

## PERFORMANCE METRICS TRAINING TRANSCRIPT

### ***Slide 1 – Introduction***

Good Morning and Welcome to the Bureau of Educator Recruitment, Development and Retention's Training on the Performance Metrics for continued approval of state-approved programs. Thank you for making time in your schedule to attend this technical assistance session. My name is Kay Caster, Educational Policy Consultant with the Office of Educator Preparation.

To help you understand the Performance Metrics that I will address today, you may wish to have a copy of Rule 6A-5.066, FAC, close by for reference. This document can be found on the Educator Preparation Website by selecting the heading, "Rule Revisions for Educator Preparation".

During this technical assistance, I will provide an introduction to the new performance metrics that are part of the continued approval process. At the end of this presentation, you will have an opportunity to ask questions.

### ***Slide 2 – Authority for Performance Metrics***

The requirements for implementing a state-approved program at your institution or as a private provider are set forth in state law.

Three Florida Statutes authorize the approval of Florida's three types of preparation programs:

- Section 1004.04 pertains to teacher preparation programs;
- Section 1004.85 pertains to educator preparation institutes; and
- Section 1012.56 pertains to professional development certification programs, offered by school districts.

Along with these statutes, Rule 6A-5.066, Florida Administrative Code, sets the requirements of continued approval as based on:

- Evidence that the program is implementing the requirements for initial approval, as indicated by the standards and indicators,
- Significant, objective, and quantifiable measures of the program; and
- Performance of program completers.

Recent changes to the standards, per statutes and rule, shift the focus for approval to both evidence of meeting quality standards and producing positive measurable outcomes. These outcomes should demonstrate the program's performance in preparing program completers that are effective in the classroom and have a positive impact on prekindergarten through grade 12 student achievement. Today's training focuses on the last bullet, which is the performance of program completers.

### ***Slide 3 – The Annual Program Performance Report or APPR***

Continued approval of all three types of teacher preparation programs is based, in part on the average of the annual results of outcome-based performance metrics during a five year approval cycle. Each year, the department publishes the Annual Program Performance Report or APPR for each program.

The APPR shows the progress that a program has made on six completer performance metrics and their targets. Each state-approved program receives an APPR for the previous academic year, if the program meets the following conditions:

- The program must have at least 3 completers in the selected cohort time period for rating the Placement performance metric **OR** the Retention performance metric, **AND**

### ***Slide 4 APPR Requirements (continued)***

- The program must have at least two completers who received an annual evaluation, which is calculated for the Annual Evaluation metric.

I will fully describe each performance metric during this presentation.

### ***Slide 5 – APPR Logistics***

Data are reported on program completers who are employed as instructional personnel in a Florida public school district. However, program completers who are employed in a private or out-of-state school in their first or second year following program completion may also be included if the data are reported and can be verified.

An APPR provides a summative rating score for the program between 1.0 and 4.0. This summative rating score is an average of all of the performance target scores for all performance metrics that apply to the program. If a performance metric does not apply to a program, such as Placement rate for the PDCP programs, then a score is not provided for that metric.

As a side note, all World Languages (such as Arabic, Chinese, French and Spanish) teacher preparation programs are considered as equivalent programs. An equivalent program is defined

as a teacher preparation program that is offered in more than one institution or school district and this program prepares candidates in the same specific educator certification subject area(s). As an example, music education programs, for grades K-12 certification, that are offered by institutions are considered equivalent programs when considering the Placement Rate performance metric.

#### ***Slide 6 - Completer Performance Data via eIPEP***

Completer performance data that are collected from the institutions, providers and districts are transmitted to the Department's "electronic Institutional Program Evaluation Plan", or referred to as the "eIPEP" system.

On the date that each program's source APPR data are available on the eIPEP data platform, the institution, private provider or school district may review the source APPR data and summative rating scores and has 45 business days to report to the Department any suspected errors or omissions. These requests to revise the data must have supporting documentation and evidence. After the 45 day period, the Department has 15 business days to review the data and supporting evidence and to notify institutions, private providers and school districts of any changes made to the APPR source data and thus, the summative rating scores.

#### ***Slide 7 - The Six Performance Metrics***

Florida Statutes identify the six performance metrics that are used in creating an APPR. These six metrics are shown in this circular graph. I will discuss each one in this order:

1. Placement Rate of program completers employed as instructional personnel.
2. Retention Rate of program completers employed as instructional personnel.
3. Student learning growth using the performance of prekindergarten to grade 12 students on statewide assessments.
4. Student performance by subgroups based on the performance of students in prekindergarten through grade 12 aggregated by student subgroup, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act.
5. Results of program completers' annual evaluations.
6. Production of program completers in statewide critical teacher shortage areas. This is a Bonus Only metric.

So let's jump in and I will explain each of the six metrics and then explain the target levels for each metric.

#### ***Slide 8 – Placement Rate***

The Placement rate takes the number of completers in that program who are reported as

1. employed in a full-time or part-time instructional position at any point in the school year
2. in a Florida public school district
3. in either the first or second academic year subsequent to program completion.
4. Also, programs are compared to other equivalent programs meaning teacher preparation programs that are offered in more than one institution or school district that prepares candidates in the same specific educator certification subject area(s).
  - a. For purposes of the APPR only, the world languages programs are considered equivalent programs.

This metric does not apply to Professional Development Certification Programs as candidates in these programs are already employed as instructional personnel in the school district offering the program.

Completers employed in a private or out-of-state school, in their first or second year following completion, are also included in the calculation; if these data are reported and can be verified.

An example of a cohort that may be included in this calculation would be a cohort of completers for 2011-2012 in an elementary program, who are employed for the first time in either 2012-2013 or 2013-2014 and meeting the other conditions for Placement rate.

#### ***Slide 9 – Performance Targets for Placement Rate***

There are four levels for the Placement Rate:

- For level 4, a program earns 4 points, if the placement rate of its completers is at or above the 68th percentile of all equivalent programs across the state.
- For level 3, a program earns 3 points, if the placement rate of its completers is at or above the 34th percentile and below the 68th percentile of all equivalent programs across the state.
- For level 2, a program earns 2 points, if the placement rate of its completers is at or above the 5th percentile and below the 34th percentile of all equivalent programs across the state.
- And Level 1, a program earns 1 point, if the placement rate of its completers is below the 5th percentile of all equivalent programs across the state.

#### ***Slide 10 – Retention Rate***

Retention rate accounts for the number of completers who remain in their teaching careers.

The rating score is calculated by

- taking the average number of years that program completers are employed
- in a full-time or part-time instructional position in a Florida public school district

- at any point of each year in a five-year period following initial employment
- in either of the two subsequent academic years following program completion.

Like I mentioned with the Placement Rate, program completers employed in a private or out-of-state school are also included in the calculation if data are reported by the program and can be verified.

### ***Slide 11 – Performance Targets for Retention Rate***

There are four target levels based on the average number of years the completers are employed in the 5-year period following initial placement (as I described in the previous slide):

- For level 4, a program earns 4 points, if the retention rate of its completers averages 4.5 or more years.
- For level 3, a program earns 3 points, if the retention rate of its completers averages at least 3 years but is less than 4.5 years.
- For level 2, a program earns 2 points, if the retention rate of its completers averages at least 2 years but is less than 3 years.
- For level 1, a program earns 1 point, if the retention rate of its completers averages less than 2 years.

### ***Slide 12 - Student Learning Growth Data Based on Performance of PreK-12 Students on Statewide Assessments***

This metric considers educators teaching in-field in prekindergarten through grade 12 classrooms for subject areas and grade levels that are assessed on statewide assessments. Rule language defines an in-field teacher as an instructional employee who is assigned to teach or provide direct support in the learning process of students in the subject area in which the instructional personnel is trained and certified. The other part of this metric uses data from the previous three-year period. For an example, this metric involves cohorts from 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12 employed in 2012-13 and who received a student learning growth score.

The metric, Performance of prekindergarten to grade 12 students on statewide assessments uses results of student learning growth based on:

1. the performance of p-12 students
2. assigned to in-field program completers
3. from the previous three-year period who received a student learning growth score
4. from the most recent academic year for which results are available.

***Slide 13 – Performance Targets for Students Performance on Statewide Assessments Using Student Learning Growth Formula***

There are four levels using the probability that the average student learning growth among students taught by program completers will meet the expectations for those students.

- For level 4, a program earns 4 points, if the probability that the average student learning growth among students taught by the program's completers exceeds the expectations for those students is greater than or equal to 95 percent.
- For level 3, a program earns 3 points, if the probability that the average student learning growth among students taught by the program's completers exceeds the expectations for those students is less than 5 percent AND falls short of the expectations for those students is less than 5 percent.
- Level 2 is not calculated for this performance metric.
- For level 1, a program earns 1 point, if the probability that the average student learning growth among students taught by the program's completers falls short of the expectations for those students is greater than or equals 95 percent.

***Slide 14 – Student Performance by Subgroup***

This metric uses students' performance, aggregated by student subgroups, as a measure of how well the teacher preparation program prepares teachers to work with a diverse population of students in a variety of settings in Florida public schools. The score indicates the average learning growth attained by students within the eight subgroups who take statewide standardized assessments in English/Language Arts in grades 4 through 10 and in Mathematics in grades 4 through 8. The score is based on in-field program completers from the previous three-year period who received a student learning growth score from the most recent academic year. At least four of the eight subgroups must be represented among the teaching assignments of program completers for a program to receive a rating on this measure.

The subgroups, defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), are students who are:

- Caucasian
- African American
- Hispanic
- Asian
- Native American

The subgroups also consider:

- Students who are receiving Free or Reduced Lunch
- Students with disabilities
- Students of limited English proficiency

***Slide 15 – Performance Targets for Student Performance by Subgroup***

- For level 4, a program earns 4 points if at least 75 percent of the subgroups meet or exceed the state standard for performance.
- For level 3, a program earns 3 points if at least 50 percent, but less than 75 percent of the subgroups meet or exceed the state standard for performance.
- For level 2, a program earns 2 points if at least 25 percent but less than 50 percent of the subgroups meet or exceed the state standard for performance.
- For level 1, a program earns 1 point if fewer than 25 percent of the subgroups exceed the state standard for performance

***Slide 16 - Program Completers' Annual Evaluations Results***

The next metric that makes up the summative rating score is the annual evaluations results of program completers employed in an instructional position in a Florida public school district. Scores are based on completers from the previous three-year period who received an annual evaluation rating from the most recent academic year. The rating is based on the number and percent of completers who are evaluated at each level:

- Highly Effective
- Effective
- Needs Improvement
- Developing
- Unsatisfactory

For an example, this metric would consider program completers of 2010-11, 2011-12 and 2012-13, who received an evaluation rating from 2013-2014.

***Slide 17 – Performance Targets for Results of program completers' annual evaluations***

- For level 4, a program earns 4 points, if
  - at least 30 percent of the program's completers received a highly effective rating, and
  - 90 to 100 percent of the program's completers received either highly effective or effective ratings, and
  - no completers were rated unsatisfactory.
- For level 3, a program earns 3 points, if
  - the program's completers did not meet criteria for Level 4, but
  - at least 80 percent of the program's completers received either highly effective or effective ratings, and
  - no completers were rated unsatisfactory.

- For level 2, a program earns 2 points, if
  - the program's completers did not meet criteria Level 3, but
  - at least 60 percent of the program's completers received a highly effective or effective rating, and
  - no more than 5 percent of the program's completers were rated unsatisfactory. There must be more than one completer if there are less than 20 completers total.
- For level 1, a program earns 1 point if the program's completers did not meet any of the criteria for target levels 2, 3 or 4.

***Slide 18 – Production of Program Completers in Critical Teacher Shortage Area - Bonus Only Metric***

The final metric is a bonus metric; therefore, programs earn bonus points if the program has increased the number of completers in a program that is deemed a critical teacher shortage area from the previous year. Currently, the critical teacher shortage subject areas are:

- Exceptional Student Education
- English/Language Arts
- Reading
- Sciences
- English for Speakers of Other Languages
- Foreign Languages
- Mathematics

***Slide 19 – Performance Targets for Production of program completers in statewide critical teacher shortage areas***

The bonus score of 4 points is earned when the number of program completers in a specified critical teacher shortage area increases from the most recent year compared to the number of program completers from the previous academic year. There must be a minimum of 2 completers in each year for this metric to apply to the program.

I will now cover how the summative rating score is calculated for a program. The first scenario is a program that does not meet the bonus metric for critical teacher shortage area. The second scenario is a program that does meet the bonus metric for critical teacher shortage area.

***Slide 20 – Calculating the Summative Rating Score for a Program that Does Not Meet Metric Six regarding a Critical Teacher Shortage Area***

For programs that are not eligible for the bonus metric, in other words, are not considered critical shortage area programs, the summative rating score becomes the average of all



performance target level scores for a program which will consist of between two (2) and five (5) performance targets).

Remember the minimum requirements for summative rating scores:

1. The program must have at least three (3) completers in the selected cohort time period for the Placement performance metric or Retention performance metric; and
2. The program must have at least two (2) or more completers who received an annual evaluation for the Annual Evaluation performance metric.
3. A program that does not receive an APPR receives a summative rating score of 1.0 for that year.

### ***Slide 21 – Elementary Education program as an Example***

Let's use an Elementary Education program as an example of a program's summative rating score without the bonus metric. I'll start with the Placement Rate. The program rates in the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile on placement rate which places the program in level 4. This earns 4 points. Next, the program averages 4 years for retention, which places the program at level 3 and earns 3 points. The program's student learning growth is at 96%, earning a level 4 or 4 points. The student learning aggregated by subgroup is at 75% or level 4 and again earns 4 points. Of the completers' annual evaluations, 82% of the completers earned Highly Effective or Effective, and no completers were rated unsatisfactory, and thus, earns 3 points. The critical shortage area metric does not apply and is not calculated.

The sum of the points earned, meaning 4+3+4+4+3 equals 18. Since the program was measured by five performance metrics, take the total number of points which is 18 and divide by the total number of metrics which is 5 giving an average of 3.6. This number is the summative rating score out of a total of 4.

### ***Slide 22 - Calculating the Summative Rating Score for a Program that Meets Metric Six-Shortage Area***

For programs that are eligible for the bonus metric, the summative rating score becomes the average of all performance target level scores for a program which will consist of the following calculations.

- the average of all other performance target level scores computed for the program (which will consist of between two (2) and five (5) performance targets)
- multiplied by 0.8,
- plus the bonus score of four (4) points
- multiplied by 0.2

***Slide 23 – Reading Program as an Example of a Summative Rating Score That Includes Metric Number Six (Production of Program Completers in Statewide Critical Teacher Shortage Areas)***

Let's use Reading as an example of a program's summative rating score with the bonus metric. Starting with the Placement Rate, the program rates in the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile, thus, placing this program in level 4. This earns 4 points. Next, the program averages 4 years for retention, which places the program at level 3 and earns 3 points. The program's student learning growth is at 96%, earning a level 4 or 4 points. The student learning aggregated by subgroup is at 75% or level 4 and again earns 4 points. Of the completers' annual evaluations, 82% of the completers earned Highly Effective or Effective and no completers were rated unsatisfactory, thus earns 3 points. Because Reading is a critical shortage area and therefore eligible for the metric, then calculate the difference in the number of completers reported most recently to the number of completers in the previous academic year. If a greater number of completers were reported than the previous year, then this bonus metric applies. In our example, the program had 8 more completers than the year before, thus earning 4 points.

Let's calculate the summative rating score for this program. Add the points earned for metrics one through five:  $4+3+4+4+3$  equals 18. Multiply this sum by .8 for a product of 14.4. Add the bonus score of 4 points for a total of 18.4 points. Then multiply this number by .2. This results in the summative rating score of 3.68 for this Reading program out of a total number of points possible, which is 4.

***Slide 24 – Contact Information***

This slide shows the contact information for the professionals in our office who are determined to help you succeed through this process.

***Slide 25 – Questions and Comments***

Now is your opportunity to ask your questions and we will be glad to respond with answers or feedback.

***Slide 26***

Thank you for your careful attention, thoughtful participation, and collaborative effort to meet the needs of preparing completers to become effective and highly effective educators.