



Contract Addendum

Performance Matters' FASTe (Formative Action System for Teacher Effectiveness)

This Contract Addendum ("Addendum") amends and supplements that certain Contract Addendum ("Agreement") between PERFORMANCE MATTERS, LLC ("PMI") and the School Board of Clay County ("the CUSTOMER") dated April 14, 2011. The purpose of this Addendum is to set forth the terms upon which PMI will supply to CUSTOMER, Multi Measure Reports (MMRs) via FASTe.

PMI and CUSTOMER agree as follows:

1. Effect of Addendum. The Agreement remains in full force and effect according to its terms. Capitalized terms used in this Addendum shall have the meaning set forth in the Agreement unless a different meaning is clearly indicated herein.

The terms of the Agreement shall continue to apply to the Services described in the Agreement, without reference to this Addendum. The terms of the Agreement also shall apply to the MMRs and other FASTe services provided hereunder, except to the extent such terms conflict with the provisions of this Addendum. To the extent of any such conflict, the provisions of this Addendum shall prevail with respect to the MMRs and other FASTe services provided hereunder.

2. Data. Any and all data relating to the MMR, including that data referenced in Attachment A, will be provided to PMI by CUSTOMER. CUSTOMER will provide the rubric for any observations and other effectiveness assessments desired by CUSTOMER. Through its FASTe system, PMI will store such data, provide analytics for the data, and make such data accessible to CUSTOMER's designated users via the MMR. Any external data feeds provided in support of the FASTe format by CUSTOMER to PMI shall be provided in a format agreed upon by the parties.
3. Professional Evaluations. In connection with certain state and federal programs, including the Race to the Top Federal grant, it is contemplated that the data and formulae provided by Customer to PMI in connection with the MMR will include those relating to professional evaluations of teachers employed by Customer. Customer and the union representing Customer's teachers have jointly determined factors, and the weighting thereof, to be used in such professional evaluations, and PMI has had no role in such determination.

For avoidance of doubt, the parties agree that Customer is solely responsible for determining and providing to PMI the factors and the weighting of each factor (the "Formula") to be used for Customer's teachers' professional evaluations, and the data to enter in to the Formula. PMI is responsible for (a) entering Customer's data into the FASTe database, (b) executing Customer's Formula using the FASTe Data approved or deemed approved by Customer, and (c) presenting the results of the Formula in the MMR.

4. Third Party Claims. Customer and PMI acknowledge the possibility that third parties may assert demands or claims and/or initiate litigation regarding Customer's teachers' professional evaluations, and that such litigation may involve the MMRs, the data and/or the Formula used in calculating the results shown in the MMRs presented as part of the FASTe services. Customer will defend, at its expense, and hold harmless PMI and its officers, agents, principals, employees and consultants, against any demands, claims or litigation relating to or arising out of the MMRs, the Formula, the data used in executing the Formula, or any other aspect of the FASTe services, and against any losses or damages arising therefrom, unless such losses or damages arise from PMI's misconduct, negligence or failure to execute the Formula set forth on Attachment A using the FASTe Data approved or deemed approved by Customer, or to present the results thereof as approved or deemed approved by the Customer.
5. Confidential Information. If CUSTOMER is an agency or political subdivision of the state of Florida, then the parties recognize and agree that CUSTOMER is subject to the provisions of the Florida Public Records Law, as codified in chapter 119, Florida Statutes. The parties also recognize and agree that the software ("FASTe Software") used to provide or otherwise related to the FASTe services is a trade secret of PMI, as defined under Fla. Stat. section 812.081. PMI takes measures to prevent the FASTe Software from becoming available to persons other than PMI's customers, for the limited purpose of supplying services to its customers. Therefore, pursuant to Fla. Stat. sections 815.045 and 119.071(1)(f), the FASTe Software is exempt from disclosure pursuant to Florida's Public Records Law, and shall not be disclosed to anyone other than Customer's designated users without court order. In the event of a public records request for any portion of the FASTe Software, Customer shall immediately give PMI written notice of such request, and PMI may independently pursue a court order protecting the disclosure of such information. PMI shall notify the CUSTOMER in writing of its intent to seek protection of the Confidential Information within 10 days of receipt of the CUSTOMERS notification. PMI's failure to notify the CUSTOMER of its intent to seek protection shall authorize the disclosure of the requested information and shall authorize the CUSTOMER to comply with the disclosure request in a manner determined appropriate by the CUSTOMER.
- 6.
7. If PMI notifies the CUSTOMER of its intent to seek a court order protecting the disclosure of the information, then the CUSTOMER will take reasonable steps to cooperate with PMI in contesting such request, requirement or order or in otherwise protecting PMI's rights prior to disclosure. PMI shall indemnify CUSTOMER for all court costs, attorney's fees, fines, assessments or other penalties of any kind or nature whatsoever which are imposed on CUSTOMER or its employees or agents as a result of CUSTOMER'S attempts to protect PMI's interests as described in this paragraph.

Any claim by PMI that its records or work, other than the FASTe Software, is confidential or a trade secret shall be made in compliance with s. 812.081 and s. 815.045, Florida Statutes. If CUSTOMER receives a public records request for materials (other than the FASTe Software) which PMI has previously and specifically indicated in writing to CUSTOMER is a trade secret, then CUSTOMER shall

use reasonable efforts to timely notify PMI of such public records request, at which time PMI may independently pursue a court order protecting the disclosure of such information. PMI shall notify the CUSTOMER in writing of its intent to seek protection of the Confidential Information within 10 days of the receipt of the CUSTOMER'S notification. PMI's failure to notify the CUSTOMER of its intent to seek protection shall authorize the disclosure of the requested information and shall authorize the CUSTOMER to comply with the disclosure request in a manner deemed appropriate by the CUSTOMER. If PMI notifies the CUSTOMER of its intent to seek a court order protecting the disclosure of the information then the CUSTOMER will take reasonable steps to cooperate with PMI in contesting such request, requirement or order or in otherwise protecting PMI's rights prior to disclosure. PMI agrees to indemnify CUSTOMER for all court costs, attorney's fees, fines, assessments or other penalties of any kind or nature whatsoever which are imposed on CUSTOMER or its employees or agents as a result of CUSTOMER's attempts to protect PMI's interests as described in this paragraph.

6. Review and Approval of MMRs. CUSTOMER and PMI acknowledge and agree that CUSTOMER's professional evaluation system contemplated herein is new and could result in errors in the preparation of such evaluations and/or the preparation of data and reports that form the predicate for such evaluations, including MMRs. Therefore, for a period of sixty (60) days after each MMR is published by being made accessible to CUSTOMER in the FASTe platform (the "Review Period"), CUSTOMER will review such MMR and will notify PMI in writing or electronically of any concerns, questions, corrections or revisions needed to the MMR or any component thereof. PMI will promptly investigate and respond to CUSTOMER's concerns and questions regarding the MMR. PMI will promptly commence any necessary revisions or corrections to the MMR and will proceed with reasonable diligence to complete any such revisions or corrections. Each MMR will be deemed approved by CUSTOMER except for those concerns, questions, corrections or revisions communicated to PMI in writing or electronically within the Review Period for such MMR.
7. Cure Period. If at any time CUSTOMER or PMI, as applicable, believe that the terms of this Addendum are not being fully performed by the other party, then CUSTOMER or PMI, as applicable, will advise the other in writing by certified mail, return receipt requested, of the specific nature of any such claim, non-performance or malfeasance. Such notice shall be addressed to the recipient party's address listed in the Agreement, or such other address as the party has designated in writing. The party receiving such notice (the "Curing Party") shall have a period of ninety (90) days after receipt thereof within which to cure such claimed breach, or, if such breach is not reasonably capable of being cured within such 90-day period, the Curing Party shall commence to cure such breach within such 90-day period and proceed with reasonable diligence to complete the curing of such breach thereafter. Provided, however, if the breach is failure to pay money due under the terms of this Addendum, then the cure period shall be thirty (30) days instead of 90 days.
8. Entire Agreement; Modification; Interpretation. This Addendum contains the entire understanding of the parties hereto relating to the subject matter hereof and cannot be modified, except by an



instrument signed by both parties hereto. The principle of strict construction against the drafting party is waived.

9. Litigation. This Addendum shall be governed by Florida law. Venue of any litigation between the parties arising out of this Addendum, any MMR prepared in connection herewith, or any other aspect of the FASTe services provided hereunder shall lie exclusively in the Clay County, Florida.

In the event that PMI, or any officer, employee, agent, consultant or representative of PMI, is requested by Customer, or subpoenaed by any third party, to respond to any discovery request, or to testify in any litigation or deposition, relating to a dispute between Customer and such third party, Customer shall pay PMI at the then-effective hourly rate for such officer, employee, consultant or representative for time spent in testimony, deposition, and reasonable preparation for same unless PMI is also a party to such litigation.

The parties below have authorized their respective officers to execute this Agreement.

Performance Matters, LLC

School Board of Clay County

By: _____
Authorized Signature

By: _____
Authorized Signature

Name: Woody Dillaha

Name: _____

Title: CEO

Title: _____

Date: 10/10/12

Date: _____

Attachment A

School District of Clay County

**MULTI-MEASURES
Call Notes of 5/8/2012**

This document is provided to the district as follow-up to the May 8th, 2012, PM conference call regarding calculations related to the multi-measure portion of your September 30th, 2011 submission to the Florida Department of Education.

To ensure that PM can produce district-specific ratings this summer, final documentation approval and integration with your FASTe contract is needed as soon as possible. PM recognizes the importance and complexities of the topic, along with its tight time window. PM very much appreciates your time, efforts and commitment to the objective.

To facilitate the quickest path to collect needed details, PM is pursuing an action plan that will likely involve subsequent conference calls and/or follow-up documents similar to this. Through progressive clarification/refinement of documentation, PM seeks to reach a level of mutual understanding that will form the base design for the instrument desired by the district. Subsequent related documents will likely grow as more detail is identified through the review and clarification build process.

Last Conference Call Between District & PM:

Tuesday, May 08, 2012, 2:00 PM (Eastern Time)

District Participants:	Multi-Measures Reporting Project Participants
Diane Kornegay - Assistant Superintendent for Instruction	Jim Magers - VP, PM Product Development
	Patrice Hartnett - VP, PM Product Management
	Chris Cirillo – Sr. Business Analyst
	Drew Thompson – Analyst / Consultant

Status of Providing PM with Electronic Copy of September 30th, 2011 Plan as Submitted to FLDOE & Approved by FLDOE (district’s plan to apply VAM to the district’s instructional staff evaluation process)

✓ PM acknowledges and appreciates receipt of final plan document copy /web link

To generate comprehensive multi-measure reporting, the components of all **staff categories** and all the components of any **multi-measures** must be identified. Accordingly, for each staff category, **percentage allocations** must be identified for any multi-measures applicable. At each staff category, multi-measure allocations must total 100%. For each client district, PM plans to review:

1. Performance Appraisal System / VAM plan submitted to FLDOE & approved by FLDOE (static)
2. Latest PM understanding of district component requests (dynamic – currently this document)
3. Data source availability and viability for requested components
 - a. Files
 - b. Fields
 - c. Formulas (including: filtering, aggregation and rule-based interpretations)
4. Parameters and controls for instrument flexibility
5. Aggregation points in component processing (timing and process logistics)

The following pages identify current PM understanding of business requirements defined by the district for Multi-Measure Reporting. Identified are components needed and their respective rules and/or relationships. Referenced in the compilation of this document was a review of recent conference call notes, documents provided to PM and the performance appraisal system document or “VAM Plan” as submitted to FLDOE, as was originally due September 30, 2012.

Summary

The district plans to evaluate instructional personnel based on Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAP) observations and student growth. The respective allocations of the final evaluation are 50%, 50%. PM did not observe any conditional reallocations of weighting (in FEAP observation domains and/or student growth measures) to be based on the years of student data available for staff member. The district expressed the desire to keep the evaluation process as simple and transparent as possible.

The district was observed to use final rating rubrics of: Highly Effective, Effective, Developing/Needs Improvement, and Unsatisfactory, based on a scale of: **3** = 85% - 100%, **2** = 60% - 84%, **1** = 50% - 59%, and **0** = 0 - 49%. This represented a doubling of the 50% scales, with a 1% adjustment made at minimum for Highly Effective (86% changed to 85%) and a 1% adjustment made at the maximum for Developing/Needs Improvement (58% changed to 59%).

PM requests clarification as to the data conditions where the district plan-referenced appraisal form for student growth (Section IV of the evaluation) is to be used instead of data calculations. For **student growth**, PM noted that it appeared to be addressed by two different methods. PM could not identify as to when one or the other is to be applied. While the plan emphasizes intent to use data of Value-Added Model (VAM), FCAT and various EOC and other assessments through calculations, the plan also approaches measurement of student growth via the appraisal form. The form appraises teachers using indicators in two areas: Assessment and Student Performance, at 18 of 33 points possible (about 54%) and 15 of 33 points possible (about 45%), respectively. The district was observed to use rubrics of: **Highly Effective, Effective, Developing/Needs Improvement, and Unsatisfactory**, using a “percentage of points possible” rubric scale of: **3** = 43% - 50%, **2** = 30% - 42%, **1** = 25% - 29%, and **0** = < 25%, and point range scale of: **3** = 29 – 33, **2** = 20 – 28, **1** = 16 – 19, **0** = 0 – 15, respectively.

For **teacher observations**, the district is using an observation instrument with six domains. The weighting of the individual domains **does not** vary by category. Points possible for all domains totaled 69. Accordingly, a percentage point equivalent of 0.007246 is applied to convert to a 100 point scale. The district uses Observation 360 to record the FEAP observations. The district was observed to use rubrics of: **Highly Effective, Effective, Developing/Needs Improvement, and Unsatisfactory**, using a “percentage of points possible” rubric scale of: **3** = 43% - 50%, **2** = 30% - 42%, **1** = 25% - 29%, and **0** = < 25%, and point range scale of: **3** = 60 – 69, **2** = 41 – 58, **1** = 35 – 40, **0** = 0 – 34, respectively. **PM observed that the scale did not address a possible point total of 59 and recommends that the district consider changing the respective range to 41-59.**

PM noted that the district is considering use of a mean of scores if multiple schools or designating a specific school if multiple schools. PM mentioned that many other districts have chosen to use a district-wide VAM interpretation when the same instructional staff member was associated with multiple sites. PM noted that the district plan set minimum number of students at **15** for value added score calculation. District reported that no survey (student and/or parent) information and no additional points factors were to be used in 2011-2012 evaluation processing. PM additionally noted that the teacher “roster verification” effort (as of February 17, 2012), requested of districts by FLDOE, was going well at the district, with completion anticipated May 25, 2012.

For instances where student growth of instructional staff is not to be determined via appraisal form (**Section IV of the evaluation**), the district plan is to primarily measure via “FCAT Reading and/or Math as per State Value Added Model for students assigned” (VAM). Courses having FCAT reading assessment will be measured by FCAT reading. Accordingly, courses having FCAT math assessment will be measured by FCAT math. Where there is a balance of reading and math, the better outcome of the two is to be used. PM noted that the district has many departmentalized schools. Further, the district referenced that finalization of PK evaluation without pre/post data and method of KG readiness evaluation were yet to be finalized. Additional assessments, listed by applicable subject, grade or position, have been identified in the chart below. Subjects and positions will likely need to be further clarified by course number and job code, respectively. Methods to be applied to measures will also need further clarification to PM. PM noted that the district plan (and chart below)...“For those subjects noted with an asterisk, school-wide FCAT proficiency or learning growth data may be used. If the position is assigned a specific group of students, that group’s FCAT data will be used.” Generally, PM interpreted the district plan to call for calculations to be based on summative mean or on growth; **however; specific desired method clarification is requested.**

For PM to properly associate staff to scheduled students, staff to categories, categories to courses, grades or positions, those to measures, and measures to assessments, the following information will likely be needed from the district in flat file format:

- **Student to Staff** schedule associations (this may parallel the state roster verification)
- **Student Level VAM** Scores (currently not provided by the state - 1 to 4 rubric scale at 4 decimal places)

- **Staff level VAM** scores (1 to 4 rubric scale at 4 decimal places)
- **Staff ID to Category** associations (staff ID & category)
- **Staff to School** (assignment) associations (or district-wide designation if employee has zero or multiple scheduled school assignments)
- **Category to Course** (some categories can reference a specific course)
- **Category to Grade** (some categories can reference a specific grade)
- **Category to Job** (some categories can reference a specific job)
- **Course to Measure** associations (course status regarding use in student growth calculations and, if to be used, how course should be considered – general (math, reading, science, writing) or specific (assessment(s) to be associated)
- **Grade to Measure** associations (grade status regarding use in student growth calculations and, if to be used, how grade should be considered – general (math, reading, science, writing) or specific (assessment(s) to be associated)
- **Job to Measure** associations (job status regarding use in student growth calculations and, if to be used, how job should be considered – general (math, reading, science, writing) or specific (assessment(s) to be associated)

PM interpreted the district plan included “Preferred Assessment Instrument for CAS” table and built the list below of identified permutations that the district requests PM to calculate in evaluation processing. The chart shows that interpretation and relates to the “Category to ...” and “... to Measure” files previously mentioned. **PM requests district feedback per any adjustments and/or clarifications.**

Course, Grade or Job From District	Measure From District	Grade Range From District	Measure To Be Calculated by PM	Measure Group at PM
Pre-K ESE	District Progress Report	Pre-K	Gr: PK = 4 Yr Old Proficiency on District developed benchmark - Proficiency Value Score (PVS) @ 1-4 pt. scale	SAM
Reading	FAIR	K - 2	Reading - FAIR (Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading)	FAIR
ESE Academic*	FAIR	K - 2	Reading - FAIR (Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading)	FAIR
ESOL*	FAIR	K - 2	Reading - FAIR (Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading)	FAIR
Reading	Performance Matters Reading/Math	3	_PM % of students performing at or above district “green” threshold (using 3 scale 60/80 rubric - specified course	SAM
L.A.	Performance Matters Reading/Math	3	_PM % of students performing at or above district “green” threshold (using 3 scale 60/80 rubric - specified course	SAM
ESE*	Performance Matters Reading/Math	3	_PM % of students performing at or above district “green” threshold (using 3 scale 60/80 rubric - specified course	SAM
Course Grade or Job From District	Measure From District	Gr Range From District	Measure To Be Calculated by PM	Measure Group at PM



SP*	Performance Matters Reading/Math	3	_PM % of students performing at or above district "green" threshold (using 3 scale 60/80 rubric - specified course	SAM
Gifted*	Performance Matters Reading/Math	3	_PM % of students performing at or above district "green" threshold (using 3 scale 60/80 rubric - specified course	SAM
DOP*	Performance Matters Reading/Math	3	_PM % of students performing at or above district "green" threshold (using 3 scale 60/80 rubric - specified course	SAM
Mathematics	FCAT Mathematics	4-6	Math - Teacher VAM - teacher taught scheduled students - at up to 3 years - @ 1-4 pt. scale	VAM - Teacher Level
Mathematics	Performance Matters Test C- Reading/Math	3	_PM % of students performing at or above district "green" threshold (using 3 scale 60/80 rubric - specified course	SAM
Science	Performance Matters Test C- Reading/Math	3	_PM % of students performing at or above district "green" threshold (using 3 scale 60/80 rubric - specified course	SAM
Reading	FCAT Reading	4-6	Reading - Teacher VAM - teacher taught scheduled students - at up to 3 years - @ 1-4 pt. scale	VAM - Teacher Level
Language Arts	FCAT Reading	4-6	Reading - Teacher VAM - teacher taught scheduled students - at up to 3 years - @ 1-4 pt. scale	VAM - Teacher Level
Science	EOC	4, 6	Earth Science - EOC - Teacher - Proficiency Value Score (PVS) @ 1-4 pt. scale	HST - Achievement Level Rubric
Science	FCAT Science	5	Science - FCAT - Proficiency at up to 3 Years - Proficiency Value Score (PVS) @ 1-4 pt. scale	HST - Achievement Level Rubric
Social Studies	EOC	4-6	Science - EOC - Teacher - % scoring at high level	HST - Achievement Level Rubric
ESE (Non-FCAT)	To be Determined	K-2	zz_Misc Measure of: Alternate Assessment @ 1-4 pt. scale	Flat File
ESE (Non-FCAT)	State Alternative Assessment	3-11	zz_Misc Measure of: Alternate Assessment @ 1-4 pt. scale	Flat File
ESE Acad.*	FCAT Reading or Math	4-11	Reading & Math - School VAM - at less than 3 years - @ 1-4 pt. scale	VAM - School Level
Course Grade or Job From District	Measure From District	Gr Range From District	Measure To Be Calculated by PM	Measure Group at PM
ESOL*	FCAT Reading or Math	4-11	Reading & Math - Teacher VAM - teacher taught scheduled students - at less than 3 years - @ 1-4 pt. scale	
Guidance*	FCAT Reading SW Data	All	Reading & Math - School VAM - at up to 3 years - @ 1-4 pt. scale	VAM - School Level
Support Facilitator	FCAT Reading SW Data	All	Reading & Math - School VAM - at up to 3 years - @ 1-4 pt. scale	VAM - School Level
Media Specialist*	FCAT Reading SW Data	All	Reading & Math - School VAM - at up to 3 years - @ 1-4 pt. scale	VAM - School Level
Technology*	FCAT Reading SW Data	All	Reading & Math - School VAM - at up to 3 years - @ 1-4 pt. scale	VAM - School Level



PE	EOC Exam	All	zz_Misc Measure of: PE @ 1-4 pt. scale	Flat File
Art	EOC Exam	All	zz_Misc Measure of: Art @ 1-4 pt. scale	Flat File
Music*	EOC Exam	All	zz_Misc Measure of: Music @ 1-4 pt. scale	Flat File
School Social Worker	FCAT Reading DW Data	All	Reading - District VAM - at up to 3 years - @ 1-4 pt. scale	VAM - District Level
School Psychologist	FCAT Reading DW Data	All	Reading - District VAM - at up to 3 years - @ 1-4 pt. scale	VAM - District Level
Staffing Specialists	FCAT Reading DW Data	All	Reading - District VAM - at up to 3 years - @ 1-4 pt. scale	VAM - District Level
Staffing Specialists	FCAT Reading DW Data	All	Reading - District VAM - at up to 3 years - @ 1-4 pt. scale	VAM - District Level
Curriculum and Health Special.	FCAT Reading DW Data	All	Reading - District VAM - at up to 3 years - @ 1-4 pt. scale	VAM - District Level
SPRINT	FCAT Reading DW Data	All	Reading - District VAM - at up to 3 years - @ 1-4 pt. scale	VAM - District Level
Homebound	FCAT Reading DW Data	All	Reading - District VAM - at up to 3 years - @ 1-4 pt. scale	VAM - District Level
Hearing	FCAT Reading DW Data	All	Reading - District VAM - at up to 3 years - @ 1-4 pt. scale	VAM - District Level
Hearing	FCAT Reading DW Data	All	Reading - District VAM - at up to 3 years - @ 1-4 pt. scale	VAM - District Level
Vision	FCAT Reading SW Data	4 - 11	Reading & Math - School VAM - at up to 3 years - @ 1-4 pt. scale	VAM - School Level
Math Coaches	FCAT Mathematics SW Data	4 - 11	Math - School VAM - at up to 3 years - @ 1-4 pt. scale	VAM - School Level
Course Grade or Job From District	Measure From District	Gr Range From District	Measure To Be Calculated by PM	Measure Group at PM
O.T.	DIBELS Test 3	K - 2	_PM % of students performing at or above district "green" threshold (using 3 scale 60/80 rubric - specified course	SAM
P.T.*	FCAT Reading DW Data	3 - 11	Reading - District VAM - at up to 3 years - @ 1-4 pt. scale	VAM - District Level
Speech	FAIR	K - 2	Reading - FAIR (Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading)	FAIR
Gifted	FAIR	K - 2	Reading - FAIR (Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading)	FAIR
DOP*	FAIR	K - 2	Reading - FAIR (Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading)	FAIR
Speech	FCAT Reading	4 – 11	Reading - FCAT - Proficiency at up to 3 Years - Proficiency Value Score (PVS) @ 1-4 pt. scale	HST - Achievement Level Rubric
Gifted	FCAT Reading	4 – 11	Reading - FCAT - Proficiency at up to 3 Years - Proficiency Value Score (PVS) @ 1-4 pt. scale	HST - Achievement Level Rubric
DOP*	FCAT Reading	4 – 11	Reading - FCAT - Proficiency at up to 3 Years - Proficiency Value Score (PVS) @ 1-4 pt. scale	HST - Achievement Level Rubric
Reading	FCAT Reading	7 - 10	Reading - FCAT - Proficiency at up to 3 Years - Proficiency Value Score (PVS) @ 1-4 pt. scale	HST - Achievement Level Rubric
Language Arts	FCAT Reading	7 - 10	Reading - FCAT - Proficiency at up to 3 Years - Proficiency Value Score (PVS) @ 1-4 pt. scale	HST - Achievement

			scale	Level Rubric
Reading	EOC Exam	11 - 12	Reading - EOC proficiency @ 1-4 pt. scale	SAM
Language Arts	EOC Exam	11 - 12	Language Arts - EOC proficiency @ 1-4 pt. scale	SAM
Mathematics	EOC Exam or FCAT Mathematics	7 - 10	Math - Teacher VAM - teacher taught scheduled students - at up to 3 years - @ 1-4 pt. scale	VAM - Teacher Level
Mathematics	EOC Exam	11 - 12	Math - EOC proficiency @ 1-4 pt. scale	SAM
Science	EOC Exam	7	Science - EOC proficiency @ 1-4 pt scale	SAM
Science	FCAT Science, EOC	8, 11	Science - FCAT - Proficiency at up to 3 Years - Proficiency Value Score (PVS) @ 1-4 pt. scale	HST - Achievement Level Rubric
Course Grade or Job From District	Measure From District	Gr Range From District	Measure To Be Calculated by PM	Measure Group at PM
Science	EOC	9 – 10	Science - EOC proficiency @ 1-4 pt. scale	SAM
Science	EOC Exam	12	Science - EOC proficiency @ 1-4 pt. scale	SAM
Social Studies	EOC Exam	7 - 10	Social Studies - EOC proficiency @ 1-4 pt. scale	SAM
Social Studies	EOC Exam	11 - 12	Social Studies - EOC proficiency @ 1-4 pt. scale	SAM
ESE*	EOC Exam	All	ESE - EOC proficiency @ 1-4 pt. scale	SAM
Guidance*	FCAT Reading SW Data	All	Reading - FCAT - School-wide Growth @ 1-4 pt. scale	HST - Achievement Level Rubric
Media Specialist*	FCAT Reading SW Data	All	Reading - FCAT - School-wide Growth @ 1-4 pt. scale	HST - Achievement Level Rubric
Technology*	FCAT Reading SW Data	All	Reading - FCAT - School-wide Growth @ 1-4 pt. scale	HST - Achievement Level Rubric
Non-core Electives*	EOC Exam	All	zz_Misc Measure of: Non-core Elective @ 1-4 pt. scale	Flat File
Foreign Language	EOC Exam	All	zz_Misc Measure of: Foreign Language (Other) @ 1-4 pt. scale	Flat File
Athletic Director	FCAT Reading SW Data	All	Reading & Math - School VAM - at up to 3 years - @ 1-4 pt. scale	VAM - School Level
Technical/Career Education	EOC Exam	All	zz_Misc Measure of: Technical/Career Education (Other) @ 1-4 pt. scale	Flat File



Staff Categories & Multi-Measures

PM understands that the district may still be refining staff multi-measure set assignments for the 2011-2012 staff evaluation process. Additional and ongoing PM / District information exchange regarding these concepts should be expected.

Conclusion

Further related communications with the district and additional PM refinement of subsequent related documents are anticipated. The goal of PM is to build a corroborative/collaborative document of understanding common to both the district and PM. Sufficient capture of detail and clarity of intent will be key to ensuring instructional staff evaluation processing via PM's FASTe.