The Indian River County District School Board met on Tuesday, December 4, 2012, at 9:00 a.m. The workshop was held in the Teacher Education Center located at the J.A. Thompson Administrative Center, 1990 25th Street, Vero Beach, Florida. School Board Members attending were: Chairman Carol Johnson, Vice Chairman Claudia Jiménez, and Board Members: Jeff Pegler, Matthew McCain, and Karen Disney-Brombach. Dr. Frances J. Adams, Superintendent of Schools, and School Board Attorney Suzanne D'Agresta were also present.

Overview of Florida's Value Added Model (VAM)
(Teacher Evaluation Process)

I.   Workshop was called to order by Chairman Johnson.

II.   Purpose of the Workshop – Dr. Adams
        Dr. Adams stated that the workshop was an opportunity to present an overview of the Value Added Model as part of the teacher evaluation process. She said that they would come back in January with details for Indian River County's teacher evaluation process.

III.   Presentation – Mr. Green
        Mr. Green walked the Board through where they were today. He said that the goal at this workshop was to define VAM and how it was used for teacher effectiveness score. Mr. Green explained the Florida State requirement as follows: New Standard for Teacher Evaluations included performance of students. As set forth in §1012.34(3)(a)1 of Florida Statutes, at least 50% of a performance evaluation must be based upon data and indicators of student learning growth assessed annually and measured by statewide assessments or, for subjects and grade levels not measured by statewide assessments, by District assessments as provided in §1008.22(8) of Florida Statutes.

        Mr. Green reviewed the test score models that were analyzed by the District. He detailed why the Value Added Models that contained individualized growth targets were chosen over the other two models. The Value Added Model was defined as a statistical model that used student-level growth scores to differentiate teacher performance in the area of student learning growth. Mr. Green stated that locally the District would further define how to utilize the information and the score.

        Mr. Green explained that Florida's Value Added Model was developed by Florida Educators through a committee of stakeholders to identify the type of model and the factors that should be accounted for in Florida's Value Added Models. The advantage of Value Added Models was in the design that mitigated the influence of differences among the entering classes by:

❖ Accounting for differences in student characteristics
❖ Setting individual growth targets per student based on prior performance and other factors
❖ No advantages or disadvantages simply as a result of the students assigned to a teacher.

To define the VAM's student performance process, Mr. Green explained how the student's growth target would be prepared. Factors used in the value added calculation included:

Student Characteristics
✓ Up to two prior years of achievement scores (the strongest predictor of student growth)
✓ Number of subject-relevant courses
✓ Disability status
✓ English language learner status
✓ Gifted status mobility
✓ Attendance
✓ Difference from modal age

Classroom Characteristics
✓ Class size
✓ Homogeneity of prior test scores

Student Characteristics NOT Directly Accounted in Calculating the Predicted Score
▪ Gender
▪ Race
▪ Ethnicity
▪ Socio-Economic Status

Mr. Green stated that the factors not used were not directly included in a teacher's VAM score. However, since these factors already influenced a student's performance, and prior performance was the predictor with the strongest weight, these factors were indirectly accounted for.

Predicted Student Score
✓ The score you would expect a student to achieve based on the student's performance on prior tests and other factors
✓ A predicted score for a student would be generated based on what would normally happen in an average class with a typical teacher
✓ The predicted score would be calculated in the current year as part of the model

Student Growth Score
✓ The difference between Current test score and Predicted test score

Teacher Components

Mr. Green explained how the VAM scores would be utilized in the teacher evaluation process. Teachers would receive credit for growth above what was expected in the average growth model. Mr. Green also explained the Presidential standard rating that would be used to adjust the teacher's score for a standard margin of error that would be the confidence factor to add a level of assurance for teachers. He reviewed what had been negotiated with the IRCEA Teachers' Union for 2011-2012.

IV.   Questions – Chairman Johnson

Board Members were given an opportunity to ask questions that included the areas of high stakes testing, targeting resources, student advantages of highly effective teachers, other factors not included, teacher fairness/uncertainty, alternative models, models for other classifications of teachers, current evaluation tool, new versus old, and presentation to teachers. Dr. Adams stated that more information would be brought to the Board at the January Information Session.

V.   ADJOURNMENT – Chairman Johnson

With no further business, the workshop adjourned at approximately 10:34 a.m.