	INTERVENE	INTERVENE
DADE	MIAMI EDISON MIDDLE SCHOOL	CORRECT II	CORRECT II
DADE	MIAMI EDISON SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	INTERVENE	INTERVENE
DADE	MIAMI JACKSON SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	CORRECT II	CORRECT II
DADE	MIAMI NORLAND SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL*	CORRECT II	CORRECT II
DADE	MIAMI NORTHWESTERN SENIOR HIGH	PREVENT II	CORRECT II
DADE	MIAMI SOUTHRIDGE SENIOR HIGH*	PREVENT II	CORRECT II
DADE	NORTH COUNTY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	CORRECT II	CORRECT II
DADE	NORTH MIAMI MIDDLE SCHOOL	CORRECT II	CORRECT II
DADE	NORTH MIAMI SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL*	CORRECT II	CORRECT II

District Name	School Name	DA 2008	DA 2009
DADE	PINE VILLA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	CORRECT II	INTERVENE
DUVAL	A. PHILIP RANDOLPH ACADEMIES*	PREVENT II	CORRECT II
DUVAL	ANDREW JACKSON HIGH SCHOOL*	CORRECT II	INTERVENE
DUVAL	EDWARD H. WHITE HIGH SCHOOL*	CORRECT II	CORRECT II
DUVAL	JEAN RIBAUT HIGH SCHOOL*	PREVENT II	INTERVENE
DUVAL	LONG BRANCH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	CORRECT II	CORRECT II
DUVAL	NATHAN B. FORREST HIGH SCHOOL*	CORRECT II	CORRECT II
DUVAL	NORTH SHORE K-8	CORRECT II	INTERVENE
DUVAL	NORTHWESTERN MIDDLE SCHOOL	CORRECT II	CORRECT II
DUVAL	PAXON MIDDLE SCHOOL	CORRECT II	CORRECT II
DUVAL	SMART POPE LIVINGSTON ELEMENTARY	CORRECT II	CORRECT II
DUVAL	WILLIAM M. RAINES HIGH SCHOOL*	CORRECT II	INTERVENE
ESCAMBLA	WARRINGTON MIDDLE SCHOOL	INTERVENE	INTERVENE
GADSDEN	EAST GADSDEN HIGH SCHOOL	CORRECT II	CORRECT II
GADSDEN	WEST GADSDEN HIGH SCHOOL	CORRECT II	CORRECT II
HAMILTON	CENTRAL HAMILTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	CORRECT II	CORRECT II
HILLSBOROUGH	FRANKLIN MIDDLE MAGNET SCHOOL	INTERVENE	INTERVENE
HILLSBOROUGH	MIDDLETON HIGH SCHOOL	INTERVENE	INTERVENE
JEFFERSON	JEFFERSON COUNTY MIDDLE/HIGH SCHOOL	PREVENT II	INTERVENE
LEON	AMOS P. GODBY HIGH SCHOOL*	NA	CORRECT II
MADISON	MADISON COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL*	PREVENT II	CORRECT II
ORANGE	MEMORIAL MIDDLE SCHOOL	CORRECT II	CORRECT II
PALM BEACH	GLADES CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL	CORRECT II	CORRECT II
PALM BEACH	LAKE WORTH HIGH SCHOOL*	NA	INTERVENE
PALM BEACH	ROSENWALD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	CORRECT II	CORRECT II
POLK	OSCAR J. POPE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	PREVENT II	CORRECT II

*Newly funded Title I schools for two years or less (not currently in need of improvement)

APPENDIX C – LOWEST 5% OF TITLE I-ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS (19)

District Name	School Name	DA 2008	DA 2009
ALACHUA	HAWTHORNE MIDDLE/HIGH SCHOOL	NA	CORRECT II
COLUMBIA	COLUMBIA HIGH SCHOOL	PREVENT II	CORRECT II
HAMILTON	HAMILTON COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL	PREVENT II	CORRECT II
HARDEE	HARDEE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	PREVENT II	CORRECT II
HENDRY	CLEWISTON HIGH SCHOOL	NA	CORRECT II
HERNANDO	HERNANDO HIGH SCHOOL	PREVENT II	CORRECT II
HERNANDO	CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL	PREVENT II	CORRECT II
LAKE	LEESBURG HIGH SCHOOL	PREVENT II	CORRECT II
LEVY	WILLISTON HIGH SCHOOL	NA	CORRECT II
ORANGE	EVANS HIGH SCHOOL	PREVENT II	CORRECT II
ORANGE	OAK RIDGE HIGH SCHOOL	PREVENT II	CORRECT II
OSCEOLA	GATEWAY HIGH SCHOOL	PREVENT II	CORRECT II
OSCEOLA	CELEBRATION HIGH SCHOOL	PREVENT II	CORRECT II
OSCEOLA	POINCIANA HIGH SCHOOL	PREVENT II	CORRECT II
PASCO	RIDGEWOOD HIGH SCHOOL	PREVENT II	CORRECT II
PINELLAS	BOCA CIEGA HIGH SCHOOL	PREVENT II	CORRECT II
PINELLAS	DIXIE M. HOLLINS HIGH SCHOOL	PREVENT II	CORRECT II
PINELLAS	LAKESWOOD HIGH SCHOOL	PREVENT II	CORRECT II
PINELLAS	GIBBS HIGH SCHOOL	PREVENT II	CORRECT II

Attachment 10c

Florida Educator Accomplished Practices

6A-5.065 The Educator Accomplished Practices.

(1) Purpose and Foundational Principles.

(a) Purpose. The Educator Accomplished Practices are set forth in rule as Florida's core standards for effective educators. The Accomplished Practices form the foundation for the state's teacher preparation programs, educator certification requirements and school district instructional personnel appraisal systems.

(b) Foundational Principles. The Accomplished Practices are based upon and further describe three (3) essential principles:

1. The effective educator creates a culture of high expectations for all students by promoting the importance of education and each student's capacity for academic achievement.

2. The effective educator demonstrates deep and comprehensive knowledge of the subject taught.

3. The effective educator exemplifies the standards of the profession.

(2) The Educator Accomplished Practices. Each effective educator applies the foundational principles through six (6) Educator Accomplished Practices. Each of the practices is clearly defined to promote a common language and statewide understanding of the expectations for the quality of instruction and professional responsibility.

(a) Quality of Instruction.

1. Instructional Design and Lesson Planning. Applying concepts from human development and learning theories, the effective educator consistently:

a. Aligns instruction with state-adopted standards at the appropriate level of rigor;

b. Sequences lessons and concepts to ensure coherence and required prior knowledge;

c. Designs instruction for students to achieve mastery;

d. Selects appropriate formative assessments to monitor learning;

e. Uses diagnostic student data to plan lessons; and

f. Develops learning experiences that require students to demonstrate a variety of applicable skills and competencies.

2. The Learning Environment. To maintain a student-centered learning environment that is safe, organized, equitable, flexible, inclusive, and collaborative, the effective educator consistently:

a. Organizes, allocates, and manages the resources of time, space, and attention;

b. Manages individual and class behaviors through a well-planned management system;

c. Conveys high expectations to all students;

d. Respects students' cultural linguistic and family background;

e. Models clear, acceptable oral and written communication skills;

f. Maintains a climate of openness, inquiry, fairness and support;

g. Integrates current information and communication technologies;

h. Adapts the learning environment to accommodate the differing needs and diversity of students; and

i. Utilizes current and emerging assistive technologies that enable students to participate in high-quality communication interactions and achieve their educational goals.

3. Instructional Delivery and Facilitation. The effective educator consistently utilizes a deep and comprehensive knowledge of the subject taught to:

a. Deliver engaging and challenging lessons;

b. Deepen and enrich students' understanding through content area literacy strategies, verbalization of thought, and application of the subject matter;

c. Identify gaps in students' subject matter knowledge;

d. Modify instruction to respond to preconceptions or misconceptions;

e. Relate and integrate the subject matter with other disciplines and life experiences;

f. Employ higher-order questioning techniques;

g. Apply varied instructional strategies and resources, including appropriate technology, to provide comprehensible instruction, and to teach for student understanding;

h. Differentiate instruction based on an assessment of student learning needs and recognition of individual differences in students;

i. Support, encourage, and provide immediate and specific feedback to students to promote student achievement; and

j. Utilize student feedback to monitor instructional needs and to adjust instruction.

4. Assessment. The effective educator consistently:

- a. Analyzes and applies data from multiple assessments and measures to diagnose students' learning needs, informs instruction based on those needs, and drives the learning process;
- b. Designs and aligns formative and summative assessments that match learning objectives and lead to mastery;
- c. Uses a variety of assessment tools to monitor student progress, achievement and learning gains;
- d. Modifies assessments and testing conditions to accommodate learning styles and varying levels of knowledge;
- e. Shares the importance and outcomes of student assessment data with the student and the student's parent/caregiver(s); and
- f. Applies technology to organize and integrate assessment information.

(b) Continuous Improvement, Responsibility and Ethics.

1. Continuous Professional Improvement. The effective educator consistently:

- a. Designs purposeful professional goals to strengthen the effectiveness of instruction based on students' needs;
- b. Examines and uses data-informed research to improve instruction and student achievement;
- c. Uses a variety of data, independently, and in collaboration with colleagues, to evaluate learning outcomes, adjust planning and continuously improve the effectiveness of the lessons;
- d. Collaborates with the home, school and larger communities to foster communication and to support student learning and continuous improvement;
- e. Engages in targeted professional growth opportunities and reflective practices; and
- f. Implements knowledge and skills learned in professional development in the teaching and learning process.

2. Professional Responsibility and Ethical Conduct. Understanding that educators are held to a high moral standard in a community, the effective educator adheres to the Code of Ethics and the Principles of Professional Conduct of the Education Profession of Florida, pursuant to Rules 6B-1.001 and 6B-1.006, F.A.C., and fulfills the expected obligations to students, the public and the education profession.

Rulemaking Authority 1004.04, 1004.85, 1012.225, 1012.34, 1012.56 FS. Law Implemented 1004.04, 1004.85, 1012.225, 1012.34, 1012.56 FS. History—New 7-2-98, Amended 2-13-11.

Attachment 10d

Florida Principal Leadership Standards

6A-5.080 Florida Principal Leadership Standards.

Florida's school leaders must possess the abilities and skills necessary to perform their designated tasks in a high-performing manner. The school leader, commensurate with job requirements and delegated authority, shall demonstrate competence in the following standards:

(1) Instructional Leadership.

(a) Instructional Leadership. High performing leaders promote a positive learning culture, provide an effective instructional program and apply best practices to student learning, especially in the area of reading and other foundational skills.

(b) Managing the Learning Environment. High performing leaders manage the organization, operations, facilities and resources in ways that maximize the use of resources in an instructional organization and promote a safe, efficient, legal and effective learning environment.

(c) Learning, Accountability and Assessment. High performing leaders monitor the success of all students in the learning environment; align the curriculum, instruction and assessment processes to promote effective student performance; and use a variety of benchmarks, learning expectations and feedback measures to ensure accountability for all participants engaged in the educational process.

(2) Operational Leadership.

(a) Decision Making Strategies. High performing leaders plan effectively, use critical thinking and problem solving techniques, and collect and analyze data for continuous school improvement.

(b) Technology. High performing leaders plan and implement the integration of technological and electronic tools in teaching, learning, management, research and communication responsibilities.

(c) Human Resource Development. High performing leaders recruit, select, nurture and, where appropriate, retain effective personnel; develop mentor and partnership programs; and design and implement comprehensive professional growth plans for all staff, paid and volunteer.

(d) Ethical Leadership. High performing leaders act with integrity, fairness, and honesty in an ethical manner.

(3) School Leadership.

(a) Vision. High performing leaders have a personal vision for their school and the knowledge, skills and dispositions to develop, articulate and implement a shared vision that is supported by the larger organization and the school community.

(b) Community and Stakeholder Partnerships. High performing leaders collaborate with families and business and community members, respond to diverse community interests and needs, work effectively within the larger organization and mobilize community resources.

(c) Diversity. High performing leaders understand, respond to, and influence the personal, political, social, economic, legal, and cultural relationships in the classroom, the school and the local community.

Specific Authority 1001.02, 1012.55 FS. Law Implemented 1012.55 FS. History—New 5-24-05, Formerly 6B-5.0012.

Attachment 10e

Review and Approval Checklist for Race to the Top Teacher Evaluation Systems

Review and Approval Checklist for RTTT Teacher Evaluation Systems 6-1-2011

Modified to Reflect Statutory Changes 3/25/11

DISTRICT: _____ Date Submitted to DOE: _____

Contact Person's Name _____ Title _____

Phone # _____ E-mail: _____

The district has also submitted by June 1, documentation for review on a school principal evaluation system: Yes _____ No _____

MOU section (D)(2)(ii) and 1012.34(1)(b) requires that the school district's instructional personnel and school administrator evaluation systems must be approved by the Department of Education. State Board Rule 6B-4.010, F.A.C., requires that where a district "...makes substantive modifications to an approved school district instructional personnel assessment system, the modified system shall be submitted to the Department of Education for review and approval." The following checklist combines the Race to the Top (RTTT) requirements for developing and conducting teacher and principal evaluation systems with those required in the recently amended section 1012.34, Florida Statutes, and Rules 6B-4.010 and 6A.5.065, F.A.C. This checklist will assist LEAs in ensuring that they have met the requirements for the RTTT grant in this area, while also satisfying requirements for Florida Statutes and State Board Rule. The checklist will also speed the review process.

DIRECTIONS:

- a. For each component of the evaluation system shown on the left, provide the page number(s) where that component is addressed in your evaluation system documentation. If more than one document is included in your submission, note the title of the document as well as the page number(s).
- b. Submit this checklist with your district's evaluation system documentation by June 1, 2011.
- c. Documentation submitted for review and approval for initial implementation in 2011-12 is to be sent in digital format no later than June 1, 2011, 11:59 PM EST to Racetothetop@fldoe.org.

A digital version of this checklist is provided on the Race-to-the-Top website (<http://www.fldoe.org/ARRA/Racetothetop.asp>). Questions and clarification on the review process may be sent to john.moore@fldoe.org.

Evaluation System Components	Sources	*ESEA Waiver
<p>Section I. System Components Referenced both by the RTTT Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and Florida Statutes</p> <p>1. Core of Effective Practices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Florida Educator Accomplished Practices • Practices strongly linked to increased student achievement • Criteria for evaluation systems listed in s. 1012.34, F.S. • Contemporary research on effective practices • The principal, direct supervisor, and any other individual performing observation will use, at a minimum, this same core of effective practices <p><u>Documentation should include:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>Acknowledgement that the purpose of the redeveloped evaluation system is increasing student learning growth by improving the quality of instructional, administrative, and supervisory service</i> b. <i>Observation instrument(s) with indicators of effective practice (see note below)</i> c. <i>Clear connection to the each of the six FEAPs practices as revised December 17, 2010. Connection may be shown on the observation instrument or on a separate page. Indicators should be sufficiently specific to support inter-rater reliability.</i> d. <i>Reference or list of related research on which it is based (see note below)</i> e. <i>Procedures for how the same core is used for all who are conducting evaluations</i> <p><i>Note: Because the purpose of the system has changed to increase student learning, the connection of specific practices to research and evidence of student learning is now needed. Because this may not be evident for all indicators at this time, you may note processes to be used to refine indicators over the next 4 years as understanding of the research base and become known.</i></p>	<p>Sources – Citations (refer to MOU, statute and rules for specifics)</p> <p>1012.34(1)(a) “For the purpose of increasing student learning growth by improving the quality of instructional, administrative, and supervisory practices... the district superintendent shall establish procedures for evaluating the performance of duties and responsibilities of all instructional, administrative, and supervisory personnel...”</p> <p><u>MOU (D)(2)(ii)2</u></p> <p>Includes the core of effective practices, developed in collaboration with stakeholders, that have been strongly linked to increased student achievement for the observation.</p> <p><u>SBE Rule 6A.5.065, F.A.C.</u> – Florida Educator Accomplished Practices form the foundation for school district instructional personnel appraisal systems.</p> <p><u>1012.34(3)(a), F.S.</u> – Performance evaluation must be based upon sound educational principles and contemporary research in effective educational practices</p>	<p>Tag to ESEA Requirement</p> <p>(1) Will be used for continual improvement of instruction</p> <p>(3) Use multiple valid measures in determining performance levels, including as a significant factor data on student growth for all students (including English Learners and students with disabilities), and other measures of professional practice (which may be gathered through multiple formats and sources, such as observations based on rigorous teacher performance standards, teacher portfolios, and student and parent surveys)</p>

Evaluation System Components	Sources	*ESEA Waiver
<p>2. Student growth measures: Existing statutes require use of data on student improvement as the primary criterion in the appraisal. The MOU establishes a more uniform way to do so among RTTT districts and defines how to connect student growth to individual teacher appraisal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student assessments for each course that will be used also for evaluation purposes • Methods of calculating student growth beginning in 2011-12 for all teachers • The timeline for implementing comparable measures of student growth for all teachers, including whether the LEA will phase-in student growth as defined in (D)(2)(i) for at least 35% of the evaluation and student growth or achievement as determined by the LEA for 15% of the evaluation. <p><u>Documentation should include:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>The list of student assessments for each subject and grade level for use in 2011-12</i> b. <i>The timeline for development/selection of student assessments for each subject and grade level that will be also used for evaluation and the anticipated timeline when they will be incorporated into the evaluation</i> c. <i>Verification of using the state-adopted student growth measure for courses associated with FCAT for 2011-12</i> d. <i>The timeline for developing/selecting growth measures for additional grades and subjects</i> e. <i>How the growth results are combined for each teacher with only FCAT course assignments and for teachers with assignments that utilize results for multiple assessments to equal 50% of the evaluation result</i> f. District decisions on whether and how to implement the following criteria from the new law: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Evaluation Criteria:</u> Classroom Teachers, excluding substitutes: If less than 3 years of data are available, years for which data are 	<p>MOU (D)(2)(i) and (ii)</p> <p>Utilizes the state-adopted teacher-level student growth measure cited in (D)(2)(i) as the primary factor of the teacher and principal evaluation systems.</p> <p>Student achievement or growth data as defined in the grant must account for at least 50% of the teacher's evaluation.</p> <p><u>1012.34(3)(a)1, F.S.</u> – The evaluation criteria must include ...1. Performance of students. At least 50 percent of a performance evaluation must be based upon data and indicators of student learning growth assessed annually by statewide assessments or, for subjects and grade levels not measured by statewide assessments, by school district assessments as provided in s. 1008.22(8). Each school district must use the formula adopted pursuant to paragraph (7)(a) for measuring student learning growth in all courses associated with statewide assessments and must select an equally appropriate formula for measuring student learning growth for all other grades and subjects, except as otherwise provided in subsection (7).</p> <p>1012.34(7) Measurement of Student Learning Growth</p> <p>(b) Beginning in the 2011-2012 school year,</p>	<p>(3) Use multiple valid measures in determining performance levels, including as a significant factor data on student growth for all students (including English Learners and students with disabilities), and other measures of professional practice (which may be gathered through multiple formats and sources, such as observations based on rigorous teacher performance standards, teacher portfolios, and student and parent surveys)</p>

Evaluation System Components	Sources	*ESEA Waiver
<p>available must be used, and percentage of evaluation based on growth may be reduced to not less than 40%.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Evaluation Criteria</u>: instructional personnel who are <u>not</u> classroom teachers: may include student learning growth data and other measurable student outcomes, provided growth accounts for 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 • <u>Student Learning Growth</u>: For subjects and grades <u>not</u> 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 • <u>Student Learning Growth</u>: For 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 provisions expire July 1, 2015. 	<p>each school district shall measure student learning growth using the formula approved by the commissioner under paragraph (a) for courses associated with the FCAT. Each school district shall implement the additional student learning growth measures selected by the commissioner under paragraph (a) for the remainder of the statewide assessments included under s. 1008.22 as they become available. Beginning in the 2014-2015 school year, for grades and subjects not assessed by statewide assessments but otherwise assessed as required under s. 1008.22(8), each school district shall measure student learning growth using an equally appropriate formula. The department shall provide models for measuring student learning growth which school districts may adopt.</p>	
<p>3. Evaluation rating criteria: Existing requirements call for procedures, methods and criteria to designate, document, and differentiate performance levels. The MOU established a more uniform way to do so among RTTT districts so that differences in proficiency levels will be recognized in the</p>	<p>1012.34 (1)(a) "For purpose of increasing student learning growth by improving the quality of instructional, administrative, and supervisory services, the district</p>	<p>(2) Meaningfully differentiate performance using at least three</p>

Evaluation System Components	Sources	*ESEA Waiver
<p>evaluation outcomes. The Student Success Act signed into law on 3/25/11 further clarifies what is required. The four summative final evaluation ratings are specified in 1012.34(2)(e). The summative rating is based on aggregating data from each of the two components of evaluation (Student Growth and Instructional Practice).</p> <p><u>Documentation should include:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>A description of the four rating labels. If the district's system uses additional rating labels for internal purposes, a description of how these labels translate into the four required labels should be included.</i> <i>The rubric(s) and weighing scales/scoring systems used to define and assign an employee's final evaluation rating. Until criteria for each of the four summative rating levels are developed by the Commissioner and adopted by the State Board, <u>districts will specify the criteria they are using.</u></i> <i>The process of assigning the final rating (i.e., who is involved in the final determination and what process takes place)</i> <i>The calculation and weighting method for the final rating.</i> 	<p>superintendent shall establish procedures for evaluating their performance of duties and responsibilities of all instructional, administrative, and supervisory personnel..."</p> <p><u>MOU (D)(2)(ii)4</u></p> <p>Includes a comprehensive range of ratings beyond a simple satisfactory or unsatisfactory, that must include "effective" and "highly effective."</p> <p><u>1012.34(2)(e), F.S.</u></p> <p>The system must...Differentiate among four levels of performance as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Highly effective Effective Needs Improvement, or for instructional personnel I the first 3 years of employment who need improvement, developing Unsatisfactory 	<p>performance levels</p>
<p>Section II. System Components Referenced only by the MOU</p> <p>4. Teacher and Principal Involvement: The LEA has designed and committed to implement an evaluation system with teacher and principal involvement.</p> <p><u>Documentation should include:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The process for development of the evaluation system that included teacher and principal involvement</i> <i>The process that will be used for continued teacher and principal involvement in review and/or improvement of the evaluation system.</i> 	<p>Sources – Citations (refer to MOU, statutes and rules for specifics)</p> <p><u>MOU D(2)(ii)1</u></p> <p>Develop and implement an evaluation system with teacher and principal involvement</p>	<p>List Page(s) in Documentation</p> <p>Teacher and Principal Involvement in the development of the guidelines</p>

Evaluation System Components	Sources	*ESEA Waiver
<p>c. Evidence of collective bargaining prior to June 1, 2011 – A document signed by the superintendent and local bargaining unit representative verifying that the evaluation system submitted has been agreed to (pending review by DOE) in accordance with the district’s collective bargaining process/contract. Based on the district’s collective bargaining process, this might only cover certain portions of the evaluation system. This may be evidenced by a tentative agreement, MOU or other equivalent formal document</p>		
<p>5. Multiple Evaluations for First Year Teachers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Evaluation” includes both observations and reviews of student work • The process includes feedback for the beginning teacher specific to improvements and level of progress toward effective teaching <p><u>Documentation should include:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The number of classroom observations and reviews of student performance data b. The types of student performance data to be included c. Who conducts the observations and data reviews d. The feedback process for first year teachers e. If a modified observation instrument or rating system is employed with beginning teachers, it should be included in the documentation <p>Note: District processes for linking evaluation to the beginning teacher support program may be included in the documentation, but is not required in the 6/1/11 review, since the schedule for completing a beginning teacher program varies by district and these will be addressed through other review processes.</p>	<p><u>MOU (D)(2)(iii)</u></p> <p>The LEA will conduct multiple evaluations for each first-year teacher that are integrated with the district’s beginning teacher support program and include observations on the core effective practices described in (D)(2)(ii)2. and reviews of student performance data.</p> <p><u>1012.34(3)(a), F.S.</u></p> <p>A performance evaluation must be conducted for each employee at least once a year except that a classroom teacher...who is newly hired...must be observed and evaluated at least twice in the first year of teaching in the school district...”</p>	<p>(4) Evaluate teachers and principals on a regular basis (5) Provide clear, timely, and useful feedback, including feedback that identifies needs and guides professional development</p>
<p>6. Additional Metric Evaluation Element: The MOU initiates a process of expanding the number of “metrics” that inform evaluation. At a minimum, multi-metric evaluations are required for the teachers who are in the year prior to a milestone career event; however, a district is permitted to use multi-metric evaluations for all teachers or other groups of teachers.</p>	<p><u>MOU (D)(2)(iii)(1)(c)</u></p> <p>Include at least one additional metric to combine with the student performance and principal observation components to</p>	<p>(3) Use multiple valid measures in determining performance levels,</p>

Evaluation System Components	Sources	*ESEA Waiver
<p><u>Documentation should include:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The additional “metric(s)” employed as part of the multi-metric evaluation The scope of the workforce to which the added metric(s) apply How the results of the additional metrics figure into the calculation of the final rating For any additional metrics that the district has not yet developed, the timeline for development and implementation of those additional metrics Where additional metrics are used, explain how a proficiency rating for the metric will impact the summative evaluation 	<p>develop a “multi-metric” evaluation system. <u>1012.34(2)(c), F.S.</u> Include a mechanism to examine performance data from multiple sources,</p>	
<p>7. Milestone career event(s)</p> <p><u>Documentation should include:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Descriptions of milestone event(s) selected When the multi-metric evaluations will occur for these employees Any additional explanation of how these are conducted or who is involved, if different from the regular evaluation process 	<p><u>MOU (D)(2)(iii)(2)</u> The LEA will conduct “multi-metric” evaluations as described in (D)(2)(ii) for teachers who are in the year prior to a milestone career event, such as being awarded a multi-year contract, a promotion, or a significant increase in salary.</p>	<p>(6) Will be used to inform personnel decisions</p>
<p>Section III. System Components Referenced by Florida Statutes</p>	<p>Sources – Citations (refer to MOU, statutes and rules for specifics)</p>	<p>List Page(s) in Documentation</p>
<p>8. Annual Evaluation:</p> <p><u>Documentation will include a description of the annual evaluation procedures for teachers (other than those who are first year teachers and teachers prior to a milestone career event, if different).</u></p>	<p><u>MOU (D)(2)(iii)</u> The LEA will conduct evaluations as described in MOU (D)(2)(ii) 1, 2, and 4. for all other teachers at least once per year. <u>1012.34(3)(a), F.S.</u> A performance evaluation must be conducted for each employee at least once a year</p>	<p>(4) Evaluate teachers and principals on a regular basis</p>

Evaluation System Components	Sources	*ESEA Waiver
<p>9. Improvement Plans</p> <p><u>Documentation should include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. How the evaluation system supports the district and school improvement plans and b. How evaluation results are used when developing school and district improvement plans. <p>NOTE: Where planning is underway to link data collection and analysis from evaluation and professional development through the Local Instructional Improvement System (LIIS) under development, districts <u>may</u> indicate how those tools will be developed support improvement planning</p>	<p><u>1012.34(2)(a), F.S.</u> Evaluation systems for instructional personnel and school administrators must be designed to support effective instruction and student learning growth, and performance evaluation results must be used when developing district and school level improvement plans.</p>	<p>(1) Will be used for continual improvement of instruction</p>
<p>10. Continuous Professional Improvement</p> <p><u>Documentation should include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. How information from the evaluation system will be returned to the teacher as feedback for individual continuous improvement b. The district's timeline for using evaluation results to inform individual professional development OR c. How the district currently uses evaluation results to inform individual professional development and the general timeline for improvements to the process under RTTT 	<p><u>1012.34(2)(b), F.S.</u> Provide appropriate instruments, procedures, and criteria for continuous quality improvement of the professional skills of instructional personnel and school administrators, and performance evaluation results must be used when identifying professional development</p>	<p>(1) Will be used for continual improvement of instruction (5) Provide clear, timely, and useful feedback, including feedback that identifies needs and guides professional development</p>
<p>11. Teaching Fields Requiring Special Procedures</p> <p><u>Documentation should include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The district process for identifying fields that need special procedures/criteria b. A list of any that have been identified 	<p><u>1012.34(2)(d), F.S.</u> Identify those teaching fields for which special evaluation procedures and criteria are necessary</p>	<p>(5) Provide clear, timely, and useful feedback, including feedback that identifies needs and guides professional development</p>
<p>12. Evaluator Training</p> <p><u>Documentation should include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. A description of the initial training process 	<p><u>1012.34(2)(f), F.S.</u> Provides training in the proper use of assessment criteria and procedures to all</p>	<p>(1) Will be used for continual improvement of instruction</p>

Evaluation System Components	Sources	*ESEA Waiver
<p>b. The process for on-going training of evaluators</p> <p>c. The process for monitoring evaluator performance and consistency of results</p>	<p>personnel with appraisal responsibilities</p> <p>1012.34(2)(g) F.S. Include a process for monitoring and evaluating the effective and consistent use of the evaluation criteria by employees with evaluation responsibilities</p>	
<p>13. Process of Informing Teachers About the Evaluation Process <u>Documentation should include:</u></p> <p>a. The process whereby personnel are informed of the criteria and procedures by which they will be evaluated, including the transition to the district's new evaluation system under RTTT</p> <p>b. The procedures for new employees who join the workforce</p>	<p><u>1012.34(3)(b), F.S.</u> Fully informs all personnel of the criteria and procedures associated with the evaluation process before the evaluation takes place</p>	
<p>14. Parent Input <u>Documentation should include:</u></p> <p>a. Describe nature of opportunities for parent input</p> <p>b. If parent input is used as an additional metric documentation for this component should be included with #6 above.</p>	<p><u>1012.34(2)(c), F.S.</u> Include a mechanism to examine performance data from multiple sources, including opportunities for parents to provide input into employee performance evaluations</p>	<p>(3) Use multiple valid measures in determining performance levels, ... (which may be gathered through multiple formats and sources, such as observations based on rigorous teacher performance standards, teacher portfolios, and student and parent surveys)</p>
<p>15. Annual review by the District <u>Documentation should include:</u></p> <p>a. The procedures, time frames, data analysis and personnel involved</p> <p>b. The process for evaluating the effectiveness of the system in supporting improvements in instruction and student learning, including the criteria to be evaluated.</p>	<p><u>1012.34(6), F.S.</u> The district school board shall establish a procedure for annually reviewing instructional personnel and school administrator evaluation assessment</p>	<p>(1) Will be used for continual improvement of instruction</p>

Evaluation System Components	Sources	*ESEA Waiver
<p>Note: districts may not be fully prepared for b. by June 1. For those who are not, a timeline for meeting this requirement should be included.</p>	<p>systems to determine compliance with this section. All substantial revisions to an approved system must be reviewed and approved by the district school board before being used to evaluate assess instructional personnel or school administrators.</p> <p><u>1012.34(2)(h), F.S.</u> Includes a process for monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of the system itself in improving instruction and student learning.</p>	
<p>16. Peer Review Option</p> <p><u>Documentation should include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Whether peer assistance is part of the evaluation system <p>If peer assistance or review is included,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. describe the role of peers in observation or in contributing evidence to be used in evaluation by the evaluating supervisor, and the groups of teachers who will be receiving peer assistance/feedback c. How peer input is used in your system (formative feedback only, part of the data used for summative evaluation, etc.) d. A description of the training peer assistance practitioners. <p>Note: for districts who have already decided to use peer contributions to their evaluation system, you may have addressed this same information under Section 6, "Multi-metric Evaluations."</p>	<p><u>1012.34(2), F.S.</u> Each district may establish a peer assistance process. This process may be a part of the regular evaluation system or used to assist employees placed on performance probation, newly hired classroom teachers, or employees who request assistance.</p>	<p>(5) Provide clear, timely, and useful feedback, including feedback that identifies needs and guides professional development</p>
<p>17. Evaluation by Supervisor</p> <p><u>Documentation should include how the supervisor for evaluation purposes is determined</u></p>	<p><u>1012.34(3)(c), F.S.</u> The individual responsible for supervising the employee must evaluate the employee's performance.</p>	

Evaluation System Components	Sources	*ESEA Waiver
<p>18. Input into Evaluation by Trained Personnel other than the Supervisor</p> <p><u>Documentation should include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. A description of personnel who will give input into evaluation b. Verification that personnel will be trained in the process <p>Note: Supporting deliberate practice for continuous progress in instructional practice expertise will generate input from numerous sources. The evaluation system should make clear to all participants which sources of input will be used to inform evaluation and ensure training for personnel whose input may inform evaluation results.</p>	<p><u>1012.34(3)(c), F.S.</u></p> <p>The evaluation system may provide for the evaluator to consider input from other personnel trained [for the task]</p>	<p>(5) Provide clear, timely, and useful feedback, including feedback that identifies needs and guides professional development</p>
<p>19. Amending Evaluations</p> <p><u>Documentation should include: procedures related to amending evaluations based on receipt of additional data.</u></p>	<p><u>1012.34(3)(d), F.S.</u></p> <p>The evaluator may amend an evaluation based upon assessment data from the current school year if the data becomes available within 90 days after the close of the school year. The evaluator must then comply with the [notification] procedures set forth in paragraph (c).</p>	<p>(3) Use multiple valid measures in determining performance levels, including as a significant factor data on student growth for all students (including English Learners and students with disabilities),</p>

Attachment 10f

Communications to LEAs Regarding Revised Evaluation Systems and Value-Added Model


District Communications Regarding Revised Evaluation Systems and the Value-Added Model

Date(s)	Component	Topic
2/4/11	Evaluations	Conference call overview of Great Teachers and Leaders
2/14/11	Evaluations	Conference call to introduce contracted support for revised evaluation systems
2/16/11	Evaluations	Contractor follow-up webinar to 2/14 call
3/3/11	Evaluations	Webinar on principal evaluations
3/14-4/1/11	Evaluations	Presentation on SB 736 at Teacher Development Academies
3/24/22	Value-Added	Conference call meeting of the Student Growth Implementation Committee (SGIC)
4/4-5/11	Value-Added	SGIC meeting to review models and select variables for exploration
4/8/11	Evaluations	Webinar on Danielson evaluation model
4/13/11	Both	Conference Call on SB 736
4/14/11	Value-Added	Conference call meeting of the SGIC to finalize variables for exploration
4/18-5/6/11	Value-Added	Value-added requirements of SB 736 at Teacher Development Academies
5/5/11	Value-Added	Press release announcing availability of an <i>Education 360</i> video on the work of the SGIC with the Committee Chairman and one of the teacher members of the Committee
5/19-20/11	Value-Added	SGIC meeting to review potential models and select a model
5/25/11	Value-Added	SGIC conference call to finalize the model to be recommended to the Commissioner
6/2/11	Value-Added	Press release announcing Commissioner's conditional approval of the SGIC-recommended model
6/7/11	Value-Added	SGIC conference call to clarify recommendation based on Commissioner's conditional approval; proposed model revised
6/10/11	Value-Added	Press release announcing Commissioner's full approval of the SGIC-recommended model, as revised
6/13/11	Value-Added	Presentation to Florida Association of MIS Directors
6/17/11	Evaluations	FLDOE begins sending E:Mail notification to districts regarding the approval status of their proposed teacher evaluation systems
6/29-7/20/11	Value-Added	Presentation of approved model at Teacher Development Academies
7/7/11	Value-Added	Presentation at Florida Teacher of the Year meeting
7/11-28/11	Value-Added	Presentation of approved model at Teacher Development Academies
7/20/11	Value-Added	White paper and PowerPoint posted to Student Growth website, as well as <i>Education 360</i> video with discussion of the approved value-added model among SGIC Chairman and two Committee members
8/1-2/11	Both	District technical assistance meetings on the value-added model and its application to evaluation systems
8/30/11	Value-Added	Follow-up call with districts on use of value added results for classification and aggregation of teacher performance.
10/20-11/15/11	Both	District training on monitoring evaluation systems implementation

Attachment 11

Evidence that the SEA has adopted one or more guidelines of local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems

Attachment 11a
Evidence for Senate Bill 736



RICK SCOTT
GOVERNOR

March 24, 2011

Secretary Kurt Browning
Secretary of State
R.A. Gray Building
500 South Bronough Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Dear Secretary Browning,

Enclosed for filing is an act that originated in the Senate during the 2011 Session, which I have approved today:

CS/CS SB 736 Education Personnel

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Rick Scott".

Rick Scott
Governor

RECEIVED
SECRETARY OF STATE
MARCH 24 2011

Attachment 11b

Evidence for Race to the Top Phase II MOU

April 29, 2010

The Honorable Charlie Crist
Office of the Governor
State of Florida
PL-05 The Capitol
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0001

Dear Governor Crist,

On behalf of Florida's Race to the Top Working Group, I am pleased to inform you that we finished meeting yesterday and will be recommending revisions to the Race to the Top Phase II Memorandum of Understanding. Those collaborative recommendations are being finalized and will be sent to you shortly. I believe the recommended revisions to the Memorandum of Understanding will put Florida in a stronger position and will assist in furthering the award of the grant, thus fulfilling your charge to the Working Group.

One recommendation of the Working Group that I would like to bring to your attention is the request for you to establish a task force to monitor the implementation of the grant and the Memorandum of Understanding should Florida receive approval. Such a task force should be made up of similar stakeholders represented in the Working Group and should hold its initial meeting thirty days after Florida receives notification that it has been awarded the grant.

The Working Group believes the task force should operate as an advisory body regarding assessments and make advisory recommendations to you, the local education agencies, and the State Board of Education relating to implementing the Race to the Top Grant. Additionally, the task force could make recommendations for legislation. The Working Group recommends the task force be required to issue its first report by January 1, 2011, and submit quarterly reports thereafter to the Governor, the State Board of Education, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Given the success of the collaborative approach you championed in the Executive Order establishing the Working Group, we are hopeful you will approve the request. Thank you for the honor of serving as Chair of this productive and collaborative group.

Sincerely,

(b)(6)

Alberto M. Carvalho, Chair
Florida's Race to the Top Working Group

AMC:cpi

cc: Florida's Race to the Top Working Group Members

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

T. WILLARD FAIR, *Chairman*

Members

DR. AKSHAY DESAI

MARK KAPLAN

ROBERTO MARTÍNEZ

JOHN R. PADGET

KATHLEEN SHANAHAN

SUSAN STORY

Dr. Eric J. Smith
Commissioner of Education



MEMORANDUM

TO: District School Superintendents

FROM: Commissioner Eric Smith

DATE: May 3, 2010

SUBJECT: FLORIDA'S RACE TO THE TOP MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING FOR PHASE 2

Please find attached Florida's Race to the Top Phase 2 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). There are two compelling reasons why I am confident that our application for Phase 2 funding in the federal Race to the Top competition will be successful. First is Florida's demonstrated reform history and nationally acclaimed progress which helped drive our high score and positive reception of our Phase 1 Race to the Top application (fourth out of 41 applicants). Second is the dedication of those who came together as the Governor's Working Group on April 28 with a charge to develop consensus around Florida's MOU. This group was well-rounded with representation from our superintendents, board members, and unions representing teachers, as well as teachers, parents, and the business community. The positive discussions reinforced the shared belief that collaboration is critical for district ownership and implementation. Therefore, we approach Phase 2 with a stronger MOU and the united spirit necessary to earn the highest amount of funding available for our students.

The signed MOU is due back to the Department of Education May 25, 2010. Please e-mail a signed copy to Holly.Edenfield@fldoe.org by May 25, and mail the original in hard copy to:

Holly Edenfield
325 West Gaines Street
Suite 1502
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0400


The Phase 2 MOU process gives me high expectations that we can work together to develop strong district plans if Florida receives a Phase 2 award. Thank you in advance for the work required on your part to take this important next step.

EJS/hre

cc: Governor Crist
State Board of Education Members

Attachment 11c

Evidence for Florida Educator Accomplished Practices



Rule: 6A-5.065


[Prev](#) [Up](#) [Next](#)

Rule Title: The Educator Accomplished Practices

Department: [DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION](#)


Division: [State Board of Education](#)

Chapter: [EDUCATOR STANDARDS, PREPARATION AND PERFORMANCE](#)



[Add to MyFLRules](#)
[Favorites](#)

Latest version of the final adopted rule presented in Florida Administrative Code (FAC):



[VIEW RULE](#)

Effective Date: 2/13/2011

History Notes: Specific Authority [1004.85](#), [1012.225](#), [1012.34](#), [1012.56 FS](#); Law Implemented [1004.04](#), [1004.85](#), [1012.225](#), [1012.34](#), [1012.56 FS](#); History-New 7-2-98, Amended 2-13-11.


References in this version: No reference(s).

History of this Rule since Jan. 6, 2006

Notice / Adopted	Section	Description	ID	Publish Date
	Final 6A-5.065	The Educator Accomplished Practices	9648413	Effective: 02/13/2011
	Change 6A-5.065	The Educator Accomplished Practices	9523186	12/30/2010 Vol. 36/52
	Proposed 6A-5.065	The purpose of the rule amendment is to revise the existing essential practices of effective teachers that form the basis for all Florida teacher preparation programs. The effect will be the establishment of the core practices	9329432	11/19/2010 Vol. 36/46
	Development 6A-5.065	The purpose of this rule development is to review the existing essential practices of effective teachers and to propose revised practices.	9170300	9/24/2010 Vol. 36/38
	Development 6A-5.065	The purpose of this rule development is to review the existing essential practices of effective teachers and to propose revised practices.	8323490	3/5/2010 Vol. 36/09
	Final 6A-5.065	The Educator Accomplished Practices	1060033	Effective: 07/02/1998

Attachment 11d

Evidence for Florida Principal Leadership Standards



Rule: 6A-5.080


[Prev](#) [Up](#) [Next](#)

Rule Title: Florida Principal Leadership Standards.

Department: [DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION](#)


Division: [State Board of Education](#)

Chapter: [EDUCATOR STANDARDS, PREPARATION AND PERFORMANCE](#)



[Add to MyFL Rules](#)
[Favorites](#)

Latest version of the final adopted rule presented in Florida Administrative Code (FAC):



[VIEW RULE](#)

Effective Date: [5/24/2005](#)

History Notes: Specific Authority [1001.02](#), [1012.55 FS](#). Law Implemented [1012.55 FS](#). History-New 5-24-05, Formerly 6B-5.0012.

References in this version: No reference(s).

History of this Rule since Jan. 6, 2006


Notice / Adopted	Section	Description	ID	Publish Date
	Proposed 6A-5.080	The purpose of this rule amendment is to revise the existing standards for Florida school leaders that form the basis for Florida's leadership preparation programs and establish the core practices for school administrator	10509094	10/14/2011 Vol. 37/41
	Development 6A-5.080	The purpose of this rule development is to review the existing standards that Florida school leaders must demonstrate in preparation programs and in personnel evaluations, and to propose revised standards that align fully ...	10324697	8/26/2011 Vol. 37/34
	Development 6A-5.080	The purpose of this rule development is to review the existing standards Florida school leaders must demonstrate in preparation programs and in personnel evaluations. The effect will be to propose revised standards that	9862589	4/29/2011 Vol. 37/17
	Final 6A-5.080	Florida Principal Leadership Standards.	3931427	Effective: 05/24/2005

Attachment 12

Differentiated Accountability Strategies and Support Document

*Note: This document will be revised subsequent to approval of Florida's ESEA
Flexibility Request to reflect changes therein*

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



**Differentiated Accountability
Strategies and Support**

Form DA-3

2011-2012

2011-2012 Strategies and Support for Differentiated Accountability-Form DA-3

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLANNING

	Deliverables	Prevent I	Correct I	Prevent II	Correct II	Intervene
The district must create a district-based leadership team that includes the superintendent, associate superintendent(s) of curriculum, general and special education leaders, curriculum specialists, behavior specialists, student services personnel, human resources and professional development leaders, and specialists in other areas relevant to the school's circumstances, such as assessment, English Language Learners, and gifted learners.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District will submit by September 1, 2011 a detailed list of all district leadership team members including name, position title, e-mail and phone contact. 	X	X	X	X	X
The district team shall develop, support, and facilitate the implementation of policies and procedures that guide school-based teams with direct support systems for each school.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District will submit by September 1, 2011 their policy and procedures that guide for school-based teams (Funding, Curriculum Support, Leadership Support, and Progress Monitoring) 	X	X	X	X	X
The district team will establish systems for Problem Solving and Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI) through district-wide consensus building, infrastructure development, and implementation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District will submit by September 1, 2011 a detailed plan outlining professional development, district meetings and support goals for the implementation of Problem Solving / RtI. 	X	X	X	X	X

2011-2012 Strategies and Support for Differentiated Accountability-Form DA-3

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLANNING

	Deliverables	Prevent I	Correct I	Prevent II	Correct II	Intervene
In conjunction with the district-based leadership team, the School Advisory Council (SAC) shall assist the school leadership team in the development of the School Improvement Plan (SIP). The district-based leadership team is responsible for ensuring that the SIP is implemented.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The school will submit an approved SIP plan by September 30, 2011. 	X*	X*	X*	X*	X
* Non-Title I and Title I A, B, or C schools may receive a waiver from FDOE if the district/school can demonstrate that their existing template provides strategies for subgroups that did not meet AYP in the area of data analysis, Rtl, and increasing student achievement. Note that <u>all</u> schools must comply with Florida Statutes regarding SIP components including: postsecondary readiness, dropout prevention and academic intervention, and professional development as stated in Sections 1008.37(4), 1003.53(2)(b), 1003.413, and 1001.42(18), F.S.						
The SAC shall review school performance data (baseline, midyear, end-of-year) and determine the causes of low performance. The SAC shall advise the school on its SIP.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The school will provide minutes and sign-in sheets to document the school performance data (baseline, midyear, end-of-year) was reviewed with SAC to guide SIP goal setting. 	X	X	X	X	X
The SIP shall be approved by the district through peer review.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The school will submit an approved SIP plan by September 30, 2011. 	X	X	X	X	X
The district-based leadership team shall monitor the implementation of the SIP.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District will provide a monitoring calendar aligned with baseline, midyear and end-of-year student performance data. 	X	X	X	X	X

2011-2012 Strategies and Support for Differentiated Accountability-Form DA-3

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLANNING

	Deliverables	Prevent I	Correct I	Prevent II	Correct II	Intervene
The Department will review, approve, and monitor SIPs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Regional Executive Director (RED) will review and approve final SIP by October 15, 2011. 		(Lowest 5%)		(F and Lowest 5%)	X (Lowest 5%)
The district shall recruit representatives of the community to establish a Community Assessment Team (CAT) to review school performance data, determine the cause for low performance for each school with a grade of F and each school in the Intervene category, and advise the district on its District Improvement and Assistance Plan. The Department's Regional Executive Directors shall participate in CAT meetings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By September 1, 2011 the district will provide the RED with a list of CAT members and meeting dates, times and locations for 2011-12. 				(F only)	X
The district shall develop and implement a District Improvement and Assistance Plan (DIAP).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district will submit the DIAP September 23, 2011 	X	X	X	X	X
The Department will review budget allocations and alignment of resources as indicated in the School Improvement Plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Regional Executive Director will review school budget allocations (see <i>Coordination and Integration</i> in the SIP plan) by October 15, 2011. 		(Lowest 5%)		(F and Lowest 5%)	X (Lowest 5%)

2011-2012 Strategies and Support for Differentiated Accountability-Form DA-3

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLANNING

	Deliverables	Prevent I	Correct I	Prevent II	Correct II	Intervene
The school shall complete a mid-year narrative report to analyze progress from the baseline to mid-year assessment that is reported to the Department to identify strategies for student interventions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The school will upload to their mid-year narrative to the School Improvement Site by February 3, 2012. The RED will review for compliance. 	X*	X*	X*	X*	X
* Non-Title I and Title I A, B, and C schools are required to complete the report only for subgroups not making AYP.						
The school shall establish a Literacy Leadership Team consistent with the K-12 Comprehensive Research-Based Reading Plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The school will submit by September 1, 2011 a detailed list of all Literacy Leadership Team members including name, position title, e-mail and phone contact and meeting dates. The school will provide quarterly minutes to reflect activities of the Literacy Leadership Team. 					
The school must offer a flexible number of meetings to inform parents of their child's performance at school. These meetings shall be held at convenient times for the teacher and parent.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By September 1, 2011, the school will provide the RED will a list of all parent meetings (in addition to SAC and PTSA) 	X	X	X	X	X
			(Lowest 5%)		(Lowest 5%)	X (Lowest 5%)

2011-2012 Strategies and Support for Differentiated Accountability-Form DA-3

LEADERSHIP

	Deliverables	Prevent I	Correct I	Prevent II	Correct II	Intervene
The school's principal and assistant principals shall have a record of increasing student achievement. The principal must have a record of turning around a similar school.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By August 1, 2011, the district will provide the RED with a written justification for principal and assistant principal placement. 		(Lowest 5%)	(D)	(D, F, and Lowest 5%)	X (Lowest 5%)
The district shall review members of the school leadership team, and replace them as necessary based upon overall school performance. The review and replacement process must be fair, consistent, transparent, and reliable.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By August 15, 2011, the district will review and provide justification for retention or replacement of school leadership team members. 	X	X	(D)	(A, B, C, and D)	
The district, with Department assistance, will review the school leadership team. The Department will make recommendations to the district with respect to replacing members of the leadership team.* The review and replacement process must be fair, consistent, transparent, and reliable.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By August 15, 2011, the district will provide the RED with a written justification for retention or replacement of school leadership team members. 		(Lowest 5%)		(F and Lowest 5%)	X (Lowest 5%)
*The following guidelines should be considered when determining if a change in leadership is necessary:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The school grade declines or there is consistent failure (D or F) under the same leadership for 2 years. The principal should be replaced. The school grade declines under the same leadership for 1 year and the percentage of Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) Criteria Met decreases. The principal should be replaced. The school grade declines under the same leadership for 1 year and the learning gains in reading and mathematics decline. The principal should be replaced. The school grade declines under the same leadership for 1 year but the learning gains in reading and mathematics increase. The principal has one more year to show growth. The school grade declines under the same leadership for 1 year and the percentage of AYP Criteria Met increases. The principal has one more year to show growth. 						

2011-2012 Strategies and Support for Differentiated Accountability-Form DA-3

LEADERSHIP

	Deliverables	Prevent I	Correct I	Prevent II	Correct II	Intervene
The district shall provide school-based administrators and instructional coaches with performance pay for raising student achievement. The performance pay process must be fair, consistent, transparent, and reliable.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district will provide evidence of differentiated pay scale to the RED by August 15, 2011. 		(Lowest 5%)		(D, F, and Lowest 5%)	X (Lowest 5%)
The district shall include student achievement in the evaluation process of district administrators who supervise schools in the Lowest 5% and provide performance pay for raising student achievement. The performance pay process must be fair, consistent, transparent, and reliable.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district will provide a sample of the evaluation tool for district administrators based on student achievement data to the RED by August 15, 2011. 		(Lowest 5%)		(Lowest 5%)	X (Lowest 5%)

EDUCATOR QUALITY

	Deliverables	Prevent I	Correct I	Prevent II	Correct II	Intervene
Teachers assigned to subgroups not making AYP must be highly qualified and certified in-field.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The school will provide the RED with evidence by September 30, 2011. 	X	X	X	X	X
All paraprofessionals must be highly qualified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The school will provide the RED with evidence by September 30, 2011. 	X*	X*	X*	X*	X*
* By the 2011-2012 school year, non-Title I and Title I schools are required to have highly-qualified paraprofessionals, as defined by No Child Left Behind (NCLB), who instruct subgroups who did not make AYP.						
The district / school shall not employ teachers for the school who are designated less than satisfactory by the teacher evaluation instrument.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district/ school will provide the RED with evidence by September 30, 2011. 		(Lowest 5%)	(D)	(D, F, and Lowest 5%)	X (Lowest 5%)

2011-2012 Strategies and Support for Differentiated Accountability-Form DA-3
EDUCATOR QUALITY

	Deliverables	Prevent I	Correct I	Prevent II	Correct II	Intervene
The school must be fully staffed by the first day of school.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The school will provide documentation regarding existing vacancies with a timeline and plan to fill any remaining vacancies to the RED on the Friday after completion of the first week of school. 		(Lowest 5%)	(D)	(D, F, and Lowest 5%)	X (Lowest 5%)
The district must develop a plan to encourage teachers and instructional coaches to remain or transfer to lower-performing schools based on increasing learning gains* by 65% or greater in reading and mathematics. The plan must be fair, consistent, transparent, and reliable.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By August 15, 2011, the district will provide the RED with a comprehensive plan (including a list of instructional staff) to retain or replace teachers at the lower-performing schools. 		(Lowest 5%)		(Lowest 5%)	X (Lowest 5%)
<p>* School districts with average learning gains in reading and/or math below 65% should refer to the criteria outlined below to determine teacher placement:</p> <p>(1) Improving 65% an achievement level, e.g., from Achievement Level 1 to Achievement Level 2.</p> <p>(2) Maintaining an Achievement Level 3, 4, or 5 for 90% of students.</p> <p>(3) Showing adequate Developmental Scale Score (DSS) change (that meets or exceeds the school average) if students stay in Achievement Levels 1 or 2.</p> <p>A reading, language arts and math teachers must meet 2 of the 3 criteria to be retained at the school.</p> <p>Learning gains can be based on a three year average of FCAT data.</p>						

2011-2012 Strategies and Support for Differentiated Accountability-Form DA-3

EDUCATOR QUALITY

	Deliverables	Prevent I	Correct I	Prevent II	Correct II	Intervene
The district must provide a reading coach, mathematics coach, and science coach to develop and model effective lessons, to lead Lesson Study, to analyze data, and provide professional development on the Common Core/Next Generation Sunshine State Standards.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District will provide the RED with a list of coaches assigned to each school by August 15, 2011. Coaches must meet highly qualified status. 		(Lowest 5%)		(*D, F, and Lowest 5%)	X (Lowest 5%)
* The district may receive a waiver from the Department if the district can demonstrate how sustained and direct support will be provided to teachers at Correct II D and F schools (excluding those in the Lowest 5%).						
Instructional coaches must maintain a daily log of activities and the school and district leadership teams must monitor these logs. The district must ensure that coaches do not provide pull-out instruction outside the context of providing professional development for teachers and do not teach more than one class.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All Instructional Coaches (school based) will maintain a daily log on PMRN (reading) or Differentiated Accountability Online Coaches Log (Science, Math, Instructional and other) District Instructional Coaches will maintain a school site visit log on the Differentiated Accountability Online Coaches Log. 		(Lowest 5%)		(D, F, and Lowest 5%)	X (Lowest 5%)
The district must ensure that performance appraisals of instructional personnel are primarily based on student achievement. The appraisals must be fair, consistent, transparent, and reliable.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TBA – Pending RTTT Value-Added tool 	X	X	X	X	X

2011-2012 Strategies and Support for Differentiated Accountability-Form DA-3

EDUCATOR QUALITY

	Deliverables	Prevent I	Correct I	Prevent II	Correct II	Intervene
The district must ensure that performance appraisals of the administrative team include student achievement, as measured by the FCAT, as well as goals related to targeted subgroups and school-wide improvement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TBA – Pending RTTT Value-Added tool 	X	X	X	X	X
The district must train staff on performance appraisal instruments and ensure that the performance appraisal process is implemented.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TBA – Pending RTTT Value-Added tool 	X	X	X	X	X
The district must provide teachers with performance pay for raising student achievement. The performance pay system must be fair, consistent, transparent, and reliable.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District will provide the RED with a copy of the MOU by August 15, 2011. 		(Lowest 5%)		(D, F, and Lowest 5%)	X (Lowest 5%)
The district, with assistance from the Department, must review and replace teachers who have not contributed to increased Learning Gains* of 65% or greater in reading and mathematics or those teachers who did not contribute to improving the school's performance. The review and replacement process must be fair, consistent, transparent, and reliable.						
Learning gains can be based on a three year average of FCAT data, as determined by the following methods: (1) Improving an achievement level, e.g., from Achievement Level 1 to Achievement Level 2. (2) Maintaining an Achievement Level 3, 4, or 5. (3) Showing adequate Developmental Scale Score (DSS) change if students stay in Achievement Levels 1 or 2.			(Lowest 5%)		(F and Lowest 5%)	X (Lowest 5%)

2011-2012 Strategies and Support for Differentiated Accountability-Form DA-3

EDUCATOR QUALITY

	Deliverables	Prevent I	Correct I	Prevent II	Correct II	Intervene
The Department oversees the staffing of the school prior to the start of school.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The school will provide documentation regarding existing vacancies with a timeline and plan to fill any remaining vacancies to the RED on the Friday after completion of the first week of school. 		(Lowest 5%)		(F and Lowest 5%)	X (Lowest 5%)
The district must implement a differentiated pay policy that includes differentiation based on district determined factors, including, but not limited to: additional job responsibilities, school demographics, critical shortage areas, and level of job performance difficulties. The policy must be fair, consistent, transparent, and reliable.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district will provide evidence of differentiated pay scale to the RED by August 15, 2011. 					
The district must ensure that mid-year vacancies are filled.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The school will provide documentation regarding existing vacancies with a timeline and plan to fill any remaining vacancies to the RED on the January 6, 2012. 	X	X	X	X	X (Lowest 5%)

2011-2012 Strategies and Support for Differentiated Accountability-Form DA-3

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT						
	Deliverables	Prevent I	Correct I	Prevent II	Correct II	Intervene
The school must ensure that Individual Professional Development Plans (IPDPs) for teachers of targeted subgroups include professional development targeting the needs of subgroups that did not meet AYP.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The school will complete by October 14, 2011. 	X	X			
The district ensures that IPDPs for teachers of targeted subgroups include professional development that targets the needs of subgroups not making AYP.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The school will provide the RED with evidence of completion by October 14, 2011. 			X	X	X
The district must participate in a sample of IPDP meetings.				X	X	X
The district must ensure that leadership professional development includes professional development that targets the needs of subgroups that did not meet AYP.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district will provide the RED with a calendar of professional development for administrators. 					
The district will provide professional development opportunities for school administrators that target the specific needs of subgroups not making AYP.		X	X	X	X	X

2011-2012 Strategies and Support for Differentiated Accountability-Form DA-3

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

	Deliverables	Prevent I	Correct I	Prevent II	Correct II	Intervene
<p>The district must ensure that appropriate resources are provided to redesign the master schedule to allow for common planning time for data-based decision making within the problem-solving process, job-embedded professional development on the Common Core/Next Generation Sunshine State Standards, and Lesson Study.</p> <p>The district must ensure that appropriate resources are allocated to redesign the master schedule. The district will ensure that more time for teachers to collaborate, plan, and engage in professional development within and across grades and subjects. Common planning time must be established within the master schedule to allow grade level meetings to occur daily in elementary schools and by subject area at the secondary level. It must be scheduled so that all grade level and subject area teachers participate at the same time and include lesson study. If the master schedule prevents this from occurring, the district must establish weekly lesson study implementation after school for a minimum of one hour a week on the same day.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district will provide copies of master schedules, lesson study schedule, and grade level or subject area meetings to the RED by August 15, 2011. 		(Lowest 5%)		(F and Lowest 5%)	X (Lowest 5%)

2011-2012 Strategies and Support for Differentiated Accountability-Form DA-3

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

	Deliverables	Prevent I	Correct I	Prevent II	Correct II	Intervene
The district must provide principals and assistant principals with professional development on monitoring classroom instruction and guiding/supporting/monitoring the activities of instructional coaches.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district will provide the RED with a professional development calendar for school-based administrators by September 30, 2011. 	X	X	X	X	X
The district must provide professional development on Florida's Continuous Improvement Model, Common Core/Next Generation Sunshine State Standards, Response to Intervention, Lesson Study, and School Grade and AYP Calculations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district will provide the RED with a calendar of the professional development for FCIM, Common Core, RtI, Lesson Study, School Grade and AYP Calculations to the RED by August 15, 2011. 	X	X	X	X	X
The district must create and maintain a pool of highly-qualified reading, mathematics, and science teachers and instructional coaches to serve in Differentiated Accountability schools.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district will provide the RED with a comprehensive plan to identify and develop potential candidates by August 15, 2011. 		(Lowest 5%)		(Lowest 5%)	X (Lowest 5%)
The district must offer a summer professional development academy that is developed in conjunction with the Department to school administrators, teachers, and instructional coaches. The district will partner with the Regional Team to encourage school administrators, teachers, and instructional coaches to participate in the DA Summer Academies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district will provide the RED with participant lists for summer DA Academies by August 15, 2011. Additional evidence may include planning, presentation materials and additional artifacts from the DA Summer Academies. 		(Lowest 5%)		(Lowest 5%)	X (Lowest 5%)

2011-2012 Strategies and Support for Differentiated Accountability-Form DA-3

CURRICULUM ALIGNED AND PACED

	Deliverables	Prevent I	Correct I	Prevent II	Correct II	Intervene
District or school develops instructional pacing guides that are aligned to the Common Core/Next Generation Sunshine State Standards in reading, writing, mathematics, and science.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district will provide copies of pacing guides upon request. All pacing guides should be completed by August 15, 2011. 	X	X	X	X	X
The Department will review the instructional pacing guide aligned to the Common Core/Next Generation Sunshine State Standards.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pacing guides will be available at the schools for review by all Department staff by August 15, 2011. 		(Lowest 5%)		(F and Lowest 5%)	X (Lowest 5%)
The school shall ensure that students are properly placed in rigorous coursework.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The school will provide the RED with a comprehensive plan to ensure that students are properly placed in rigorous coursework by August 15, 2011. 	X	X	X	X	X

2011-2012 Strategies and Support for Differentiated Accountability-Form DA-3

CURRICULUM ALIGNED AND PACED

	Deliverables	Prevent I	Correct I	Prevent II	Correct II	Intervene
The school must implement the district K-12 Reading Plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The school will provide evidence that they are in compliance with the K-12 Reading Plan by August 15, 2011. The school will provide evidence upon request which may include master schedule, CAR-PD/NG CAR-PD trained staff, decision tree used for placement in reading interventions, list of students with assigned intervention teacher and reading teacher credentials. 	X	X	X	X	X
The district must implement the K-12 Reading Plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district will provide evidence that schools are in compliance with the K-12 Reading Plan by August 15, 2011. The district will provide evidence of professional development on the K-12 Reading Plan August 30, 2011. 	X	X	X	X	X
The district shall review data to determine the effectiveness of all instructional programs and class offerings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district will provide the RED with a summary of program effectiveness based on analysis of student data by August 15, 2011. 	X	X	X	X	X

2011-2012 Strategies and Support for Differentiated Accountability-Form DA-3

CURRICULUM ALIGNED AND PACED

	Deliverables	Prevent I	Correct I	Prevent II	Correct II	Intervene
The Department will review data to determine the effectiveness of all instructional programs and class offerings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The RED will review the program effectiveness summary and provide feedback by August 15, 2011. 		(Lowest 5%)		(F and Lowest 5%)	X (Lowest 5%)
The district must extend the learning day.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district will provide an overview and schedule of the extended learning day for each school by August 15, 2011. 		(Lowest 5%)		(Lowest 5%)	(Lowest 5%)

FLORIDA'S CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT MODEL

	Deliverables	Prevent I	Correct I	Prevent II	Correct II	Intervene
The school must implement Florida's Response to Intervention model set forth in the Statewide RtI Implementation Plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The school will provide the RED with the names of the RtI team and a schedule of their meetings by August 15, 2011. 	X	X	X	X	X
The school must implement Florida's Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM). The school will develop and implement a comprehensive FCIM model which includes an FCIM calendar, FCIM focus lessons (mini-lessons on tested benchmarks), curriculum pacing guide, and progress monitoring data collection/analysis schedule.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The school will provide the RED with a copy of their comprehensive FCIM model for reading, mathematics and science by August 15, 2011. 	X (FCIM implemented with subgroups not making AYP)	X (FCIM implemented with subgroups not making AYP)	X (FCIM implemented school-wide)	X (FCIM implemented school-wide)	X (FCIM implemented school-wide)

2011-2012 Strategies and Support for Differentiated Accountability-Form DA-3

FLORIDA'S CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT MODEL

	Deliverables	Prevent I	Correct I	Prevent II	Correct II	Intervene
The district must monitor implementation of Florida's Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district will provide the RED with a copy of their monitoring plan for each school's FCIM model by August 15, 2011. 	X (FCIM implemented with subgroups not making AYP)	X (FCIM implemented with subgroups not making AYP)	X (FCIM implemented school-wide)	X (FCIM implemented school-wide)	X (FCIM implemented school-wide)
The district must ensure real-time access to student achievement data.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district will provide the RED with password and log-in information to access real-time student achievement data by August 15, 2011. The district will provide the RED with evidence of staff development for school-based administrators by August 30, 2011. 	X	X	X	X	X
The district must prescribe interim (Benchmark baseline, mid-year, and mini) assessments in reading, writing, mathematics, and science for Level 1-3 students.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district will provide the RED with an assessment calendar by August 15, 2011. 	X (Only subgroups not making AYP)	X (Only subgroups not making AYP)	X (School-wide)	X (School-wide)	X (School-wide)

2011-2012 Strategies and Support for Differentiated Accountability-Form DA-3

FLORIDA'S CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT MODEL

	Deliverables	Prevent I	Correct I	Prevent II	Correct II	Intervene
The district will use the Problem Solving/Rtl process to analyze progress monitoring data in reading, writing, mathematics, and science through interim assessments to inform instruction. In the area of reading, this requirement maybe fulfilled through the use of the Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district will provide the RED with a copy of their comprehensive monitoring plan by August 15, 2011. 			X	X	X
The district must participate in the Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR) for Levels 1-3* students.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district will include the FAIR schedule as part of the assessment calendar by August 15, 2011. The school will ensure that students are rostered with their Intervention Teacher by September 15, 2011. 				X*	X*
* The district may receive a waiver for Level 3 students from the Department if the district can demonstrate that the current reading assessment used in Correct II and Intervene schools is reliable, aligned to the NGSSS Benchmarks, and predicts FCAT performance.						
The district administration must ensure that data chats are conducted between district administration and school administration, school administration and teachers, and teachers and students following baseline, mini-, and mid-year assessments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district will provide the RED with a calendar of all data chat meetings by August 1, 2011. 	X	X	X	X	X

2011-2012 Strategies and Support for Differentiated Accountability-Form DA-3

MONITORING PROCESSES AND PLANS

	Deliverables	Prevent I	Correct I	Prevent II	Correct II	Intervene
The school must provide quarterly updates on the implementation of the School Improvement Plan to the School Advisory Council and make updates to the School Improvement Plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The school will provide the RED with a calendar and minutes of quarterly meeting. 	X	X	X	X	X
The school leadership team must monitor implementation of the School Improvement Plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The school will provide minutes and agendas from school leadership team upon request. 	X	X	X		
The school must participate in a comprehensive instructional monitoring process.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The school will provide the RED with a copy of their comprehensive Instructional model for reading, mathematics and science by August 15, 2011. 	X	X	X	X	X
The district must develop a comprehensive instructional monitoring process and follow-up that includes classroom, school leadership team, and school-wide monitoring.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district will provide the RED with a copy of the classroom walkthrough tool and schedule for monitoring by August 15, 2011. 	X	X	X	X	X
The district must ensure that schools demonstrating the greatest need, based on data analysis, receive the highest percentage of resources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district will provide the RED with a summary of support allocation based on school need by August 15, 2011. 					

2011-2012 Strategies and Support for Differentiated Accountability-Form DA-3

MONITORING PROCESSES AND PLANS

	Deliverables	Prevent I	Correct I	Prevent II	Correct II	Intervene
The Department will report progress bi-monthly to the State Board of Education.			(Lowest 5%)		(F and Lowest 5%)	X (Lowest 5%)
Monthly district meetings with the Regional Executive Director (RED) and district department leaders are held to coordinate strategies and resources to assist lowest-performing schools.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district will provide the RED with a calendar of meeting dates and locations by August 15, 2011. 		(Lowest 5%)			X (Lowest 5%)
The district must establish a position to lead the turnaround effort at the district level. The selected employee will report directly to the superintendent and directly supervise principals at the lowest-performing schools.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district will provide the name and contact information for the designated turnaround staff by August 15, 2011. 					X (Lowest 5%)

Attachment 13

School Improvement Plan Template

Note: This document will be revised subsequent to approval of Florida's ESEA Flexibility Request to reflect changes therein

Differentiated Accountability Action Plan for Reading/Writing School Improvement Plan

Department of
Education



Full Review: Reading and Writing SIP Action Plan

Concerns on SIP
Action Steps related to
Reading/Writing

Concerns on SIP Action Steps
related to Reading/Writing

Revised Action Steps
(to address Concerns)
Tasks
(to implement Action Step)

Evidence of Implementation
(to document Progress)
Timeline
(Introduced to Completed:
Month/day to Month/Day)

Person Responsible
(Title, Name)

Action Step:

Evidence:

Task #1:

Timeline:

Responsible:

Task #2:

Timeline:

Responsible:

Action Step:

Evidence:

Task #1:

Timeline:

Responsible:

Task #2:

Timeline:

Responsible:

Action Step:

Evidence:

Task #1:

Timeline:

Responsible:

Task #2:

Timeline:

Responsible:

Action Step:

Evidence:

Task #1:

Timeline:

Responsible:

Task #2:

Timeline:

Responsible:

Action Step:

Evidence:

Task #1:

Timeline:

Responsible:

Task #2:

Timeline:

Responsible:

Differentiated Accountability Action Plan for Mathematics School Improvement Plan

Department of
Education



II Review: Mathematics SIP Action Plan

Recommendations on SIP
Action Steps related to
Mathematics

Concerns on SIP Action Steps
related to Mathematics

Revised Action Steps
(to address Concerns)
Tasks
(to implement Action Step)

Evidence of Implementation
(to document Progress)
Timeline
(Introduced to Completed:
Month/day to Month/Day)

Person Responsible
(Title, Name)

Action Step:

Task #1:

Task #2:

Action Step:

Task #1:

Task #2:

Action Step:

Task #1:

Task #2:

Action Step:

Task #1:

Task #2:

Action Step:

Task #1:

Task #2:

Responsible:

Responsible:

Responsible:

Responsible:

Responsible:

Responsible:

Responsible:

Responsible:

Responsible:

Responsible:

Differentiated Accountability Action Plan for Science School Improvement Plan

Department of
Education



II Review: Science SIP Action Plan

Action Steps Science	Commendations on SIP Action Steps related to Science	Concerns on SIP Action Steps related to Science	Revised Action Steps (to address Concerns) Tasks (to implement Action Step)	Evidence of Implementation (to document Progress) Timeline (Introduced to Completed: Month/day to Month/Day) Evidence:	Person Responsible (Title, Name)
			Action Step: Task #1: Task #2:	Evidence: Timeline: Timeline:	Responsible: Responsible:
			Action Step: Task #1: Task #2:	Evidence: Timeline: Timeline:	Responsible: Responsible:
			Action Step: Task #1: Task #2:	Evidence: Timeline: Timeline:	Responsible: Responsible:
			Action Step: Task #1: Task #2:	Evidence: Timeline: Timeline:	Responsible: Responsible:
			Action Step: Task #1: Task #2:	Evidence: Timeline: Timeline:	Responsible: Responsible:
			Action Step: Task #1: Task #2:	Evidence: Timeline: Timeline:	Responsible: Responsible:
			Action Step: Task #1: Task #2:	Evidence: Timeline: Timeline:	Responsible: Responsible:

