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2019 School Grades
20 Year Look at A&B vs D&F Grades
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Statewide Highlights

• The percentage of schools earning an A or B grade increased to 63% (2,088) up from 57% (1,905) 2017-18.
  • The percentage of schools earning an A grade increased to 35% (1,180) up from 31% (1,044) in 2017-18.

• Overall, elementary schools had the largest increase in the percentage of schools increasing their grade with 28% (494) of elementary schools improving one or more letter grade.

• Elementary schools saw the largest percentage point increase in A schools (up 5 percentage points from 28% to 33%) and the largest percentage point decrease in D and F schools (down 3 percentage points from 10% to 7%).

• The number of “F” schools decreased by more than half, from 35 schools in 2017-18 to 14 schools in 2018-19.
77% of Schools Graded “D” or “F” in 2018 Improved Their Grade in 2019

- Did Not Increase Their Grade: 23%
- Increased Their Grade: 77%
81% of Schools Graded “F” in 2018 Improved Their Grade in 2019

- 1 Improved to an "A"
- 5 Remained an "F"
- 3 Improved to a "B"
- 3 Improved to a "D"
- 14 Improved to a "C"
Florida’s Focus on Low-Performing Schools is Paying Off
District Grades for 2019
School Grades
# School Grades Model
(A maximum of 11 components)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Language Arts</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Social Studies</th>
<th>Graduation Rate</th>
<th>Acceleration Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement (0% to 100%)</td>
<td>Achievement (0% to 100%)</td>
<td>Achievement (0% to 100%)</td>
<td>Achievement (0% to 100%)</td>
<td>Overall, 4-year Graduation Rate (0% to 100%)</td>
<td>High School (AP, IB, AICE, dual enrollment or industry certification) (0% to 100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Gains (0% to 100%)</td>
<td>Learning Gains (0% to 100%)</td>
<td>Learning Gains (0% to 100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Middle School (EOCs or industry certifications) (0% to 100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Gains of the Low 25% (0% to 100%)</td>
<td>Learning Gains of the Low 25% (0% to 100%)</td>
<td>Learning Gains of the Low 25% (0% to 100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percent Tested

• Must test 95% of students
• Calculated for each assessment and then aggregated.
• Schools that do not test 95% of students will receive grades of “I”
• Superintendents can appeal the “I” by demonstrating that the data accurately represents the school’s progress or requesting that late reporting assessment results be included.
• Commissioner will review data to determine if the performance data is representative of the school’s progress.
• If the Commissioner determines the data is representative, she will release grades for these schools at the end of the appeals period.
### Learning Gains in School Grades

- 2014 Legislature established a new framework for **learning gains** requiring that learning growth toward achievement levels 3, 4, and 5 is demonstrated by students who scored below each of those levels in the prior year (s. 1008.34(3)(b), F.S.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve one or more achievement levels from one year to the next (e.g., move from Level 1 to Level 2; Level 2 to Level 4, etc.)</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain a Level 3, Level 4, or Level 5 from one year to the next</td>
<td>Same, <strong>except</strong> for Level 3 and Level 4, in addition to maintaining the level, the student’s scale score must have improved from one year to the next</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For students who remain in Level 1 or Level 2, demonstrate a specified scale score gain</td>
<td>For students who remain in Level 1 or Level 2, demonstrate a learning gain by increasing their score to a higher subcategory within the Level (e.g., move from the bottom third of Level 1 to the middle third of Level 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Learning Gains of the Lowest 25%

• Calculated for both English Language Arts and Mathematics

• Applies the same learning gains methodology to the lowest performing 25% of students

• Determining the lowest performing 25% of students
  • Uses the performance of students in the prior year calculated at each grade level to identify the lowest performing 25% of students (EOCs not by grade level)
  • Low 25% is no longer limited to students in Achievement Levels 1 and 2
Middle School Acceleration

• The percentage of eligible students who passed one or more high school level statewide, standardized end-of-course (EOC) assessments or attained industry certifications identified in the industry certification funding list
• Calculated for all schools that include grades 6, 7, and 8 or grades 7 and 8
• Eligible students include full-year-enrolled students, who are current year grade 8 students who scored at or above Achievement Level 3 on the Mathematics statewide assessments (FSA & EOC) in the prior year, or are full-year-enrolled students in grades 6, 7, or 8 that took high school level EOC assessments or industry certifications (industry certification data is the most recent available and lags by one year)
• Students must be enrolled in the course to be included
• A student is included in the calculation no more than once
Graduation Rate

- The most recent 4-year cohort graduation rate measured according to 34 § CFR 200.19
- Calculated for all schools that include grades 9 to 12, grades 10 to 12, and grades 11 and 12
- Also calculated for combination schools that include these grade levels
- Beginning in 2016-17, students who withdraw to a private school that the district has a contract with will remain in the graduation cohort for their last public school
College and Career Acceleration

- Cohort-based calculation using the graduates from the graduation rate calculation as the denominator
- The percentage of graduates who, while in high school
  - Were eligible to earn college credit through AP, IB, or AICE examinations
  - Earned a C or better in dual enrollment or
  - Earned a CAPE industry certification
### School Grades Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>62% of total points or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>54% to 61% of total points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>41% to 53% of total points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>32% to 40% of total points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>31% of total points or less</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The State Board of Education sets the scale and must, per state law, periodically review the scale to determine whether the expectations should be raised to encourage increased student achievement.
- If the Board adjusts the grading scale upward, it must inform the public and the school districts of the reasons for the adjustment and the anticipated impact on school grades.
Calculating the School Grade

• The school’s grade is determined by
  • Summing the points earned for each component (each component is worth 100 points) and dividing by the sum of total points available for all components with sufficient data
  • The percentage resulting is the percentage of points the school earned from all applicable components
  • This percentage is compared to the scale set by the State Board of Education to determine a school’s grade
School Grades Model
Other Topics

• Per state law, if two or more schools operate at the same facility (collocated schools), and at least one of the collocated schools does not earn a school grade or a rating because of insufficient data, the performance data across all the schools at the same location are combined to calculate a school grade (s. 1008.34(3)(a)3, F.S.)

• This provision results in more schools being included in school accountability
Every Student Succeeds Act
ESSA State Plan Approval

• Drafted with public input, including workgroup of superintendents
• Required no changes to Florida’s state accountability systems
• Preserves the focus on increased student achievement
• Adds a Federal calculation to satisfy ESSA requirements
• Plan was approved September 26, 2018
Accountability

• Calculation of Federal percent of points index
  • Includes all school grades components plus English Language Proficiency progress
  • English Language Proficiency progress – the percent of ELLs who make progress on ACCESS for ELLs 2.0
    • ELLs who increase their composite proficiency level or
    • Remain at a composite score of 4, 5, or 6
  • Calculated for all schools including ESE, Alternative, and DJJ
    • K-3 schools that don’t receive their own index receive the Federal percent of points index of the school to which a majority of their students matriculate, as is currently done for the school grade for school recognition purposes
  • Calculated overall and by subgroup
Subgroups

• Subgroups include:
  • Economically disadvantaged students
  • Major racial and ethnic groups (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, American Indian or Alaska native, and two or more races)
  • Students with disabilities
  • English Language Learners (ELLs)
Percent Tested

• Schools testing less than 95% of their students, overall or by subgroup, will have to review their testing practices and submit a plan for change to achieve 95% tested.

• Schools testing less than 95% will have the achievement denominators for ELA and Math increased to 95% for the Federal index calculation.
EduData Portal

https://edudata.fldoe.org/
Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)

- The Every Student Succeeds Act (also known as ESSA) is a bipartisan federal law that was signed in December 2015.
- It amended the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, replacing No Child Left Behind provisions.
- Each state had to submit a state plan detailing how it would comply with the new law.
- Requires State, District and School Report Cards that replace School Public Accountability Reports (SPARS)
State, District, and School Report Cards

- In February, the department released EduData a new interactive report card that provides the federally required components for the state, district, and school report cards

- Includes the following:
  - School grade and school grade components, and Federal index
    - Components disaggregated by subgroup
    - State, District, School level
  - English Language Proficiency Progress
    - State, District, School level
  - Whether the school was identified for support

- Last week, the department released a new Map and Compare Schools feature in EduData. This allows parents to:
  - Search for similar schools based on selected filters
  - View a side-by-side comparison of up to 3 schools and key accountability measures.
Find and Compare Florida Public Schools

Find a Florida School (Beta Test)

Find a Florida public school by searching within a district or by searching a distance from a selected school, city or zip code.

Search for Schools within a District

Search for Schools by Distance

Distance from Selection (Mi. Miles)

Search by distance from a zip code, city or school.

Narrow your search by setting filters.
View a Side-by-Side Comparison

2018-19 School Report Card Comparison (Beta Test)

COCONUT GROVE ELEMENTARY SCHL
Miami-Dade School District
Traditional Public, Elementary School

Contact Information

School Overview

Student Count  Teacher Count
449 35

School Grade
A 85%

Total School Grade Percent of Points

School Grade Components
ELA Achievement: 90%
ELA Learning Gains: 83%
ELA Low 25%: 80%
Math Achievement: 69%
Math Learning Gains: 84%
Math Low 25%: 53%
Social Studies Achievement: *
Science Achievement: 68%
Middle School Acceleration: *
College & Career Acceleration: *
Graduation Rate: *

Inexperienced
Teachers: 13.5%
Classes Taught by Out-of-Field Teachers: 6.3%
Ineffective Teachers: 0%

FAIRLAWN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
Miami-Dade School District
Traditional Public, Elementary School

Contact Information

School Overview

Student Count  Teacher Count
601 37

School Grade
A 62%

Total School Grade Percent of Points

School Grade Components
ELA Achievement: 68%
ELA Learning Gains: 58%
ELA Low 25%: 55%
Math Achievement: 72%
Math Learning Gains: 68%
Math Low 25%: 57%
Social Studies Achievement: *
Science Achievement: 83%
Middle School Acceleration: *
College & Career Acceleration: *
Graduation Rate: *

Inexperienced
Teachers: 0%
Classes Taught by Out-of-Field Teachers: 0.9%
Ineffective Teachers: 0%

ENEIDA M. HARTNER ELEM. SCHOOL
Miami-Dade School District
Traditional Public, Elementary School

Contact Information

School Overview

Student Count  Teacher Count
418 29

School Grade
B 59%

Total School Grade Percent of Points

School Grade Components
ELA Achievement: 46%
ELA Learning Gains: 60%
ELA Low 25%: 71%
Math Achievement: 59%
Math Learning Gains: 56%
Math Low 25%: 53%
Social Studies Achievement: *
Science Achievement: 65%
Middle School Acceleration: *
College & Career Acceleration: *
Graduation Rate: *

Inexperienced
Teachers: 32.3%
Classes Taught by Out-of-Field Teachers: 0%
Ineffective Teachers: 6.46%
District and School Report Cards

MSID Information

YP HIGH SCHOOL

Grades Served: 9 10 11 12

District: Your District
Type: High School
Principal: John Smith

Contact Info:
1000 ABC Circle
Your City, Fl 32000-0000
(850) 111-1111

For information about Florida's Consolidated State Plan see Every Student Succeeds Acts (ESSA).

MSID information Including Longitude and Latitude

www.FLDOE.org
Subgroup Information

Data Sources:
- Surveys 2, 3, 5
- Accountability files
- Department of Children and Families (Foster Data)
### Additional Report Card Sections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population and Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments - Academic Achievement, Growth, and Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments - English Language Learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceleration Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline and Attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation and Beyond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator Qualifications and Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term Goals and Interim Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Course Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per-Pupil Expenditures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VAM Overview
Background

• Section 1012.34(7)(a), F.S., requires the Commissioner of Education to approve a formula to measure individual student learning growth on the statewide, standardized assessments in English language arts and mathematics.

• The current formula (Florida’s VAM), identified in 2011, was developed upon the recommendation of a stakeholder committee of Florida educators.

• Because the model requires prior student assessment data, VAM results are produced ONLY for teachers who teach the following grades and subjects:
  • English language arts – grades 4 – 10
  • Mathematics – grades 4 – 8
  • Algebra 1 – grades 8 and 9

• About 1/3 of teachers receive VAM scores.
Value-Added Results and Scores

The formula measures the average amount of learning growth of a teacher's students above or below the expected learning growth of similar students in the state, resulting in a value-added score.

- A score of “0” indicates that, on average, students performed no better or worse than expected based on the factors in the model.
- A positive score indicates that students, on average, performed better than expected.
- A negative score indicates that students, on average, performed worse than expected.
- The value-added score is not based on student achievement levels.
Factors the Value-Added Model Controls For

- Up to 2 prior test scores
- Disabilities
- English language learner status
- Gifted status
- Attendance
- Number of times the student changed schools
- Number of years above or below the typical age of peers in the same grade
- Number of courses students took in the subject during the year
- Class size
- Similarity of prior test scores among students in the class
Standard Error

- VAM scores contain some variability
- The standard error measures that variability
- Consistent with best practices, the standard error is used to construct a confidence interval around a score (like the +/- points in a poll) to enhance accuracy and identify different levels of performance
VAM Score Classifications are Stable

• 77% of teachers with VAM scores classified as Highly Effective remained Highly Effective the subsequent year. And 99% of these teachers remained at least Effective.

• 85% of teachers with Effective VAM scores either remained Effective or improved to Highly Effective the following year.

• This means that placing students in our most fragile schools with teachers whose VAM scores were at least Effective last year significantly increases these students’, and the school’s, chance of success this year.
VAM Score Classifications are Stable

• By contrast, only 38% of teachers with VAM scores classified as Needs Improvement improved their scores to Effective or Highly Effective.

• And among teachers with VAM scores classified as Unsatisfactory, who had nowhere to go but up, fewer than 1/3 of them did.

• The best way to prevent students from falling further behind is to provide them with a teacher with a positive track record.
Role of VAM in Turnaround Schools Rule 6A-1.099811, F.A.C.

• District-managed Turnaround
  • Ensure that teachers’ state VAM percentages are in alignment with the district/state average so Needs Improvement and Unsatisfactory teachers are limited

• Turnaround Option—Closure
  • Ensure teachers rated as Unsatisfactory or Needs Improvement based on the three-year aggregated state VAM rating and administrators are not reassigned to other School Improvement schools within the district

• Turnaround Option—Charter and External Operator
  • Ensure that teachers rated as Unsatisfactory and Needs Improvement based on the three-year aggregated state VAM rating and on the district’s approved evaluation system are not hired
VAM Data Visualization Tool
Background

- Section 1012.34(7)(a), F.S., requires a third party, other than the assessment developer, to analyze student learning growth data calculated using the formula (i.e., Florida’s VAM) and provide access to a data visualization tool that enables teachers to understand and evaluate the data and school administrators to improve instruction, evaluate programs, allocate resources, plan professional development, and communicate with stakeholders.

- The VAM Visualization Tool was launched on September 20, 2019, providing secure-access to teachers and school administrators.
Florida's Value-Added Model (VAM) Ratings: VAM scores represent the amount the teacher contributed to student learning growth, on average, among the students they taught by statistically controlling for other factors that impact student learning growth. The department provides ratings for the 3-Year FSA Aggregate VAM score for English Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics teachers, as well as ratings for the 1-Year 8th Grade Algebra I and the 1-Year 9th Grade Algebra I VAM scores for Algebra teachers. Only instructors in ELA grades 4-10, mathematics grades 4-8, and Algebra I grades 8-9 receive a VAM score using the state models.

The department uses different processes for determining which score to use for teachers who have more than one of these types of scores, depending on the project. Questions regarding which score was used when a teacher has both an FSA and an Algebra I score, or Algebra I scores for both 8th and 9th grade should be directed to the department’s Bureau of Accountability Reporting.

### State Distribution of Overall VAM Ratings for Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Effective</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Florida Standards Assessments (FSA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>VAM Score</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Student Assessments</th>
<th>Data from the Most Recent Year Included?</th>
<th>VAM Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-year FSA Aggregate Combined</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Highly Effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher Value-Added Report

3-year FSA Aggregate Combined

Aggregate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>VAM Score</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Student Assessments</th>
<th>Data from the Most Recent Year Included?</th>
<th>VAM Rating/Performance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-year FSA Aggregate Combined</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Highly Effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is included?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Test/Subect</th>
<th>Included</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>FSA English Language Arts (ELA)</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>FSA Mathematics</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>FSA English Language Arts (ELA)</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>FSA Mathematics</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>FSA English Language Arts (ELA)</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State Distribution of Teachers for FSA Aggregate

Year 2018-19

- Unsatisfactory: 15%
- Needs Improvement: 15%
- Effective: 56%
- Highly Effective: 14%
Teacher Value-Added Report

Raw VAM Score for Grade and Subject

- 95% Confidence Interval
- 68% Confidence Interval

* The Standard represents the point at which the teacher’s students’ scores, on average, align with expectations.

VAM Scores for Individual Subjects and Grades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Raw VAM Score for Grade and Subject</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Student Assessments</th>
<th>VAM Rating/Performance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>3.773</td>
<td>1.522</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>-0.500</td>
<td>1.754</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>4.010</td>
<td>1.416</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

www.FLDOE.org
## Teacher's Student Roster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Actual Score</th>
<th>Expected Score</th>
<th>Difference between Actual and Expected Score</th>
<th>2018-19 Performance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student-CJkJ</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>262.557</td>
<td>23.443</td>
<td>L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-CgRm</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>291.112</td>
<td>6.888</td>
<td>L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-CXqx</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>286.380</td>
<td>13.620</td>
<td>L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-CpYd</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>281.452</td>
<td>22.548</td>
<td>L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Cbhj</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>295.887</td>
<td>9.113</td>
<td>L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-CPtd</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>285.950</td>
<td>22.050</td>
<td>L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-yQF</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>278.622</td>
<td>31.378</td>
<td>L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Cynd</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>291.753</td>
<td>21.247</td>
<td>L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-CYXv</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>300.249</td>
<td>14.751</td>
<td>L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Clhc</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>303.477</td>
<td>12.523</td>
<td>L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Cbfg</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>301.188</td>
<td>14.812</td>
<td>L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-CMqj</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>320.518</td>
<td>-3.518</td>
<td>L2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Florida’s Value-Added Model (VAM) Ratings: VAM scores represent the amount the teacher contributed to student learning growth, on average, among the students they taught by statistically controlling for other factors that impact student learning growth. The department provides ratings for the 3-Year FSA Aggregate VAM score for English Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics teachers, as well as ratings for the 1-Year 8th Grade Algebra I and the 1-Year 9th Grade Algebra I VAM scores for Algebra teachers. Only instructors in ELA grades 4-10, mathematics grades 4-8, and Algebra I grades 8-9 receive a VAM score using the state models.

The department uses different processes for determining which score to use for teachers who have more than one of these types of scores, depending on the project. Questions regarding which score was used when a teacher has both an FSA and an Algebra I score, or Algebra I scores for both 8th and 9th grade should be directed to the department’s Bureau of Accountability Reporting.

### 3-year FSA Aggregate Combined

- **VAM Score**: -0.258
- **Standard Error**: 0.081
- **Student Assessments**: 282
- **Data from the Most Recent Year Included?**: Yes
- **VAM Rating**: Unsatisfactory

---

### State Distribution of Overall VAM Ratings for Teachers

- Unsatisfactory: 14%
- Needs Improvement: 14%
- Effective: 54%
- Highly Effective: 17%
Teacher Value-Added Report

Report: Teacher Value-Added  Test: 3-year FSA Aggregate
Teacher: Teacher-slc  Subject: Combined

View the Teacher Value-Added Summary

3-year FSA Aggregate Combined

Aggregate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>VAM Score</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Student Assessments</th>
<th>Data from the Most Recent Year Included?</th>
<th>VAM Rating/Performance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-year FSA Aggregate Combined</td>
<td>-0.258</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is included?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Test/Subject</th>
<th>Included</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>FSA Mathematics</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>FSA Mathematics</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>FSA Mathematics</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State Distribution of Teachers for FSA Aggregate

Year 2018-19

Unsatisfactory 56%
Needs Improvement 15%
Effective 15%
Highly Effective 14%
Teacher Value-Added Report

Raw VAM Score for Grade and Subject

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Raw VAM Score for Grade and Subject</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Student Assessments</th>
<th>VAM Rating/Performance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>-4.488</td>
<td>1.676</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Well Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>-2.879</td>
<td>1.850</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>-2.395</td>
<td>1.669</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Standard represents the point at which the teacher’s students’ scores, on average, align with expectations.
## Teacher’s Student Roster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Actual Score</th>
<th>Expected Score</th>
<th>Difference between Actual and Expected Score</th>
<th>2018-19 Performance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student-CBLW</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>271.794</td>
<td>1.206</td>
<td>L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-CrRR</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>285.000</td>
<td>-12.000</td>
<td>L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-DBQh</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>286.843</td>
<td>-8.843</td>
<td>L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-hfd</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>297.348</td>
<td>-12.348</td>
<td>L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Gtdc</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>310.505</td>
<td>-22.505</td>
<td>L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-CsFF</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>309.689</td>
<td>-11.689</td>
<td>L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-CsSz</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>314.024</td>
<td>-14.024</td>
<td>L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-CzczH</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>325.831</td>
<td>-25.831</td>
<td>L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-CTHI</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>278.837</td>
<td>21.163</td>
<td>L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-CxVg</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>321.728</td>
<td>-14.728</td>
<td>L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-ClsV</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>339.399</td>
<td>-30.399</td>
<td>L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-mZt</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>339.838</td>
<td>-29.838</td>
<td>L1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future Development

• The department will continue to make enhancements based on feedback
• Training opportunities are forthcoming
• A site for the public is in development