The purpose of this document is to provide guidance to districts for:

* Devising a fair and reliable system to identify high performing teachers who provide direct instruction to students but do not receive state value-added model (VAM) scores (hereafter referred to as non-state VAM teachers), and
* Submitting a request for the review of a proposal of an Alternative Student Growth Model for these teachers.

Developing and receiving funding for an Alternative Student Growth Model is an opportunity to incentivize either recruitment at the beginning of a school year or retention at the end of the school year. This will ensure that teachers who have demonstrated their effectiveness, but do not teach VAM core content subjects, help support and build the foundation of learning through their service to our most fragile students and schools.

**Guidance**

The Alternative Student Growth Model must follow the K12 ESEA Common Federal Program Guidance.

**K12 ESEA Common Federal Program Guidance- Recruitment, Retention and Reward Incentives**

*Recruitment, retention and reward incentives must be based on a three-year aggregate state value-added model (VAM) score. If state VAM is not available, another student growth model may be proposed. The student growth model must be fair and reliable. The LEA must submit the model demonstrating the classification and distribution of non-state VAM teacher scores for approval. A state-approved teacher evaluation system does not necessarily meet this requirement. Incentives can be part of a structured pay system or a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU); however, the above criteria shall apply. Incentives for attendance and non-instructional personnel are not allowable. Recruitment incentives for teachers with less than one year of experience or for hard to staff positions will be considered on a case by case basis.*

Suggested programs that may fund incentives are Title I- Part A, Title II, Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) and Turnaround School Supplemental Services Allocation (TSSSA). The program office will review the submitted proposed Alternative Student Growth Model and may ask for additional information. As a reminder, the district should not negotiate or agree to incentivize an Alternative Student Growth Model and/or agree to a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the use of these program funds without approval, unless the district has already secured an alternative funding source.

District and school-based leadership, paraprofessionals or other school personnel who do not provide content area direct instruction are not eligible for this incentive. Also, because they are already eligible for other incentive programs, teachers who receive VAM scores from the state are not eligible to receive an incentive under this model. Teachers who receive a district teacher evaluation system rating of Needs Improvement/ Developing or Unsatisfactory are also not eligible.

**Further Guidance and Assurances**

When submitting a request for an Alternative Student Growth Model the district shall:

* Identify the student assessment tool used to calculate the growth model and assure that it measures at least a one year snapshot of student growth. For example, the pre and post measurement should be at least seven months apart and should demonstrate an average of at least a year’s worth of growth. Furthermore, the teacher’s score as compared to other peer teachers should show evidence of effective teaching and significant positive impact.
* Assure that the assigned score and classification will be based on the students who received direct instruction from the teacher.
* Calculate an average district score that includes data collected from the student assessment tool and shall include information from all teachers providing instruction to the students represented in the model, regardless of whether they have a state VAM score or not.

**Example of an Approvable Alternative Student Growth Model**

Proposal for Incentives:

* The rating of non-state VAM teachers is within the following thresholds:
  + No more than 10% of the instructional staff is classified Highly Effective (HE)
  + No more than 15% of the instructional staff is classified Effective (E)

**District Submission of Proposal**

The district proposal shall be explained and submitted below for review to [Amanda.Meeks@fldoe.org](mailto:Melissa.Ramsey@fldoe.org).

|  |
| --- |
| **Supporting Evidence for Request** |
|  |

**Contact Information**

For follow-up questions or to schedule a conference call the following district contact is the lead on this request.

|  |
| --- |
| **Name and title of person who is the lead for this request** |
|  |
| **Email and phone number** |
|  |