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- 2005-06 School Grades and AYP Results
- 2006-07 School Grade Changes
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- Round Table Discussions (Two Sessions)
- Summary of Round Table Discussions
- Reminders
- Questions and Answers
Responsibilities for Evaluation and Reporting

- **School Grades Under A+ Plan**
  - School grades were first issued in 1999.
  - In 2002, learning gains were first included in the calculation.

- **Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)**
  - AYP has been calculated since 2003.
Responsibilities for Evaluation and Reporting

- **Schools in Need of Improvement**
  - Required by No Child Left Behind (NCLB).
  - Evaluation and Reporting is working with the K-12 Division to determine Schools in Need of Improvement.
  - Only Title I schools that miss AYP two consecutive years are subject to sanctions.

- **School Recognition**
  - In 2006, $157,587,811 was distributed to 1,799 schools for earning an A or improving at least one school letter grade.
  - The total amount awarded over the eight years has been $852,688,204.
Responsibilities for Evaluation and Reporting

Alternative Schools Accountability

- The 2006 legislature passed House Bill 7087, commonly known as A++, which was signed into law on June 5, 2006, by Governor Jeb Bush.

- Provides alternative schools the option of earning a school grade or a school-improvement rating.

- If an alternative school chooses not to be graded, those students’ performance data will be included in the calculation of the alternative school’s improvement rating and the “home school’s” school grade.

- Further discussion of the implementation of this law will occur during the roundtable discussions this afternoon.
Responsibilities for Evaluation and Reporting

- Voluntary Pre-Kindergarten (VPK) Accountability
  - VPK providers are responsible for ensuring their children are ready for kindergarten.
  - Evaluation and Reporting will be working with the Office of Early Learning to develop this accountability calculation.
  - Every child enrolled in the VPK Program is screened using a statewide kindergarten screening. These screenings provide objective data for readiness for kindergarten.
  - Screenings that will be used:
    - ECHOS (Early Childhood Observation System) is a continuous observational assessment system to determine if the child is on track to meeting expectations.
    - DIBELS (Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills) is a series of short probes to measure progress of foundational reading skills.
Responsibilities for Evaluation and Reporting

- STAR Evaluation, Teacher Effectiveness
  - Evaluation and Reporting is developing a fair and equitable way to determine teacher effectiveness by enacting value tables to identify the top 25% of effective teachers.
  - A value table is a valid and reliable way to measure improved student achievement and identify effective teachers.
Responsibilities for Evaluation and Reporting

- **STAR Evaluation, Teacher Effectiveness**
  - In proviso language contained in the 2006 General Appropriations Act, $147.5 million is provided for the Special Teachers Are Rewarded performance pay plan (STAR Plan).
  - Districts are responsible for selecting an instructional personnel evaluation instrument for purposes of STAR, half of which must be based on student performance on the Sunshine State Standards.

- **Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Accountability**
  - Evaluation and Reporting is working with the K-12 division to develop an accountability calculation for effectiveness of SES providers.
Responsibilities for Evaluation and Reporting

- No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Office
  - Evaluation and Reporting acts as a clearing house for all NCLB processes and reporting.

- Research, Analysis, and Evaluation
  - Evaluation and Reporting is tasked with a number of ad-hoc analyses examining the impact of programs and policies on student achievement.
    - Charter schools
    - Class size
    - Course-taking patterns

- Research Alerts
Responsibilities for Evaluation and Reporting

- SAT/ ACT/ PSAT/ PLAN and Teacher Projections
  - Multiple results and trends are published on our website.

- Teacher Projections
  - Multiple trends and statistical reports pertaining to teacher data are on our website.
    - New hires
    - Critical teacher shortage areas
    - Florida teacher retention
    - Supply of New Teachers

- Projected High School Graduates
& Adequate Yearly Progress

2005-2006
School Grades
And
AYP Results

Source: Florida Department of Education

Source: Florida Department of Education
In 2006, there were 943 elementary schools, 353 middle schools, 64 high schools, and 107 combination schools that earned an “A” school grade; 360 elementary schools, 103 middle schools, 95 high schools, and 52 combination schools that earned a “B” school grade; 289 elementary schools, 61 middle schools, 146 high schools, and 74 combination schools that earned a “C” school grade; 107 elementary schools, 52 middle schools, 66 high schools, and 13 combination schools that earned a “D” school grade and; 7 elementary schools, 1 middle school, 10 high schools, and 3 combination schools that earned an “F” school grade.

Source: Florida Department of Education
In 2006, 1,034 schools maintained an “A” school grade, 203 schools maintained a “B” school grade, 291 schools maintained a “C” school grade, 67 schools maintained a “D” school grade, and 6 schools maintained an “F” school grade. There were 277 schools that improved to an “A” from a “B”, 104 schools improved to an “A” from a “C”, 14 schools improved to an “A” from a “D”, and 2 schools improved to an “A” from an “F”. There were 180 schools that improved to a “B” from a “C”, 30 schools improved to a “B” from a “D”, and no school improved to a “B” from an “F”. There were 99 schools that improved to a “C” from a “D” and 12 schools that improved to a “C” from an “F”. There were 11 schools that improved to a “D” from an “F”. There were 178 schools that dropped from an “A” to a “B”, 40 schools dropped from an “A” to a “C”, no school dropped from an “A” to a “D”, and 1 school dropped from an “A” to an “F”. There were 105 schools that dropped from a “B” to a “C”, 2 schools that dropped from a “B” to a “D”, and 1 school that dropped from a “B” to an “F”. There were 37 schools that dropped from a “C” to a “D” and 2 schools that dropped from a “C” to an “F”. There were 7 schools that dropped from a “D” to an “F”.

Source: Florida Department of Education
In 2006, there are 1,034 schools that maintained their “A” school grade, 36 new schools that earned an “A” school grade, 397 schools improved to an “A” school grade, and 332 schools improved to a school grade other an “A”.

Source: Florida Department of Education
Of the schools graded an “F” in 2005, 2 earned an “A”, none earned a “B”, 12 earned a “C”, 11 earned a “D”, and 6 earned an “F” in 2006. There were 33 schools that earned an “F” in 2005 that are alternative schools in 2006 and earned a points-only grade. There were 3 “F” schools in 2005 that were not open in 2006. There were 6 schools that were an “F” in 2005 that were too small to be graded in 2006. There were 3 schools that were an “F” in 2005 that are an “I” in 2006.

Source: Florida Department of Education
Raising Standards and Higher Accountability Lead to Improved Student Performance

In 2007, the bar will be raised again. Science, the lowest 25 percent in Mathematics, and Grade 11 and 12 FCAT retakes will be included in the school grade calculation.

Due to provisions in A++ legislation (House Bill 7087, sections 46 and 47), alternative schools have the option to not be included in school grade calculations. As a result, 22 schools that would have earned an “F” earned a points-only grade in 2006.

As expectations for school performance increase, Florida schools are rising to the occasion. The number of low performing schools has decreased to 21 in 2006, from 158 in 1995, 71 in 1996, 30 in 1997, 4 in 1998, (then the standards were raised) 78 in 1999, 4 in 2000, 0 in 2001 (then the standards were raised again), 64 in 2002, 35 in 2003, 49 in 2004, (then the standards were raised) and 78 in 2005. Standards will be raised again for the 2007 school year when Science, the lowest 25 percent in Mathematics, and Grade 11 and 12 FCAT retakes are included in the school grade calculation.

Source: Florida Department of Education
In 2006, schools earned an average of 68 points toward their school grade for meeting high standards in reading, this is an increase from 58 points in 2002, 61 points in 2003, 63 points in 2004, and 64 points in 2005. In 2006, schools earned an average of 62 points toward their school grade for making learning gains in reading, this is an increase from 61 points in 2002, 65 points in 2003, 63 points in 2004, and 62 points in 2005. In 2006, schools earned an average of 63 points toward their school grade for making learning gains with the lowest 25 percent of students in reading, this is equal to the 63 points in 2002, 65 points in 2003, 61 points in 2004, and 60 points in 2005. In 2006, schools earned an average of 68 points toward their school grade for meeting high standards in math, this is an increase from 58 points in 2002, 61 points in 2003, 63 points in 2004, and 65 points in 2005. In 2006, schools earned an average of 69 points toward their school grade for making learning gains in math, this is a decrease from 72 points in 2002, 71 points in 2003, 70 points in 2004, and 69 points in 2005. In 2006, schools earned an average of 83 points toward their school grade for meeting high standards in writing, this is an increase from 78 points in 2002, 86 points in 2003, 85 points in 2004, and 81 points in 2005.

Source: Florida Department of Education
In 2006, the school grade component for the lowest 25 percent of reading was comprised of 207,842, 65 percent, standard curriculum students; 98,947, 31 percent, students with disabilities; and 12,266, 4%, limited English proficient students.

Source: Florida Department of Education
In 2006, 67% of standard curriculum students in the lowest 25 percent made learning gains in reading; 56% of students with disabilities in the lowest 25 percent made learning gains in reading; and 70% of limited English proficient students in the lowest 25 percent made learning gains in reading.

Source: Florida Department of Education
No Child Left Behind
Adequate Yearly Progress

In 2005, 1,117 schools, 36 percent, made adequate yearly progress; 828 schools, 27 percent, made provisional adequate yearly progress; and 1,161 schools, 37 percent, did not make adequate yearly progress.

In 2006, 916 schools, 28 percent, made adequate yearly progress; 1,240 schools, 39 percent, made provisional adequate yearly progress, and 1,041 schools, 33 percent, did not make adequate yearly progress.

Source: Florida Department of Education
## 2006 School Grades Compared to AYP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A+ Plan</th>
<th>NCLB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2006 School Grade</strong></td>
<td><strong>Schools</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2006, 1,467 schools earned an "A", of these "A" schools, 1347 satisfied at least 90 percent of the adequate yearly progress criteria. In 2006, there were 610 "B" schools, of these "B" schools, 528 satisfied at least 80 percent of the adequate yearly progress criteria. In 2006, there were 570 "C" schools, of these "C" schools 513 satisfied at least 70 percent of the adequate yearly progress criteria. In 2006, there were 121 "D" schools, 107 satisfied at least 60 percent of the adequate yearly progress criteria. In 2006, there 21 "F" schools, of these "F" schools, 20 satisfied at least 50 percent of the adequate yearly progress criteria.

Source: Florida Department of Education
History of School Grades

- 1991: Sunshine State Standards Adopted
- 1996: Blueprint 2000
- 1998: FCAT in Grades 4, 8, and 10
- 1999: FCAT Expanded to Grades 3-10
- 2001: Learning Gains Added to School Grades
- 2002: Include all students in School Grades
- 2005: Include Science, Math Low 25 percent, and Retakes
- 2007: A+ School Grades Issued
- 2001: FCAT in Grades 4, 8, and 10

Blueprint 2000

Sunshine State Standards Adopted

FCAT in Grades 4, 8, and 10

FCAT Expanded to Grades 3-10

Include all students in School Grades

2001

A+ School Grades Issued

Learning Gains Added to School Grades

Include Science, Math Low 25 percent, and Retakes
2006-07 School Grade Changes

- **Writing**
  - Remain at 3.5, no increase to 4.0.

- **Science**
  - Add as a seventh component.

- **Math Lowest 25 Percent**
  - Add as an eighth component.

- **Revised School Grading Scale**
  - 800 point scale change from current 600 point scale.

- **Retakes of Grade 11 and 12**
  - Earn ten bonus points when half of all 11th and 12th graders retaking the FCAT meet the graduation requirement.
Writing

The Writing component of the school grade will remain at 3.5 rather than increasing to 4.0 for determining the percent meeting high standards.

This change was implemented because including the multiple choice items in Writing is an option in 2007-08 and Writing will become a graduation requirement in 2009-10.

Based on feedback received, the department is making all changes regarding Writing at the same time.
Florida’s School Grading System

50% based on Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>READING</th>
<th>MATH</th>
<th>WRITING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Gains</td>
<td>Learning Gains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Gains of Lowest 25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Florida’s School Grading System

50% based on Learning Gains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>READING</th>
<th>MATH</th>
<th>WRITING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Gains</td>
<td>Learning Gains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Gains of Lowest 25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Science added as a seventh component.

- One point will be awarded for each percent meeting high standards, achievement level 3 or above, on FCAT.

- The Science component was adopted in November 2003 by the State Board of Education.
Math Lowest 25 Percent

- Learning gains among students in the Math Lowest 25 Percent will be added as an eighth component.
  - One point will be awarded for each percent making learning gains.
  - This calculation will mirror the current Reading Lowest 25 Percent calculation.
  - This maintains the balance of half meeting high standards and half learning gains in the school grade calculation.
# Florida’s School Grading System

## 50% based on Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>READING</th>
<th>MATH</th>
<th>WRITING</th>
<th>SCIENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance</strong></td>
<td><strong>Performance</strong></td>
<td><strong>Performance</strong></td>
<td><strong>Performance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Gains</td>
<td>Learning Gains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Gains of Lowest 25%</td>
<td>Learning Gains of Lowest 25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Florida’s School Grading System

50% based on Learning Gains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>READING</th>
<th>MATH</th>
<th>WRITING</th>
<th>SCIENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Gains</td>
<td>Learning Gains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Gains of Lowest 25%</td>
<td>Learning Gains of Lowest 25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The school grading scale will be adjusted in 2006-07 to account for the addition of the Science and Math Lowest 25 Percent components, adding 200 points to the scale and requiring 115 more points to earn an A-F.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>600 Point Scale</th>
<th>800 Point Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>410+</td>
<td>525+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>380 to 409</td>
<td>495 to 524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>320 to 379</td>
<td>435 to 494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>280 to 319</td>
<td>395 to 434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>&lt; 280</td>
<td>&lt; 395</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adequate Progress of Low 25% in Reading and Math

- A school with enough points to earn an “A” must show adequate progress of the low 25% in both reading and math for the current year or the grade will be lowered to a “B”.
- A school with enough points to earn a “B” must show adequate progress of the low 25% in both reading and math for either the current or previous year or the grade will be lowered to a “C”.
  - A “Yes” in Reading in the current or previous year and a “Yes” in Math in the current or previous year = grade is not lowered
- A school with enough points to earn a “C” must show adequate progress of the low 25% in both reading and math for either the current or previous year or the grade will be lowered to a “D”.
  - A “Yes” in Reading in the current or previous year and a “Yes” in Math in the current or previous year = grade is not lowered
### Adequate Progress of Low 25% in Reading and Math

Some possible scenarios for schools with points equivalent to “B” or “C”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&lt;=50% in Reading</th>
<th>&lt;=50% in Math</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Year</strong></td>
<td><strong>Previous Year</strong></td>
<td><strong>Current Year</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
High schools will be able to earn ten bonus points toward their school grades when 50 percent of all 11th and 12th graders retaking the FCAT Reading and Mathematics meet the graduation requirement.

Further discussion of the implementation of this law will occur during the roundtable discussions this afternoon.
Adequate Yearly Progress

- Changes for 2007
  - Benchmarks Increase
  - Long Term Students with Disabilities Flexibility
- Safe Harbor
## 2006 Changes

- AYP Benchmarks change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SWD Flexibility

The flexible reporting standards are:

1. **SWD 1% Policy**: Proficiency through alternative assessment standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities (maximum of 1% of total tested population).

2. **Long Term SWD 2% Policy**: Proficiency through modified achievement standards, benchmarks, or another alternate assessment for students who may not be able to meet grade-level standards but are not part of the 1% (maximum of 2% of total tested population).

3. **Short Term**: SWD mathematical adjustment.
Students with significant cognitive disabilities may be assessed using an alternative assessment.

The percent of students reported as proficient on an SWD alternate assessment may not exceed 1% of the total assessed population.

The 1% proficient limit is calculated at both the state and district levels and applied to state, district, and school levels.
SWD Long Term 2% Policy: Summary

- USED offers additional flexibility modified achievement standards, benchmarks, or another alternate assessment.
- This 2% group of students is separate from the 1% of significant cognitive disabilities students.
Short Term Mathematical Adjustment for SWD

- Applies to schools/districts that did not make AYP based *solely* on the performance of the SWD subgroup.

- Starting in 2004-05, the mathematical adjustment was added to the percent of students with disabilities who are proficient for a revised AYP calculation.
Safe Harbor is a second way for schools/districts to satisfy Math/Reading AYP criteria.

To be eligible for Safe Harbor, a school must:
- test at least 95% of students in total and in each subgroup.
- meet writing criteria for the total.
- meet graduation rate criteria for the total.
- have a school grade that is not D or F.
Safe Harbor - Adequate Yearly Progress

To meet Safe Harbor, each subgroup being evaluated must:

- decrease the percent of non-proficient students by at least 10% from the preceding year.
- meet the writing criteria.
- meet the graduation rate criteria.
School Grades Beyond 2007

- Writing multiple choice, rather than just the essay component.
- State Board is always open to discussions on raising the bar.
Membership Matching

- Membership Matching with EIAS
  - Matching Process
  - Data Update Process

- Education Information & Accountability Services Contact Information
  - Ruth Jones: Ruth.jones@fldoe.org
  - Tsung-Yuan Lin: Tsung-Yuan.Lin@fldoe.org
    - Phone: 850-245-0400
    - Suncom: 205-0400
Membership Matching Surveys 2 and 3

- Purpose of Membership Matching
- Features
- Matching Process
- Timeline for 2006-07
- What Works
- Need for Improvement
- To Remember
Purpose of Membership Matching

- For AYP and School Grading Process:
  - Identify students meeting the requirement of being in school all year.
  - Identify students needing updates to data.
Features

- **Timing**
  - During survey 3 data base processing rather than after.

- **Responsibility**
  - Shared by many, not just Accountability Coordinator.

- **Data Source**
  - One integrated, consolidated data source (Student Data Base) rather than a separate system.
Data Matching Process

- Start with all Survey 3 Student Demographic Records. (1)
- Remove McKay, Home Ed, & Private School students. (School of Enrollment = 3518, N998 & N999) (1)
- Remove students if District of Instruction is not equal to District of Enrollment. (1)
- Remove students with no matching course record. (2)
Data Matching Process – Continued

- Place all removed records in the Deleted Records file (F70549) with an indicator of why the record was removed. (1.1)
- Do the same record matching and removal for survey 2. Generate file F70586. (1.2)
Data Matching Process – Continued

• Match survey 3 records to ESE and ELL records and add four data elements. (3)
  • Exceptionality, Primary
  • Exceptionality, Other
  • Alternate Assessment Administered
  • ELL Entry Date
• (ELL = English Language Learners)
Data Matching Process – Continued

- Match survey 3 record to the Prior School Status record and indicate: (4)
  - Same school
  - Same district
  - New
  - Missing
  - None of these
Add three PSS fields to record. (4)
- Prior District
- Withdrawal Date
- Withdrawal Code

Flag students with multiple PSS records.
Data Matching Process - Continued

- Match survey 3 records to survey 2 records. (5)
  - Use District & School of Enrollment and Student ID.
  - If not found, use Alias ID.
- Put records with multiple matches in the Problem Records file (F70550). (9)
- Put records that have a survey 2 school match in the Matched File (F70548). (8)
Data Matching Process - Continued

- If no match at school level, try again at District level. (6)
- Put records in Problem or Matched files with indicator of district match if matched.
Data Matching Process – Continued

- Look at PSS codes and determine whether the remaining non-matches are expected or unexpected. (7)
- Put unexpected non-matches in the Problem Records file (F70550). (9)
- Put expected non-matches in the Unmatched Expected Records file (F70551). (10)
Data Matching Process – Continued

- Five Files are Produced
  - F70549 Deleted Survey 3 Records
  - F70586 Deleted Survey 2 Records
  - F70548 Matched Records
  - F70551 Unmatched Expected Records
  - F70550 Unmatched Problem Records
2006-07 Timeline

- **Survey 3, 2006-07**
  - Survey Week: February 5-9, 2007
  - State Processing: February 12 – March 9, 2007 (Starts one week earlier than last year.)

- **Request the Accountability Match files during state processing.**
  - Use CICS menu.
  - Five files are run overnight.

- **Correct errors and submit corrections by 4:00 p.m. EST on Friday, March 9, 2007.**
What Works

- Collaboration between data staff and accountability staff at DOE and District levels.
- Early review of student information.
- Accurate Student ID Numbers.
- Looking at Prior School Status records.
Need for Improvement

- Missing and Incorrect Data
  - Race, Gender, ESE, etc. not always updated
  - ELL dates often missing
  - Incorrect Grade Levels

- Missing Prior School Status/Student Attendance records.
To Remember

Submit all four records, as appropriate:

- Student Demographic,
- Exceptional Student (ESE)
- English Language Learner (ELL)
- Student Course Schedule

Students must have a course record to be included.

Data should reflect Friday of FTE Week (February 9).
To Remember

- Use N998 in School Number, Current Enrollment for Home Schooled students who attend the district for a class.
- Use N999 in School Number, Current Enrollment for Private School students who attend the district for a class.
To Remember

- Initial file submissions are processed in the morning.
- Batch update files run after 4:00 p.m. daily.
- Batch update files for survey 2 run every night rather than just on Wednesdays.
- Reports run at night.
- Reports must be requested from NWRDC.
Aids for Gathering Prior Year Data

- **Student Locator**
  - Use CI CS system at NWRDC
  - Locate student IDs and prior FL public schools attended

- **FASTER**
  - Keep Reading and Math Litho Codes locally
  - Send to new school when student moves
  - Required data elements as of 1/1/07
Why? To get the most accurate data for bonus calculations

- Match 2006 Summer, 2006 Fall, and 2007 Spring retake assessments with Surveys.
- Most accurate data to use in bonus calculation.

How? Similar to PY Data matching process in 2005-06

- Evaluation and Reporting and Education Data Warehouse (EDW) independently match 2006 Summer, 2006 Fall, and 2007 Spring retake assessments with Surveys.
- Evaluation and Reporting compares results and then codes records accordingly.
Districts and schools use the website to update matches.

Website open from November/December through May.
11th/12th Grade Retake Website

- Link will be added to Main Application Menu

Main Application Menu

Reading/Math History Updates

Assessment Data Corrections: Application is closed. Thank you for your participation.

School Types

Student Data Updates

District Appeals

11th/12th Grade Retakes
Survey/Assessment Match codes

- Y = the record matches. No further information needed.
- N = the record does not match. Retake administration date and PAS (Litho Code) are needed.
- V = the record may or may not match.
  - Verify Match Code = Y if district/school agrees the record matches.
  - Verify Match Code = N if district/school do not agree the record matches. And district/school enter retake administration date and PAS.
- C = district/school confirmed that this record matches by selecting “Yes” for “Verify Survey/Assessment Match.”
Update table on web

Data table on Northwest Regional Data Center (NWRDC)

Unique fields are district number, school number, SID, administration month, and survey number and two digit year.

Districts may upload data to web
- Upload file layout must be strictly followed.
- Upload errors reported back to district.
Improvements to Websites

- Main Menu Page
- Sorting by Grade
- Websites Open for Training
- More Meaningful Error Messages
- Appeals Website
Roundtable Discussions

- Alternative School Improvement Ratings
- School Grades - Awarding bonus points for 11th and 12th grade retakes
Wrap Up

- Summary of roundtable discussions
- Reminders
- Questions and Answers
Contact Information

Evaluation and Reporting Office
Florida Department of Education
325 West Gaines Street, Room 316
Tallahassee, FL 32399

Phone: (850) 245-0411
Email: evalnrpt@fldoe.org
Website: http://www.firm.edu/doe/evaluation/