Using Data Well
Agenda

Session 1: 8:30 – 10:15 am – Large and Very Large Districts
10-15 – 10:30 am – Break
Session 2: 10:30 – 12:15 pm – Small to Medium Districts

Introductions of Speakers

Division of Innovation and Technology: Data Submission and Validation of Data
Stephen Bowen, Assistant Deputy Commissioner – Data Systems

Division of Accountability, Research and Measurement: SWD and Accountability
Jason Gaitanis, Assistant Deputy Commissioner

Division of Public Schools: Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services
Heidi Metcalf, Sr. Educational Program Director
Cyndi Holleman, IDEA Data Coordinator

Round Tables- Districts share out Best Practices
Introductions
Innovation and Technology: Data Submission and Validation of Data

Stephen Bowen
Assistant Deputy Commissioner – Data Systems
Data Quality Does Not Happen in a “Silo”

• Collaboration between ESE and MIS staff is essential.

• There are many reports available from Northwest Regional Data Center (NWRDC).

• MIS/IS Staff can request reports (NWRDC CICS Student Component Menu / Option 26 – Reports for Request).

• SIS reports may be available for ongoing checks
NWRDC CICS Student Component Menu / Option 26 – Reports for Request Sample of Reports

Potentially Problematic Data Elements

• Time, Total School Week
• Time With Non-Disabled Peers (<= Total)
• Exceptional Student, IDEA Educational Environments (KG 6 yrs old by SV)
• Exceptional Student, Dismissal Date (SV5)
• F62670 – Individual List of Graduates (Diplomas and Certificates) (SV5)
• F70999 – Diplomas by Primary Exceptionality and School (SV5)
NWRDC CICS Student Component Menu / Option 26 – Reports for Request Sample of Reports

- F61108 – Exceptional Student Validation/Exception
- F71213 – Exceptional Student Aggregate Exception
- F62645 – Student Course Records with no Matching Exceptional Student Record
- F71138 – McKay FTE F71138/71139, F71216/71217
- F05107 FTE by School, Program and Grade
- F05108 FTE by School Program and Count
- F62645 Student Course Records with No Exceptional Student Record
- F70999 – Diplomas by Primary Exceptionality and School
NWRDC CICS Student Component Menu / Option 26 – Reports for Request Sample of Reports

Reports Helpful for Reviewing Data Submitted

• F62894 – ESE Duplicated County by Exceptionality and Age
• F63355 – Unduplicated ESE Membership by Exceptionality
• F70201 – ESE County by FEFP Program by School
• F70448 – Alternate Assessment of Y or P (data file)
• F71000 – ESE IDEA Educational Environments

Your MIS Director can provide a complete list of the available reports.
Know Your Resources and Sources

- Who monitors your data?
- Develop a partnership between ESE and MIS staff
- Find out what mind of SIS reports are available
SWD and Accountability

Jason Gaitanis
Assistant Deputy Commissioner – ARM
School Grades
School Grades Model
11 Possible Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Language Arts</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Social Studies</th>
<th>Middle School Acceleration</th>
<th>Graduation Rate</th>
<th>College and Career Acceleration</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>Middle School (HS EOCs or industry certifications) (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>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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

www.FLDOE.org
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 resulting percentage is the percentage of points the school earned from all applicable components
  - This percentage is converted to a grade using the scale set by the State Board of Education
School Grades Scale

• 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 State 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.

<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>
School Grades Percent Tested

• Must test 95% of students
• Calculated for each subject and then aggregated
• Schools that do not test 95% of students will be assigned an “I”
• Superintendents can appeal the “I” by demonstrating that the data accurately represent the school’s progress or by requesting that late-reported assessment results be included
• Commissioner will review the school’s data to determine if the student performance data are representative of the school’s progress
• If the Commissioner determines the data are representative, the grades will be released for these schools at the end of the appeals process
How are Students with Disabilities Included in School Grades?

• Students with disabilities are eligible to be included in all 11 components

• Students who take the FSAA—Performance Task are eligible to be included in the achievement, learning gains, and low 25% components

• Students who take the FSAA—Datafolio are only included in percent tested
FSAA Learning Gains Criteria
English Language Arts and Mathematics

• 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.)

• For students who remain in Level 1 or Level 2, split Levels 1 and 2 into multiple sections (Level 1 into thirds and Level 2 in half) and require the student to improve from section to section within the Level (e.g., move from the bottom third of Level 1 to the middle third of Level 1)

• For students who remain in Level 3, split Level 3 into two sections and require the student to improve from section to section within the Level (e.g., move from the bottom half of Level 3 to the top half of Level 3)

• Maintain a Level 4 from one year to the next
Learning Gains Reminder

• A learning gain can be made using prior-year and current-year like-tests only

• A learning gain cannot be made from a prior-year FSAA to a current-year FSA, or a prior-year FSA to current-year FSAA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Level 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>540-582</td>
<td>583-598</td>
<td>591-598</td>
<td>599-617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>540-581</td>
<td>582-596</td>
<td>590-596</td>
<td>597-617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>540-582</td>
<td>583-598</td>
<td>591-598</td>
<td>599-617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 6</td>
<td>540-582</td>
<td>583-598</td>
<td>591-598</td>
<td>599-617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>540-582</td>
<td>583-598</td>
<td>591-598</td>
<td>599-617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8</td>
<td>540-581</td>
<td>582-597</td>
<td>590-597</td>
<td>598-613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>540-581</td>
<td>582-597</td>
<td>590-597</td>
<td>598-619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10</td>
<td>540-583</td>
<td>584-597</td>
<td>591-597</td>
<td>598-616</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FSAA Mathematics – Grade Level and EOCs

#### Learning Gains Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>540-585</td>
<td>540-555</td>
<td>556-570</td>
<td>571-585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>540-586</td>
<td>540-555</td>
<td>556-571</td>
<td>572-586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>540-585</td>
<td>540-555</td>
<td>556-570</td>
<td>571-585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 6</td>
<td>540-585</td>
<td>540-555</td>
<td>556-570</td>
<td>571-585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>540-586</td>
<td>540-555</td>
<td>556-571</td>
<td>572-586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algebra 1</td>
<td>725-773</td>
<td>725-741</td>
<td>742-757</td>
<td>758-773</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Federal Uniform Graduation Rate

• All students must be accounted for
• Only standard diplomas count
• Does not remove transfers to adult education programs (remain in denominator)
• Assigns DJJ students back to their most recent regular high school
Federal Uniform Graduation Rate

• Key for the 2017-18 Graduation Rate
  • Year0 – 1314
  • Year1 – 1415
  • Year2 – 1516
  • Year3 – 1617
  • Year4 – 1718
Formats Used for the Cohort Build

- Final Survey Data
  - Format: Student Demographic Information
    - Survey 2/Year1
    - Survey 5/Year1-Year4
  - Format: Student Course Transcript Information
    - Survey 2/Year1
  - Format: End-of-Year Status
    - Survey 5/Year0-Year4
  - Format: Prior School Status/Student Attendance
    - Survey 5/Year1-Year4
  - Format: Exceptional Student
    - Survey 2/Year1
    - Survey 5/Year1-Year4
  - Format: Federal/State Indicator Status
    - Survey 2/Year1
    - Survey 5/Year1-Year4
Building the Unadjusted Cohort

Key Data Elements

- Student Number Identifier, Florida
- School Number, Current Enrollment
- Withdrawal Code
- Diploma Code
- Withdrawal Date
- Grade Level
Building the Unadjusted Cohort

• Include all first-time 9th graders in Fall 2014 membership in your district (Year1)
  • From Survey 2 Demographic and Course

• Add incoming transfers on the same schedule to graduates found in Survey 5 Demographic and End-of-Year Status
  • New 9th graders in Year1
  • New 10th graders in Year2
  • New 11th graders in Year3
  • New 12th graders in Year4
Federal Uniform Graduation Rate for Students with Disabilities

• Students are included in the SWD subgroup for graduation rate based on the first ESE status reported on the exception education format, that can be found during the 4 years of the cohort
  • If the student enters the cohort in Year1 with no ESE classification but is then classified ESE in Year3, this student is not included in the SWD graduation rate
  • If the student transfers in during Year2 with a classification, this student is included
  • Both the primary and other are reviewed
  • Students who are Gifted only are excluded
2017-18 Process

• District review process—Graduation Rate Cohort Corrections application closes December 13th
  • Primary Accountability Coordinators are working with their district and schools to make corrections
  • Review process serves as the appeals process

• Results for the high school graduation rates will be available on the department’s EDStats PK-20 Reporting Tool:
  • [https://edstats.fldoe.org/](https://edstats.fldoe.org/)
  • Click on the green button for “PK-12 Public Schools”
  • Click on “High School Graduation Rates” under “Interactive Reports - PK-12”
School Improvement Ratings
School Improvement Rating Model

• Alternative schools and Exceptional Student Education (ESE) center schools can choose whether to receive a school grade or a school improvement rating

• If a school chooses to receive a rating, student performance results are used in both the school’s rating and the students’ home-zoned school’s grade
  • Students scoring at the Emergent level (Levels 1 and 2) who have always been in an ESE center in the district are not tied back to the home-zoned school’s grade
  • Students attending a charter school are not tied back to the home-zoned school’s grade
  • “Dropout Retrieval” and “Alternative to Expulsion” are excluded from school improvement ratings and school grades

• The department provides the district a list of schools in order to verify schools eligible to choose a rating
School Improvement Rating Model
2 Possible Components

• Schools will be rated on only those components for which they have sufficient data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Language Arts</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Gains (0% to 100%)</td>
<td>Learning Gains (0% to 100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Improvement Rating – Percent Tested

• Schools must assess 80% of students to receive a rating

• Schools that assess less than 90% of students are not eligible to receive a rating of Commendable
School Improvement Rating Scale

• The rating is based on the percentage of possible points earned by each school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commendable</td>
<td>50% of points or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining</td>
<td>26% to 49% of points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>25% of points or less</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How are Students with Disabilities Included in School Improvement Ratings?

• Students with disabilities are eligible to be included in both components

• Students who take the FSAA—Performance Task are eligible to be included (the definition of a learning gain is the same as that used for school grades)

• Students who take the FSAA—Datafolio are only included in percent tested
Using Data Well for Student Outcomes for SWDs

Heidi Metcalf, Sr Education Program Director, BEESS
Cyndi Holleman, IDEA Data Coordinator, BEESS
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What Matters Most for SEAs and LEAs

• Focus on what adults do – intentionally and collectively – to include and assist all students in learning at higher levels.

Initiated and funded by the National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO)
## What Matters Most: Key Practices Guide

### Key Practice 1: Use Data Well

While states, districts, and individual teachers use data and have been for some time now, there has been too much emphasis placed only on the performance of students in state assessments. While these data are important for planning, they provide little ongoing guidance to teachers or administrators. Districts that rate “Excellent” have reported that they are engaged in developing district-wide processes that allow for more collaborative use of existing data to make smarter decisions, including the targeting assessment information and learning of the classroom, school, and district levels. These processes include the development, implementation, and ongoing use of formative assessments, and the use of multiple indicators to inform, and or improve, how to collaboratively plan these shared assessments and plan for student instruction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Considerations For Increasing the Performance of Students with Disabilities as Part of Districts with Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| State Education Agency | To what degree do state education agencies (SEAs):  
  - Use data to identify and respond to common needs related to student learning across areas (e.g., region, school, intermediate/compromise service area, district, state)?  
  - Establish clear expectations for effective use data across SEA offices and departments, facilitating coherence and reducing fragmentation in the services and/or supports provided to districts?  
  - Align, enhance, or create new state systems of support focused on building the capacity of all districts in the state to improve instructional practice and student learning?  
  - Establish mechanisms for providing high-quality, clear, and consistent support— including facilitation and professional development—to all districts in the state in the effective use of data to improve the learning of all students and groups of students, such as students with disabilities?  
  - Provide tools/products/services that facilitate the effective use of data by all districts, schools, and teachers in improving instructional practice and student learning?  
  - Ensure that state institutes are targeted to providing support to underperforming districts and, at the same time, are applicable and used by all districts in the state to continually support higher levels of learning for all students? |
| Districts & their Schools | To what degree do districts and their schools:  
  - Establish clear expectations for effective use data at all levels of this system?  
  - Use data to identify district, building, and classroom needs, and establish goals and performance targets at the district and school level?  
  - Use data to measure the degree of implementation of strategic priorities, including professional development to each district/school-related goals?  
  - Use data to evaluate the impact of strategies/actions on student learning?  
  - Require teachers and teacher teams to use data to establish instructional priorities and inform instructional practice on an ongoing basis?  
  - Model and monitor the use of data to inform instructional decisions?  
  - Provide support at all levels of the effective use of data to facilitate higher levels of learning for all students and groups of students, such as students with disabilities? |
| Districts & Families | To what degree are parents/families empowered to:  
  - Provide relevant and timely information and feedback to district/local personnel on multiple dimensions (e.g., academic, social, personal) of their children's progress and development?  
  - Participate as members of the district or school leadership team?  
  - Understand the importance of high-level expectations in core content areas (e.g., writing)?  
  - Understand the implications of their child's instruction to their child's assessments of what their child is learning and the level of learning?  
  - Work with the district/school/teacher to collect data on their child's performance in designated areas? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Practice 1: Use Data Well</th>
<th>Key Practice 2: Focus Your Goals</th>
<th>Key Practice 3: Select and Implement Shared Instructional Practices</th>
<th>Key Practice 4: Implement Deeply</th>
<th>Key Practice 5: Monitor and Provide Feedback and Support</th>
<th>Key Practice 6: Inquire and Learn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Require the use of data at all levels to identify needs, monitor progress, and make continual improvements to instructional practices</td>
<td>• Align all work across the district with the <strong>district goals</strong></td>
<td>• <strong>Reduce the number of initiatives</strong> and ensure that all work aligns directly with a <strong>small number of goals</strong> and strategies</td>
<td>• <strong>Define what full implementation of identified instructional strategies chosen for improvement looks like at the classroom level, school level and district level.</strong></td>
<td>• Value accountability and make results the <strong>central focus</strong> of the district</td>
<td>• Move from a focus on individual buildings to a focus on <strong>district-wide implementation to sustain the work</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Take advantage of the expertise and resources around you,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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BEESS Reporting Cycle

State or Federal Legislation

State develops data collection requirements to meet legislation.

Local schools submit data to local district office.

Local district office submits data to FDOE.

FDOE prepares reports to meet the state and/or federal legislation.

We only collect data that is required by legislation.

Reporting requirements must be approved by Data Governance Committee.

Local districts are responsible for providing training to school-level staff on data reporting.

Local districts work with FDOE staff with submission and reporting questions.

SPP Indicators such as graduation and dropout rates, LRE, Discipline,
Surveys 2 and 3

Survey 2:
Survey Week: October 8-12, 2018
Due Date: October 19, 2018
State Processing: October 15 – November 2, 2018
Final Update/Amendment Date: December 15, 2018

Preliminary data used for:
- LRE data verification activities
- Membership in rank order table

Final data used: (Note: Final data is not available until end of March or first of April)
- EDFacts Child Count/LRE Submission
- Calculation of Indicators 5, 6, 9 and 10
- Calculation of disproportionate identification, placement for CEIS
- Calculation of population growth
- Indicator 12

Survey 3:
Survey Week: February 4-8, 2019
Due Date: February 16, 2019
State Processing: February 11 – March 1, 2019
Final Update/Amendment Date: April 15, 2019

Preliminary data used for:
- District Membership Counts
- Free and Reduced-Price Lunch

Survey 5 and Other Sources

Survey 5: Cumulative, all-year school data
Due date: July 26, 2019
State processing: July 22 – August 23, 2019
Final Update/Amendment Date: October 31, 2019

Data used for:
- Indicator 1, Cohort Graduation Rate (calculated by School Grades Office)
- Indicator 2, Dropout Rates using EDFacts File 009 which is due Nov. 7, 2018
- Discipline 4A and 4B (EDFacts file 006 and PERA 3509)
- Disproportionate discipline for CEIS (used EDFacts File 006 and 143 and all-year membership from PERA 3509)
- Indicator 12
- MOE/CEIS Student count data

Data received from other sources:
- Indicator 3, Statewide Assessments: (BEESS requests files 185, 189, 175, and 178 from Bureau of Accountability. These files should be available by the end of December)
- Indicator 14, Postschool Outcomes: BEESS requests data from FETPIP in October/November
- Indicator 11, Child Find (web-based data collection)
- Indicator 7, Preschool outcome data (web-based data system managed by contractor)
- Indicator 8, Parent Survey (system managed by contractor)
- Indicator 12, Transition (OCH provides data to contractor)
- Indicator 13, Secondary Transition (GSW)
- Special Education Related Services Personnel (EDFacts file C099) collected via web-based survey
District Data Reporting Schedule

- **Survey 2 data is used for:**
  - LRE data verification activities
  - Membership of districts in rank order table
  - Creation of Child Count and LRE submission
  - Calculation of Part B SPP Indicators 5, 6, 9, and 10
  - Calculation of disproportionate identification, placement for CEIS
  - Part of indicator 12
District Data Reporting Schedule

• **Survey 5 data is used for:**
  • Indicator 1, Graduation rate
  • Indicator 2, Dropout rate
  • Discipline 4A and 4B
  • Disproportionate discipline for CEIS
  • Part of indicator 12
Additional Data Collections

Data received from sources other than automated database:

- **Assessment data**: The Office of Evaluation and Reporting uses these data for indicators 3B, 3C and assessment data included in Databook. Data available by mid-December.
- **FETPIP**: Postschool outcome data (Indicator 14). Data available in late November.
- **60-day timeline data**: Submitted by districts to FDOE via a web-based data collection survey (Indicator 11). Web-based submissions due mid-November.
- **Preschool outcome data**: Submitted by districts via a web-based data collection survey managed by a contractor (Indicator 7). Data received from contractor in December.
- **Parent survey data**: Managed by outside contractor (Indicator 8). Data received in September.
- **Part C to B Transition**: Department of Health supplies data to contractor for Indicator 12. Data available in late January.
- **Secondary Transition**: GSW
- **Select personnel data**: Web-based application. Data submitted by the LEA’s and based upon the October counts.
- **Restraint and Seclusion**: Districts report to FDOE via a web-based database.
What do we do with all this data?

- Some data is required for state and federal reporting.

- More importantly:
  - Data provides an overall indicator of progress
  - Data allows you to consider if activities/strategies you have put into place are making an impact
Examples of Using Data Well

Impact of Inclusion in Student Performance:

• How can your data help promote more inclusion for SWD?
• Which grade level or school type has the lowest or highest LRE in your district?
• Do the elementary schools have more inclusion than the middle schools? Do the middle schools have more inclusion than the high schools? If so, why is this? Compare the primary exceptionalities between those schools. Is it behavior-related? Compare student discipline between those schools.

Factors for Educational Outcomes:

• Does discipline impact graduation or dropout rates?
• Does attendance impact graduation or dropout rates?
So, while data quality doesn’t happen in a “silo” neither does data analysis. No one, stand-alone report will show the whole picture.
Example: Educational Outcomes

Cohort Graduation Rates by Race Compared to Discipline Incidents of Removal

White: 70% Graduation Rate, 37% SWD Discipline Removals
Black: 55% Graduation Rate, 47% SWD Discipline Removals
Hispanic: 85% Graduation Rate, 12% SWD Discipline Removals
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Example: Impact of Inclusion (LRE)

• Do inclusion rates affect student performance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Schools</th>
<th>Schl Grade</th>
<th>Regular Class</th>
<th>% Disabled Scoring Level 3 and Above - ELA</th>
<th>% Non-Disabled Scoring Level 3 and Above - ELA</th>
<th>GAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample A Elementary School</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample A Middle School</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample A High School</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample B Elementary School</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample B High School</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample B Middle School</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Example: Impact of Inclusion (LRE)**

- Do discipline/behavior issues or attendance affect inclusion decisions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Schools</th>
<th>Regular Class</th>
<th>SWD Students Absent 21+ Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample A Elementary School</td>
<td>0251</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample A Middle School</td>
<td>0281</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample A High School</td>
<td>0331</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample B Elementary School</td>
<td>0341</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample B High School</td>
<td>0351</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample B Middle School</td>
<td>0361</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Helpful Web Links
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Online Resources

• BEESS: http://fldoe.org/academics/exceptional-student-edu/
• Student Database Manuals for Reporting: http://fldoe.org/accountability/data-sys/database-manuals-updates/
• Florida PK-20 Education Information Portal: https://edstats.fldoe.org/SASPortal/main.do
• School Grades and Accountability Reports: http://fldoe.org/accountability/accountability-reporting/school-grades/index.stml
Impact of Data - LEA Determinations
Use of Data for USED

• States are required to use data to create annual reports
  • LEA Determinations
  • CEIS (Identification, Placement, and Discipline)
• State Performance Plans: February 1 of each year, Florida submits the State Performance Plan (SPP)-Annual Performance Report (APR) to USED
• In the SPP-APR, we report targets for 17 indicators as well as progress in meeting those targets.
• The FFY 2015 Part B SPP-APR Report can be found on DOE’s ESE homepage under Topics of Special Interest located at www.fldoe.org/academics/exceptional-student-edu

www.FLDOE.org
2015-2018 LEA Determinations

In 2015: Points earned for Compliance & CEIS
Starting 2016: Points earned for Compliance, Performance & CEIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Met Requirements</th>
<th>Needs Assistance</th>
<th>Needs Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2018 LEA Determination Criteria
• Federal Uniform Graduation rate (2016-17) 60.3%
• Dropout Rate (2016-17) 11.7%
• Regular Class Placement (2017-18) 83%

2019 LEA Determination Criteria
• Federal Uniform Graduation rate (2017-18) 62.3%
• Dropout Rate (2017-18) 10%
• Regular Class Placement (2018-19) 85%
2019 LEA Determinations

• Step One: any district required to set aside 15% of IDEA, Part B funds for CEIS 2018-19 and 2019-20 will automatically be identified as Needs Intervention; any district required to set aside 15% of IDEA, Part B funds for CEIS for 2019-20 (but not in 2018-19) will automatically be identified as Needs Assistance.

• Step Two: Points are earned based on the compliance and performance criteria listed below. The 2019 point values resulting in the determination categories are:
  • Meets Requirements: 14-18 points
  • Needs Assistance: 8-13 points
  • Needs Intervention: 4-7 points or in Needs Assistance 4 consecutive years
  • Needs Substantial intervention: 0-3 points
### Compliance Points Criteria

- No critical state fiscal audits from 2018
- SPP 9 – No disproportionality for inappropriate identification (2018-19)
- SPP 10 – No disproportionality for specific disability categories. (2018-19)
- SPP 11 - ≥95% evaluated within 60 days with parental consent (2017-18)
- SPP 12 - ≥95% of children referred from Part C prior to age 3 and were eligible for Part B
- SPP 13 - ≥95% of transition IEP’s compliant (2017-18)
- ≥95% of 2016-17 findings of noncompliance corrected within one year
- Submission of valid and reliable data
  - SPP 5- all errors for placement or age were corrected
  - CEIS – correct funding source/identified students
- Submission of timely data
  - Timely submission of SPP 11 and SPP 12

### Performance Points

- SPP 1 – Federal Graduation Rate
  - 2016-17 met target
  - 2017-18 met target
  - Improvement
- SPP 2 – Federal Dropout Rate
  - 2016-17 met target
  - 2017-18 met target
  - Improvement
- SPP 5 – LRE
  - Met target 2018-19 (3 points)
  - Within 10% of target and any improvement (2 points)
  - Within 10% of target and no decrease greater than 5%
Data Determines Tiered Level of Support Needed
Supports provided by BEESS for Student Outcomes

Follow-up Monitoring Call

Districts that received an on-site visit the prior school year share current data, the strategies in place to address the targeted areas as well as barriers and resources for implementation.

Desk Top Monitoring (DTM) Support for Student Outcomes

Districts are selected for DTM based on current data in targeted areas. During conference call will be district provide most recent data and share what strategies they have in place to address the targeted areas as well as barriers and resources for implementation.

On-Site Monitoring Visits

Districts in need of intensive supports are selected based on data in targeted areas.

BEESS Strategic Team

BEESS Strategic team members reach out to districts in need of intensive supports for specific indicators that are not being visited or participating in a DTM or Follow up call.
On-Site Monitoring Visits
Focus on Equity and Access to Reduce Barriers to College, Life and Career Readiness

On-site monitoring focus areas:

• LEA Determination Criteria
• Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS) (Over-identification and Discipline)
• Discipline (suspension and expulsion)
• Incidents of restraint and seclusion
• Graduation rates
• Dropout rates
• Least restrictive environment
• ELA Scores for 3th Grade SWD
• Middle grade math scores for SWD
• Preschool proficiency in Communication
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2013-14 to 2018-19 On-Site Monitoring

- In 2013-14 on-site visits shifted from compliance to student outcomes.
- In 2016-17 Parent Focus Groups were added to the on-site visits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>District visits</th>
<th>Peer Monitors included</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2013-14 to 2018-19
Data includes visits scheduled this year

- Total of 79 on-site visits (22 districts have received multiple visits)
- Multiple DOC facilities visited
- 6 county jails visited
- 2 nursing facilities for students who are medically-fragile visited
- More than 78 BESSS staff members, 18 FDOE staff and 178 project staff have participated on visits
- 51 Peer monitors included on visits
Positive Outcomes for On-site Monitoring

• Executive district-level leadership and key school staff members (*boots on the ground*) are participating in day 1 and day 3 of the on-site visit meetings
• Outcomes for students with disabilities are becoming part of district-wide initiatives rather than just an ESE concern!
• More transparency when sharing barriers and resources
• Districts are accessing data at the district level and taking ownership of data
• Increase in collaboration with discretionary project staff
• Implementation of effective MTSS framework systems is understood
• Utilizing early warning tracking systems to track students who are at-risk of not graduating
• Ability to project graduation rates and develop strategies to enable at-risk students to keep on track in order to graduate with their cohort
• Districts working to ensure that error codes are corrected prior to submission to FDOE
• Conducting root cause analysis for disproportionate over-identification of specific ethnic groups
• Effective professional development and training being offered
Sample Topics for Round Table Discussions

What is the process for reviewing data in your district?

Do you request reports from your MIS person or does your MIS person download reports from NWRDC and provide them to you?

How do you use your data?

Share any reports your district used or uses to assist in developing or monitoring effectiveness of strategies.