

Differentiated Accountability – BPAA  
Recommendation

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) released a memorandum to Superintendents on July 13, 2009 titled *Administration Changes in Low-Performing Schools*. This memorandum outlined a methodology that districts should use when determining principal replacement specifically at Intervene, Correct II-F, Correct II-D, and D former F schools.

Therefore, the following represents a draft attempt to construct a fair and comprehensive methodology for determining principal effectiveness beginning in 2009-10, not only at Differentiated Accountability (DA) schools as required by the state, but for schools districtwide. The measures in the BPAA Proposed Method are based solely on principal feedback during workshops in January through March 2010. Note that this method does not replace current principal evaluation procedures, and is not presently tied to any pay-for-performance plan. Feedback from principals suggested that a principal be eligible for rotation only after having been employed at the same position at the same school site for three consecutive years. In addition, no actions would be taken against the principal until the third year. Finally, charter schools were not included in this analysis.

**FDOE Memorandum Method**

In the attached memorandum, the Florida Department of Education (FDOE) outlined several instances in which a change in school leadership should be made at Intervene, Correct II-F, Correct II-D, and D former F schools. Following are the criteria detailed in the memorandum.

*“The following guidelines should be considered when determining if a change in leadership is necessary:*

- *The school grade declines or there is consistent failure (D or F) under the same leadership for 2 years – The principal should be replaced.*
- *The school grade declines under the same leadership for 1 year and the percentage of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Criteria Met decreases – The principal should be replaced.*
- *The school grade declines under the same leadership for 1 year and the learning gains in reading and mathematics declines – The principal should be replaced.”*

**Simulation Results**

**2005-06 – 10 schools districtwide**

**2006-07 – 66 schools districtwide**

**2007-08 – 26 schools districtwide; 6 schools per FDOE memorandum definition\*** (Larkdale Elem, Martin Luther King Elem, North Side Elem, Sunland Park Elem, Arthur Ashe Mid, Coconut Creek High)

**2008-09 – 21 schools districtwide; 9 schools per FDOE memorandum definition\*** (North Fork Elem, Sunland Park Elem, Blanche Ely High, Boyd Anderson High, Coconut Creek High, Coral Springs High, Dillard High, Hollywood Hills High, South Plantation High)

**\* Note that the FDOE memorandum only recommended principal replacement at the following schools: Intervene, Correct II-F, Correct II-D, and D former F schools. These designations began in 2007-08.**



**BPAA Proposed Method<sup>1</sup>**

- Principal is given three years to improve student performance measures
- Includes AYP Criteria Met, Learning Gains in Mathematics, Learning Gains in Reading, and School Grades
- Represents slight variation to methods included for principal replacement in FDOE memorandum

Year 1 to Year 3 Analysis – 4 Performance Criteria

1. School grade increases, or is ‘C’ or above (without a drop from ‘A’ or ‘B’ to ‘C’).
2. AYP Criteria Met increases or maintains.
3. Learning gains in Math:
  - Are above 80%,
  - Do not decrease 10 or more percentage points if between 60% and 79%, or
  - Increase or maintain, if below 60%.
4. Learning gains in Reading:
  - Are above 80%,
  - Do not decrease 10 or more percentage points if between 60% and 79%, or
  - Increase or maintain, if below 60%.

Quadrant 1 - Principal remains at the school if from Year 1 to Year 3:

The school met 4 out of 4 performance criteria

Simulated Results 2009: 106 schools (76 elementary, 15 middle, 15 high)

Simulated Results 2008: 81 schools (54 elementary, 12 middle, 15 high)

Simulated Results 2007: 109 schools (82 elementary, 16 middle, 11 high)

Simulated Results 2006: 139 schools (87 elementary, 29 middle, 23 high)

Quadrant 2 - Principal remains at the school if from Year 1 to Year 3:

The school met 3 out of 4 performance criteria

Simulated Results 2009: 81 schools (46 elementary, 26 middle, 9 high)

Simulated Results 2008: 71 schools (41 elementary, 22 middle, 8 high)

Simulated Results 2007: 58 schools (35 elementary, 13 middle, 10 high)

Simulated Results 2006: 44 schools (29 elementary, 10 middle, 5 high)

Quadrant 3 - Principal remains at the school, provides review of factors, and requests targeted assistance, if from Year 1 to Year 3:

The school met 1 or 2 out of 4 performance criteria

Simulated Results 2009: 21 schools (15 elementary, 0 middle, 6 high)

Simulated Results 2008: 46 schools (33 elementary, 6 middle, 7 high)

Simulated Results 2007: 32 schools (13 elementary, 10 middle, 9 high)

Simulated Results 2006: 17 schools (16 elementary, 0 middle, 1 high)

Quadrant 4 - Possible rotation of principal would be recommended after further analysis if from Year 1 to Year 3:

The school met 0 out of 4 performance criteria

Simulated Results 2009: Zero schools (0 elementary, 0 middle, 0 high)

Simulated Results 2008: 9 schools (8 elementary, 1 middle, 0 high)

---

<sup>1</sup> Simulations are based on cohorts “Year 1 to Year 3” from 2003-04 to 2008-09

Simulated Results 2007: 7 schools (6 elementary, 1 middle, 0 high)

Simulated Results 2006: 1 school (1 elementary, 0 middle, 0 high)

#### Further Analysis for Quadrant 4

Additional analysis would be performed for schools that were in Quadrant 4 from Year 1 to Year 3 to determine if these schools exhibited systemic declines for each year under the same principal. The following simulated results show outcomes from Year 1 to 2 and Year 2 to 3 for these Quadrant 4 schools. Note that zero schools fell into Quadrant 4 for all three data reviews (Year 1 to 3, Year 2 to 3, and Year 1 to 2).

Simulated Results 2008 Year 2 to 3: 3 schools (North Side Elem, Peters Elem, and Plantation Elem)

Simulated Results 2008 Year 1 to 2: 3 schools (Collins Elem, Park Ridge Elem, and Arthur Ashe Middle)

Simulated Results 2007 Year 2 to 3: 3 schools (Collins Elem, North Fork Elem, and McNicol Middle)

Simulated Results 2007 Year 1 to 2: 1 school (Dillard Elem)

Simulated Results 2006 Year 2 to 3: 1 school (Dillard Elem)

Simulated Results 2006 Year 1 to 2: Zero schools

#### Factors

These are the factors that may impact the ability of the principals to meet the requirements set. If a principal does not meet the student achievement requirements under the method, the principal would provide a review of how the factors negatively impacted the school's specific student achievement deficiencies, and would also request targeted assistance to improve these deficiencies.

1. Student demographic changes
  - Due to boundary modifications
  - Due to influx of Choice students
  - Other circumstances related to changes in student demographics (i.e., loss of Title I status)
2. Employment issues
  - Staff mobility
  - Teacher qualifications
  - Open positions for long periods of time
  - Staff personal issues (i.e., leave of absence, maternity leave)
3. Extenuating circumstances
  - Emergencies (i.e., hurricanes, serious negative events)
  - Facilities issues (i.e., construction issues, building issues)

**Rubric Year 1 to 3**

<p><u>Quadrant 1:</u></p> <p><u>Criteria:</u> Meets 4 out of 4 criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> School Grades</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> AYP Criteria Met</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Learning Gains Math</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Learning Gains Read</li> </ul> <p><u>Outcome:</u> Principal remains at the school</p>	<p><u>Quadrant 2:</u></p> <p><u>Criteria:</u> Meets 3 out of 4 criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> School Grades</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> AYP Criteria Met</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Learning Gains Math</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Learning Gains Read</li> </ul> <p><u>Outcome:</u> Principal remains at the school</p>
<p><u>Quadrant 3:</u></p> <p><u>Criteria:</u> Meets 1 or 2 out of 4 criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> School Grades</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> AYP Criteria Met</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Learning Gains Math</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Learning Gains Read</li> </ul> <p><u>Outcome:</u> Principal remains at the school; provides review of factors and requests targeted assistance</p>	<p><u>Quadrant 4:</u></p> <p><u>Criteria:</u> Meets 0 out of 4 criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> School Grades</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> AYP Criteria Met</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Learning Gains Math</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Learning Gains Read</li> </ul> <p><u>Outcome:</u> Possible rotation of principal after further analysis</p>