Document #1 - A

Recommendations that Can be Implemented by Rulemaking or Policy Changes

| Culture Mark | Description | Statutory and | Statutory Change | The altern | |
|--|---|---------------------|---------------------------------|------------------|---|
| Subcommittee Work | Description | Rule Reference | Needed | Timeline | Commissioner Recommendation/ Rationale |
| Recommendations that Can Be Implement | | 1000.04 | | | |
| 1. In the learning gains calculation, | With minimum expected gains defined for students with FCAT 2.0 | s.1008.34 | No Sebeel avade statute | 2012 School | Recommended for rule amendment. |
| additional weight should be | scores as a year of expected growth on the FCAT 2.0 vertical scale, | Dula CA | School grade statute | Grades | (Commissioner's #4) |
| provided for students in level 1 and | vertical score increases beyond expected growth could be given | Rule 6A- 1.09981 | provides discretion | | Recommended only with substantial growth such that |
| 2 (FCAT) and levels 1, 2, and 3 (FAA) | added weight in the numerator of the calculation (e.g. a weighting | 1.09981 | to DOE on how to | | a student will make 4 years of gain within 3 years time. |
| who make gains beyond the minimum expected gains. | of 1.1 instead of 1.0). Defined values for minimum expected growth would be needed for students at FAA emergent levels. | | calculate learning gains per | | This provides an incentive to focus instructional effort on SWD and ELLs that are over represented in this |
| minimum expected gains. | Gains exceeding those values could be given added weight in the | | 1008.34(3)(b)1.b. | | group. The weight provided would be 1.1. |
| (21 Taskforce members indicated | numerator. | | 1008.54(5)(0)1.0. | | group. The weight provided would be 1.1. |
| • | | | | | |
| agreement) 2. Ensure appropriate resources for | Subcommittee felt strongly that to expect certain quality outputs | N/A | N/A | Ongoing | Recommended for consideration in budget and future |
| high quality instruction programs | and be accountable for those outcomes, one cannot lose sight of | N/A | N/A | Ongoing | board policy. |
| for ELLs | inputs – including resources, professional development, and | | | | The Commissioner is supportive of appropriate |
| | teacher preparation. | | | | resources for ELL programs. The State Board can |
| (16 Taskforce members indicated | | | | | consider this during budget discussions. |
| agreement) | | | | | |
| 3. Align assignment of weighted | With changes adopted for Rule 6A-1.09981, greater weight is given | Rule 6A- | No. Section | 2012 School | Not recommended for rule revision. |
| recognition for students taking FAA | for students taking the FCAT 2.0 who move up one or more levels | 1.09981 | 1008.34(3)(b)1 | Grade | The Commissioner believes that weighted points |
| with students taking FCAT | to level 4 and level 5. The subcommittee believes that a | 1.00001 | affords DOE | 0.000 | should be used sparingly and only when necessary to |
| (additional weight for FAA levels 4- | corresponding greater weighting for movement up to above- | | considerable | | affect a policy shift. |
| 6 and more additional weight for | grade-level performance should be applied to students taking the | | discretion in defining | | |
| FAA levels 7-9) | FAA. This change would be consistent with incentivizing higher | | the specifics of the 3 | | |
| , | performance applied to FCAT 2.0 scores. | | components of | | |
| (13 Taskforce members indicated | | | schools grades | | |
| agreement) | | | (performance, gains, | | |
| | | | improvement of low | | |
| | | | 25%) | | |
| 4. Look at growth/learning gains over | Learning gains would be calculated for students taking the FAA | Sections | No for school grades | 2012 or 2013 | Not recommended for rule revision. |
| a longer period of time (2+ years) | or, on a more limited basis for students who scored at emergent | 1008.34 and | under s. 1008.34; | School Grades | The Commissioner addresses learning gains for |
| | levels (1, 2, 3) by measuring gains over a two-year period instead | 1008.341, F.S., | | Implementing for | emergent level FAA students in the following |
| (12 Taskforce members indicated | of a single year. (This means that three years of scores would be | Rule 6A- | | the 2012 school | recommendation. |
| agreement) | needed instead of two years of scores.) The practice already | 1.09981 | | grade may delay | |
| | occurs for students at alternative schools, where three years of | (school | | the release of | |
| | scores are needed to compare two years of learning gains. The | grades) and | | school grades. | |
| | practice could be applied only in the regular school grading | 6A-1.099822 | | | |

| | | Statutory and | Statutory Change | | |
|--|--|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---|
| Subcommittee Work | Description | Rule Reference | Needed | Timeline | Commissioner Recommendation/ Rationale |
| Recommendations that Can Be Implement | nted by Rulemaking or Policy Changes | | | | |
| | calculation (in which three years of scores would be needed). A | (alternative | | | |
| | possible drawback to this practice would be that some students | school | | | |
| | would not be included if they did not have three years of scores. | ratings). | | | |
| | Or, the change could be drawn up to allow for learning gains to be | | | | |
| | calculated the regular way for students who did not have three | | | | |
| | years of scores. The rationale for the recommendation is that | | | | |
| | students taking the FAA, and especially students at the emergent | | | | |
| | levels, take longer than non-disabled students to be able to show | | | | |
| | progress. | | | | |
| 5. Review the number of points | The subcommittee expressed concerns that the FAA may not be | s. 1008.341 | No | 2012 School | Recommended for rule amendment. |
| required for students at level 1, 2, 3 | sensitive enough to measure growth and proficiency for students | Rule 6A- | | Grades | (Commissioner's Rec. # 1) |
| of Florida Alternate Assessment | with the most significant cognitive disabilities. | 1.09981 | | | The Commissioner's proposal is to use a gain of 5 |
| (FAA) to make learning gains and | | | | | points as the standard for a learning gain for students |
| proficiency. | | | | | who remain at FAA levels 1, 2, and 3. This is sensitive |
| | | | | | enough to reflect gains for students with severe |
| (11 Taskforce members indicated | | | | | cognitive disabilities and yet reflects a meaningful gain |
| agreement) | | | | | on the FAA. |
| 6. The state should develop a uniform | The subcommittee suggested that the use of a statewide, | ESEA | No; however a | Statewide IEP | Not recommended for rule revision. |
| statewide IEP. This form should | standards-based IEP allows for consistent monitoring of student | | statutory change | available now but | This would require a statutory change to implement. |
| include an additional section to | progress toward goals. There is currently a statewide electronic IEP | s. 1003.576 | would be necessary | districts are not | |
| measure the goals and objectives of | system that is being used by over 30 districts. The subcommittee | F.S. | to mandate the use | required to use it | |
| the IEP and how they fit into the | discussed including the IEP in the state accountability system (see | - 1000 34 F C | of a statewide IEP | | |
| state accountability system. | Goal 4). | s.1008.34 F.S. | form | | |
| (8 Taskforce members indicated | | Rule 6A- | | | |
| agreement) | | 1.09981 F.A.C. | | | |
| agreementy | | 1.055011.A.C. | | | |
| 7. Full inclusion means meaningful | This was the subcommittee's guiding principle in crafting | N/A | N/A | N/A | Commissioner supports full inclusion of ELL students. |
| participation that leads to accurate | recommendations not simply for the inclusion of a subset of ELLs | , | | | No rule change is anticipated at this time. |
| and fair measurement of English | in school accountability, but for all ELLs throughout the system. | | | | |
| Language Learner (ELL) | | | | | |
| achievement. | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

| | | | Statutory and | Statutory Change | | | | |
|---|--|---|---------------------|---|-----------------------|---|--|--|
| S | ubcommittee Work | Description | Rule Reference | Needed | Timeline | Commissioner Recommendation/ Rationale | | |
| R | Recommendations that Can Be Implemented by Rulemaking or Policy Changes | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Revised recommendation from Document 3 number 1. For the 2011-12 school year if the school grade preliminarily calculated for a school based on the points earned is more than one letter grade drop the points assigned shall be adjusted such that the school's letter grade is reduced by no more than one letter grade. | This is a revision of the recommendation in Document 3 number 1. This revised recommendation can be accomplished without statutory revision and helps in the transition to higher standards based on the FCAT, and the inclusion of EOC assessments as well as other changes to the grading rule. | Rule 6A- 1.09981 | Not as proposed because the proposal maintains the statutory elements of a school grade and includes an additional factor based upon last year's performance. | 2012 School Grades | Recommended for rule amendment. (Commissioner's Rec. # 3) This would help ease the transition to higher standards and allow schools an additional year to implement strategies designed to help students meet the new standards. | | |