## The School Board of Sarasota County Special Teachers are Rewarded (STAR) PLAN for 2006-2007

Pursuant to Sections 1012.22 and 1012.34, F.S., and the 2006 legislative proviso language, The School Board of Sarasota County developed this plan for submission to the State Board of Education for review and approval. An advisory committee, comprised of teachers, principals, central administrative staff, and union leadership worked collaboratively to design a comprehensive and equitable STAR Plan to identify and reward Sarasota County's highest performing $25 \%$ of instructional personnel with bonus pay as per the requirements of the STAR legislation.

All school-based instructional personnel, as defined by s.1012.01 (1) (a - d), F.S. at K -12 schools, are automatically eligible for consideration for STAR without the need to apply. As required, $50 \%$ of the STAR score is based on improved student achievement and $50 \%$ on the results of the annual appraisal of professional competencies.

The STAR Plan components, including the methodology for determining improved student achievement and the calculation of the top $25 \%$ of instructional personnel, are described in the identified sections below.

## Instructional Personnel Groupings

Working under the assumption that high quality, effective teachers can be found in all grade levels, content areas and types of schools, The School Board of Sarasota County made the determination to create meaningful instructional personnel groupings for the purpose of calculating STAR rankings. The advisory committee established divisions within each of the elementary, middle, and high school groups. They established further divisions based on teaching assignments in order to offset any effects that may result due to the use of different assessment tools and methods of calculating improved student achievement. In general, the district subdivided instructional personnel based on whether the individuals have classroom or non-classroom assignments. If they have classroom duties, the committee further delineated whether personnel teach FCAT tested subject areas or only non-FCAT tested subject areas. Finally, the committee further subdivided the instructional personnel groups by their primary courses (e.g., World History) or grade levels taught (e.g., grade 1), and the common assessments used for their students. Flow charts representing the groupings and subdivisions are provided in Appendix A.

## Assessments Used to Measure Student Achievement

In general, the primary assessment will be the FCAT Sunshine State Standards (SSS) for students in grades 3-11 who have FCAT SSS Reading, Mathematics, and/or Science results. In most cases, FCAT results from the prior year will serve as the "pretests" for the current year. Locally-administered commercial tests or district developed/procured end-ofyear subject area assessments will be used to assess students' performance in other
content areas, not measured by the FCAT, as well as for other grade levels that are not part of the state's FCAT program.

The summary charts in Appendix B provide the assessments to be used by grade and subject areas within elementary, middle, and high school levels.

## District-Developed Standardized Subject Area Exams

When FCAT data are not available, the district will develop and administer subject area exams. District work groups, comprised of curriculum and assessment staff and schoolsite subject area teachers, will design and develop or procure the district subject area exams. Established standards for test development and/or item selection will be followed at all phases, including test blueprint and item specification development, item writing and review, and test construction.

In 2006-07, student achievement on the end-of-course district exams will be determined based on the district value-added tables using students' prior year FCAT Achievement Level scores on the specified content area and the performance levels attained on the specified post assessment measures. (See Appendix B.)

## Methods to Determine "Gains" or Improved Student Achievement

The district will employ district-developed value added tables following the state's model. Value tables assign points based on each student's achievement by his/her change in relative performance status from one year to the next. In accordance with Value Theory, the committee chose to value significant improvements more highly than modest improvements. A decline in performance is attributed no value or represents a deduction. The district will develop value tables for FCAT subject areas and for all other non-FCAT areas.

## Value Tables

Based on actual student data, the District will create frequency tables to determine the likelihood of each student outcome, and value points will be set for each. For example, the following value points might correspond to the following outcomes: a student who scored a Level 1 in 2006 and then scores a Level 3 in 2007 would receive 350 points; a student who declines from a Level 4 to a Level 3 would receive (minus) -150 points, and a student who remains at a Level 1 is given zero (0) or no points. Each student will be associated with a value point based on his or her performance from one year to the next. Value points for students will then be linked to the teacher by a class or course and are summed and divided by the number of students in that particular class (or across sections of the same course for that teacher). Each teacher will be awarded an average value score for his/her primary course, subject area, or grade. To eliminate the differences in student outcomes due to the use of different assessment tools, teachers will be ranked (from lowest to highest) based on their value point "score" within the respective grouping of all other teachers who teach the same course. Each person's percentile ranking will later be converted to STAR points. An example of value table calculations for a high school
teacher based on his/her students' prior year FCAT their 2007 scores on the FCAT and the end-of-year exam scores is provided in Appendix C.

## Criteria for Analysis

Teachers' ratings will be based on their primary course groupings if there is a minimum of ten students with valid pre-and post assessment scores. An exception to the ten student minimum will be made for low frequency courses. For example, self-contained ESE teachers will be ranked on their students' performance regardless of class size. All teachers' student achievement ratings will be based on the students whom they instruct in the fourth quarter of the academic year. A student's score will be included in the analysis only if (1) that student was enrolled in the class for both FTE survey 2 and survey 3 (for annual non block courses); (2) the student was enrolled for FTE Survey 3 for second semester courses; or (3) the student was present more than 24 days of the fourth quarter for quarter classes.

All teachers and school-based instructional personnel will participate in STAR if they are actively employed for 91 or more instructional days for the academic year.

## Instructional Personnel Annual Appraisal System

The current Teacher Performance Appraisal System (TPAS) was formerly aligned with the requirements of the STAR program. There are six domains each for Classroom Teachers and Non-Classroom Teachers, as follows:

| CLASSROOM TEACHERS |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| I. Student Performance | I.NON-CLASSROOM TEACHERS <br> Instructional Impact on Student <br> Performance |
| II. Classroom Management | II. Program Management |
| III. Subject Area Knowledge and | III. Professional-Technical |
| Instructional Planning |  |
| IV. Delivery of Instruction and Use of and Planning |  |
| Technology in the Classroom | IV. Service Delivery and Use of |
| V. Evaluation of Instruction | V. Evaluation of Services |
| VI. Professional Behaviors | VI. Professional Behaviors and |
| Relationships |  |

The advisory committee updated the summative teacher assessment forms to identify the key dimensions and indicators that are aligned with Florida Statutory requirements, the Accomplished Practices, and NeXt Generation teacher performance behaviors (see Appendix D). There are four versions of the summative annual appraisal form for all Instructional Personnel:

1. TPAS Evaluation for Classroom Teachers, Level I (for all teachers employed on Annual Contracts).
2. TPAS Evaluation for Classroom Teachers, Level II (for all teachers employed on Professional Services Contracts).
3. TPAS Evaluation for Non-Classroom Instructional Personnel, Level I (for all instructional personnel who do not have classroom duties and have not yet received their Professional Service Contract).
4. TPAS Evaluation for Non-Classroom Instructional Personnel, Level II (for all instructional personnel who do not have classroom duties and are employed on a Professional Services Contract).

The District has identified specific indicators for each of the domains for the two groups of instructional personnel: classroom teachers and instructional personnel with nonclassroom duties (e.g., data, literacy, and technology coaches; guidance counselors, school psychologists, etc.).

TPAS Rating Categories and Evaluation Criteria
The TPAS evaluates teacher performance based on their demonstrated competencies in the six domains listed above. Each of the six areas will be evaluated and rated based on five performance levels: Outstanding, Excellent, Satisfactory, Needs Improvement, and Unsatisfactory.

The advisory committee developed rubrics to define expectations for classroom and nonclassroom teaching personnel. These will be used to assist administrators with the performance appraisal process. The rubrics illustrate the distinctions for the five performance levels.

Each performance level is associated with a numerical rating. The District will sum across the indicators and domains for a total number of points on the annual appraisal. The District will rank each person based on the total number of points received within elementary, middle, and high school levels for each TPAS instructional group.

## Computing the Total STAR Score

Each instructional personnel member will have two equally weighted components which comprise the total STAR score: a student achievement component and an annual appraisal component. The percentile ranking for the student achievement component and the annual appraisal component are converted to a STAR Point Value using the Percentile Ranking to STAR Point Conversion Table.

| Percentile Ranking to STAR Point Conversion |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentile Ranking | STAR Points Awarded | Percentile Ranking | STAR Points Awarded |
| $99^{\text {th }}$ | 500 | $74{ }^{\text {th }}$ | 250 |
| $98^{\text {th }}$ | 490 | $73^{\text {rd }}$ | 240 |
| $97^{\text {th }}$ | 480 | $72^{\text {nd }}$ | 230 |
| $96{ }^{\text {th }}$ | 470 | $71^{\text {st }}$ | 220 |
| $95^{\text {th }}$ | 460 | $70^{\text {th }}$ | 210 |
| $94^{\text {th }}$ | 450 | $69^{\text {th }}$ | 200 |
| $93^{\text {rd }}$ | 440 | $68^{\text {th }}$ | 190 |
| $92^{\text {nd }}$ | 430 | $67^{\text {th }}$ | 180 |
| $91^{\text {st }}$ | 420 | $66^{\text {th }}$ | 170 |
| $90^{\text {th }}$ | 410 | $65^{\text {th }}$ | 160 |
| $89^{\text {th }}$ | 400 | $64^{\text {th }}$ | 150 |
| $88^{\text {th }}$ | 390 | $63^{\text {rd }}$ | 140 |
| $87^{\text {th }}$ | 380 | $62^{\text {nd }}$ | 130 |
| $86^{\text {th }}$ | 370 | $61^{\text {st }}$ | 120 |
| $85^{\text {th }}$ | 360 | $60^{\text {th }}$ | 110 |
| $84^{\text {th }}$ | 350 | $59^{\text {th }}$ | 100 |
| $83^{\text {rd }}$ | 340 | $58^{\text {th }}$ | 90 |
| $82^{\text {nd }}$ | 330 | $57^{\text {th }}$ | 80 |
| $81^{\text {st }}$ | 320 | $56^{\text {th }}$ | 70 |
| $80^{\text {th }}$ | 310 | $55^{\text {th }}$ | 60 |
| $79^{\text {th }}$ | 300 | $54^{\text {th }}$ | 50 |
| $78^{\text {th }}$ | 290 | $53^{\text {rd }}$ | 40 |
| $77^{\text {th }}$ | 280 | $52^{\text {nd }}$ | 30 |
| $76^{\text {th }}$ | 270 | $51^{\text {st }}$ | 20 |
| $75^{\text {th }}$ | 260 | $50^{\text {th }}$ | 10 |
|  |  | $49^{\text {th }}$ and below | 0 |

For each instructional personnel member, the total number of STAR points awarded based on the results of the annual appraisal component $(0-500)$ will be added to the total
number of STAR points awarded on the student improvement component (0 $0-500$ ), to create the Total STAR score (0-1000).

| Student Achievement |  | Annual Appraisal <br> STAR Points | STAR Points <br> Possible $0-500$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Possible $0-500$ |  |  | TOTAL STAR SCORE |
|  |  |  |  |

An example of the process used to determine the total STAR score for a $5^{\text {th }}$ grade teacher is shown in Appendix $E$.

## Identifying Top 25\% for STAR Bonus

The District will rank personnel based on the Total STAR Score within elementary, middle, and high school levels. All instructional personnel, who have no more than one satisfactory rating (on the STAR designated indicators) and no rating of "needs improvement" (N) or "unsatisfactory" (U) on their 2006-07 annual appraisal, will be eligible for consideration of the STAR award. As per 1012.34, F.S. and the STAR proviso language, instructional personnel who have received a N, U, or more than one satisfactory rating on the annual appraisal are not eligible for the STAR award and will be removed from the ranked list. Instructional personnel whose Total STAR Score is in the top 25\% of the elementary, middle, and high school levels will receive the STAR award. The flow chart diagram on the next page below depicts the process.

## The School Board of Sarasota County Process to Identify STAR - Eligible Instructional Personnel



## Distribution of STAR Awards

STAR awards shall be distributed from the district's STAR allocation for 2006-07. All instructional personnel who meet the STAR requirements and are ranked in the top $25 \%$ will receive a STAR award. The dollar amount of the award will be equal to five percent ( $5 \%$ ) of the individual's annual base salary. If the allocated dollars exceed funding requirements for the top $25 \%$, the additional funds will be distributed in equal amounts, not to exceed $5 \%$ of the individuals' base salary, to instructional personnel whose total STAR score ranked $26^{\text {th }}$ at the elementary, middle, and high school levels. Remaining funds will then be distributed to the next percentage of top performing instructional personnel. This process will continue until all STAR funds are exhausted. The STAR awards are NOT eligible to be credited towards retirement.

Personnel who are eligible to receive the STAR awards will be notified no later than June 30, 2007. Eligibility for the STAR award is determined annually.

## APPENDIX A

## Instructional Personnel Groupings

Elementary, Middle, and High School Levels

## ELEMENTARY INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL GROUPINGS


*Teachers will be linked by course code to their primary areas of instruction for grouping purposes.
**The non-FCAT tested teacher groups listed are not exhaustive.

*Teachers will be linked by course code to their primary areas of instruction for grouping purposes. **The non-FCAT tested teacher groups listed are not exhaustive.

## APPENDIX A-3

HIGH SCHOOL INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL GROUPINGS

*Teachers will be linked by course code to their primary areas of instruction for grouping purposes. **The non-FCAT tested teacher groups listed are not exhaustive.

## APPENDIX B

2006-2007 Assessments and Methods
To Determine Improved Student Achievement
Elementary, Middle, and High School

2006-2007 ASSESSMENTS \& METHODS TO DETERMINE IMPROVED STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT ELEMENTARY

| Grade/subject area/ course | Pre - Assessment | Post - Assessment | Method to determine gains or improved achievement * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade K <br> Reading | DIBELS | Oral Reading Fluency (ORF) Readers <br> DIBELS - Non Readers | Value Table based on Fall Pre-test of Kindergarten DIBELS to Spring post-test of DIBELS /ORF |
| Grade 1 <br> Reading and Mathematics | ORF | Stanford Achievement Test, $9^{\text {th }}$ Ed. (SAT - 9) Norm-referenced Test (NRT) Reading and Mathematics | Value Table based on 2006 ORF to 2007 Grade 1 SAT Reading; Value Table based on 2006 ORF to 2007 Grade 1 SAT Math. Results of the reading and math value tables will each contribute $1 / 2$ toward the weighted average value score. |
| Grade 2 <br> Reading and Mathematics | SAT-9 NRT <br> Reading and Mathematics (ORF for students lacking SAT scores) | SAT-9 NRT Reading and Mathematics | Value Table based on 2006 Grade 1 SAT to 2007 Grade 2 SAT Reading; Value Table based on 2006 SAT to 2007 Grade 2 SAT Math. Results of the reading and math value tables will each contribute $1 / 2$ toward the weighted average value score. |
| Grade 3 <br> Reading and Mathematics | SAT - 9 NRT Reading and Mathematics | FCAT Sunshine State Standards (SSS) Reading and Mathematics | Value Table based on 2006 Grade 2 SAT to 2007 Grade 3 SAT Reading; Value Table based on 2006 SAT to 2007 Grade 3 SAT Math. Results of the reading and math value tables will each contribute $1 / 2$ toward the weighted average value score. |
| Retained Grade 3 <br> Reading and Mathematics | SAT - 10 NRT <br> Reading and <br> Mathematics | FCAT SSS Reading and Mathematics | Value Table based on 2006 Grade 3 SAT to 2007 Grade 3 FCAT Reading; Value Table based on 2006 SAT to 2007 Grade 3 SAT Math. Results of the reading and math value tables will each contribute $1 / 2$ toward the weighted average value score. |
| Grades 4 and 5 Reading and Mathematics | FCAT SSS Reading and Mathematics | FCAT SSS Read and Mathematics | Value Table based on 2006 grades 3/4 FCAT to 2007 grades 4/5 FCAT Reading; Value Table based on 2006 grades $3 / 4$ FCAT to 2007 grades $4 / 5$ FCAT Math. Results of the reading and math value tables will each contribute $1 / 2$ toward the weighted average value score. |


| Elementary School Continued |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade/subject area/ course | Pre - Assessment | Post - Assessment | Method to determine gains or improved achievement * |
| Grades 4 and 5 <br> Reading Only <br> Science Only <br> Social Studies Only | FCAT SSS Reading | FCAT SSS Reading | Value Table based on 2006 grades 3/4 FCAT Reading to 2007 grades $4 / 5$ FCAT Reading. |
| Grades 4 and 5 Mathematics Only | FCAT SSS Mathematics | FCAT SSS Mathematics | Value Table based on grades $3 / 4$ Spring 2006 FCAT to grades 4/5 Spring 2007 FCAT Mathematics. |
| Special Areas: <br> Music, Art, PE, Foreign <br> Language, Dance, Drama | FCAT SSS Reading | District-developed subject area end-of-year (EOY) exam and FCAT SSS Reading | Value Table based on 2006 FCAT Reading to 2007 FCAT Reading; Value Table based on 2006 FCAT Reading to 2007 EOY subject area exam. Results of the reading and subject area value tables will each contribute $1 / 2$ toward the weighted average value score. |
| ESE (non-FCAT and FCAT Tested) | Alternate <br> Assessment (AA) or FCAT grades 3 -4, or SAT grade 2 <br> Reading and Mathematics | Alternate Assessment (AA) or FCAT SSS, grades 3-5 Reading and Mathematics | Value Table based on 2006 AA or FCAT Reading to 2007 AA or FCAT Reading; Value Table based on 2006 AA or FCAT Math to 2007 AA or FCAT Math; Results of the reading and math area value tables will each contribute $1 / 2$ toward the weighted average value score. The combined average will also be weighted by the proportion of students with AA and FCAT outcome scores. |
| Not linked to course code: <br> (e.g., Behavioral <br> Specialist, Guidance Counselor, ESE Liaison, Literacy Coach, Data Coach, IT Coach, Schoo Psychologist, Reading Coach, Media Specialist, Home School Liaison, Social Workers) | FCAT SSS Reading and Mathematics | FCAT SSS Reading and Mathematics | Value Table based on 2006 grades $3 / 4$ FCAT to 2007 grades $4 / 5$ FCAT Reading for all students school-wide; Value Table based on 2006 grades $3 / 4$ FCAT to 2007 grades $4 / 5$ FCAT Math for all students school-wide. Results of the reading and math value tables will each contribute $1 / 2$ toward the weighted average value score. |
| * Classroom teachers: Data is included for students for whom instructional personnel have specific responsibilities. Non-classroom instructional personnel: Data is included for all students school-wide. |  |  |  |

2006-2007 ASSESSMENTS \& METHODS TO DETERMINE IMPROVED STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT MIDDLE SCHOOL

| Subject area/ <br> course | Grade | Pre - Assessment | Method to determine gains or improved <br> achievement * Assessment |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Language Arts | Grade 6-8 | FCAT SSS <br> Reading | FCAT SSS Reading | Value Table based on 2006 grades 5/6/7 FCAT <br> Reading to 2007 grades 6/7/8/ FCAT Reading. |
| Mathematics | Grades 6-8 | FCAT SSS <br> Mathematics | FCAT SSS Mathematics | Value Table based on 2006 grades 5/6/7 FCAT <br> Mathematics to 2007 grades 6/7/8/ FCAT <br> Mathematics. |
| Social Studies | Grade 6-8 | FCAT SSS <br> Reading | FCAT SSS Reading and <br> District Social Studies <br> EOY exam | Value Table based on 2006 grades 5/6/7 FCAT <br> Reading to 2007 6/7/8/ FCAT Reading; Value Table <br> based on 2006 FCAT Reading to 2007 EOY social <br> studies exam. Results of the reading and subject area <br> value tables will each contribute $1 / 2$ toward the <br> weighted average value score. |
| Science | Grade 6 and 7 | FCAT SSS <br> Reading | FCAT SSS Reading and <br> District EOY Science <br> exam | Value Table based on 2006 grades 5/6 FCAT Reading <br> to 2007 grades 6/7 FCAT Reading; Value Table <br> based on 2006 FCAT Reading to 2007 EOY science <br> exam. Results of the reading and subject area value <br> tables will each contribute $1 / 2$ toward the weighted <br> average value score. |


| Middle School Continued |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Subject area/ course | Grade | Pre - Assessment | Post - Assessment | Method to determine gains or improved achievement* |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { ESE } \\ & \text { (non-FCAT and } \\ & \text { FCAT Tested) } \end{aligned}$ | All Grades | Alternate Assessment (AA) or FCAT, Reading and Mathematics | Alternate Assessment (AA) or FCAT, Reading and Mathematics | Value Table based on 2006 AA or FCAT to 2007 AA or FCAT Reading. Value Table based on 2006 AA or FCAT to 2007 AA or FCAT Math. Reading and Mathematics will each contribute 50 percent toward a weighted average value score. The combined average will also be weighted by the proportion of students with AA and FCAT outcome scores. |
| Not linked to course code: <br> (e.g. Guidance Counselor, Data Coach, ESE Liaison, ESOL Liaison, IT Coach, Literacy Coach, Math Coach, School Social Worker, School Psychologist, Media Specialist, Behavior Specialist, Home School Liaison) | n/a | FCAT SSS Reading and Mathematics | FCAT SSS Reading and Mathematics | Value Table based on 2006 grades 5/6/7 FCAT to 2007 grades 6/7/8 FCAT Reading for all students school-wide; Value Table based on 2006 grades 5/6/7 FCAT to 2007 grades 6/7/8 FCAT Math for all students school-wide. Results of the reading and math value tables will each contribute $1 / 2$ toward the weighted average value score. |
| *Classroom teachers: Data is included for students for whom instructional personnel have specific responsibilities. Non-classroom instructional personnel: Data is included for all students school-wide. |  |  |  |  |

2006-2007 ASSESSMENTS \& METHODS TO DETERMINE IMPROVED STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT HIGH SCHOOL

| Subject area/ course | Grades | Pre - Assessment | Post - Assessment | Method to determine gains or improved achievement * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Language Arts | 9 \& 10 | FCAT SSS Reading | FCAT SSS Reading | Value Table based on 2006 grades 8/9 FCAT Reading to 2007 grades $9 / 10$ FCAT Reading. |
|  | 11 \& 12 | FCAT SSS Reading | District Lang Arts EOY exam | Value Table based on 2005 or 2006 grade 10 FCAT Reading to 2007 EOY Language Arts exam at the appropriate grade level |
| Mathematics | 9 \& 10 | FCAT SSS Mathematics | FCAT SSS Mathematics | Value Table based on 2006 grades 8/9 FCAT Mathematics to 2007 grades 9/10 FCAT Mathematics |
|  | 11 \& 12 | FCAT SSS Mathematics | District Mathematics EOY exam | Value Table based on 2005 or 2006 grade 10 FCAT Mathematics to 2007 EOY Math exam at the appropriate grade level |
| Social Studies | 9 \& 10 | FCAT SSS Reading | District Social Studies EOY exam and FCAT Reading | Value Table based on 2006 grade 8/9 FCAT Reading to 2007 grades 9/10 Reading; and Value Table based on 2006 grade 8/9 FCAT Reading to 2007 EOY Social Studies exam at the appropriate grade level. Results of the reading and subject area value tables will each contribute $1 / 2$ toward the weighted average value score. |
| Social Studies | 11 \& 12 | FCAT SSS Reading | District Social Studies EOY exam | Value Tables based on Spring FCAT 2006 Reading and performance level on the district EOY Social Studies exam |
| Science | 9-10 | FCAT SSS Reading | District Science EOY exam and FCAT SSS Reading | Value Table based on 2006 grade 8/9 FCAT Reading to 2007 grades 9/10 Reading; and Value Table based on 2006 grade 8/9 FCAT Reading to 2007 EOY Science exam at the appropriate grade level. Results of the reading and subject area value tables will each contribute $1 / 2$ toward the weighted average value score. |

High School Continued

| Subject area/ course | Grades | Pre - Assessment | Post - Assess. | Method to determine improved achiev. * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Science | 11 | FCAT SSS Reading | FCAT SSS Science | Value Table based 2006 grade 10 FCAT Reading to 2007 Grade 11 FCAT Science |
|  | 12 | FCAT SSS Science | District Science EOY exam | Value Table based on 2006 grade 11 FCAT Science to 2007 grade 12 District EOY Science Exam |
| Electives: <br> (e.g., Art, Dance, Music, <br> Foreign, Language, <br> Health, P.E., ROTC, <br> Drivers Education, <br> Computer Education, <br> Library/Media) | ALL Grades | FCAT SSS Reading | District-developed EOY exam specific to subject area | Value Table based on 2006 grades 8/9/10 FCAT Reading to 2007 9/10/11/12 EOY subject area studies exam. Results of the reading and subject area value tables will each contribute $1 / 2$ toward the weighted average value score. |
| All Grades | ESE (non-FCAT and FCAT) | Alternate Assessment (AA) and FCAT | Alternate Assessment (AA) and FCAT | Value Table based on 2006 AA or FCAT to 2007 AA or FCAT Reading. Value Table based on 2006 AA or FCAT to 2007 AA or FCAT Math. Reading and Mathematics will each contribute 50 percent toward a weighted average value score. The combined average will also be weighted by the proportion of students with AA and FCAT outcome scores |
| Not linked to course code: (e.g., Guidance Counselor, Data Coaches, ESE Liaison, ESOL Liaison, IT Coach, Literacy Coach, Mathematics Coach, School Social Worker, School Psychologist, Media Spec., Behavior Spec., Resource Teacher, Home School Liaison) | NA | FCAT SSS Reading and Mathematics | FCAT SSS Reading and Mathematics | Value Table based on 2006 grades 8/9 FCAT to 2007 grades $9 / 10$ FCAT Reading for all students school-wide; Value Table based on 2006 grades $8 / 9$ FCAT to 2007 grades 9/10 FCAT Math for all students school-wide. Results of the reading and math value tables will each contribute $1 / 2$ toward the weighted average value score. |

*Classroom teachers: Data is included for students for whom instructional personnel have specific responsibilities.
Non-classroom instructional personnel: Data is included for all students school-wide.

## APPENDIX C

## Sample Value Table Calculation

High School World History Teacher

## SAMPLE VALUE TABLE CALCULATION for a

HIGH SCHOOL WORLD HISTORY TEACHER with 96 10th GRADE STUDENTS


VALUE SCORE $=$ WEIGHTED AVERAGE $=(152 * 96)+(105 * 89) / 185=129$

* Multiply the number of students each Outcome Cell (i.e. frequency) by the Value of Each Outcome to Calculate the Value Points. (e.g. 3 Students X 455 Value $=1365$ Value Points).


## APPENDIX D

## DRAFT Instructional Annual Evaluation Forms

- Instructional Annual Evaluation - Level I
- Instructional Annual Evaluation - Level II
- Non-Classroom Instructional Annual Evaluation - Level I
- Non-Classroom Instructional Annual Evaluation - Level II


## TPAS



## TPAS

INSTRUCTIONAL ANNUAL EVALUATION - LEVEL II


## TPAS

NON-CLASSROOM INSTRUCTIONAL ANNUAL EVALUATION - LEVEL I


## NON-CLASSROOM INSTRUCTIONAL ANNUAL EVALUATION - LEVEL II



## Appendix E

## Calculating Total STAR Score:

Example for a $5^{\text {th }}$ grade classroom teacher

## APPENDIX E <br> Calculating Total STAR Score: Example for a $5^{\text {th }}$ grade classroom teacher

Scenario: $5^{\text {th }}$ grade classroom teacher with 26 grade five students. She is responsible for providing instruction in language arts and mathematics to her students.

## Step 1. Determine Student Achievement Component

- The students' scores are analyzed using a value table to assign points for Achievement Level improvements made from the 2006 to the 2007 FCAT, separately for Reading and Mathematics. The points earned for reading and math on the FCAT value tables are combined and weighted (so they each count $1 / 2$ of the total).
- The teacher receives a combined weighted average value point score of 137 , which is her Student Achievement Component.
- Compared to all other $5^{\text {th }}$ grade classroom teachers whose students have FCAT data, 137 falls at the $87^{\text {th }}$ percentile rank.
- A percentile rank of 87 corresponds to 380 STAR points.


## Step 2. Determine Annual Appraisal Component

- Summing the rating scores across all the TPAS indicators, the teacher received a total of 118 points on her annual TPAS evaluation.
- Her TPAS final rating is ranked at the $97^{\text {th }}$ percentile among all other elementary teachers. The $97^{\text {th }}$ percentile converts to 480 STAR points.


## Step 3. Calculate Total STAR Score

- Sum the STAR points accrued on each component to determine the total STAR score:

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
\text { Student Achievement STAR points } & 380 \\
\text { Annual Appraisal STAR pts } & +\quad 480 \\
\hline \text { Total STAR Score } & 860
\end{array}
$$

## Step 4. Ensure that teacher is eligible for STAR consideration

This teacher did not receive "Needs Improvement" or "Unsatisfactory" ratings on any indicator on her TPAS and no more that one "Satisfactory" rating, so she is eligible for STAR.

## Step 5. Determine if Teacher is in the Top $\mathbf{2 5 \%}$

Compared to all other $5^{\text {th }}$ grade classroom teachers across all elementary schools whose students' gains were determined on the same assessment:

- A total STAR Score of 860 falls within the top $25 \%$.
- In this example, the $5^{\text {th }}$ grade teacher will receive the STAR award.

