

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN

SB 6 AND THE RACE TO THE TOP PHASE 1 AND PHASE 2 APPLICATIONS

QUESTIONS/ISSUES/CONCERNS	SB 6	RACE TO THE TOP PHASE 1	RACE TO THE TOP PHASE 2
Education reform and accountability, teacher evaluations, end of course exams, funding, and collective bargaining.	Was punitive in nature and focused on identifying the bad teachers and punishing, compensating and certifying ALL teachers based on unproven ideas and student test scores.	This application mandated a prescriptive evaluation and performance based pay system without recognition of collective bargaining rights and implications.	Gives school districts and unions an opportunity to explore alternative ways of evaluating and identifying low performing teachers based on locally negotiated concepts which will include student test scores as only one of many factors. Doesn't address punishments, compensation or certification changes.
How was this language developed?	Was crafted only by those who have a general dislike of public schools, teachers and their union. Specifically, Jeb Bush, Sen. Thrasher who is both the Republican Party of Florida chair and the bills senate sponsor and Senate President Jeff Atwater who is running for Chief Financial Officer (CFO).	Was crafted by FLDOE and others without stakeholder input.	Was crafted by executive order of Gov. Crist after his veto of SB 6. The workgroup's application was developed by representatives of FEA, Pinellas CTA, Florida PTA, a teacher of the year representative, legislators, school board members, and a member of the Florida Chamber. The

			<p>Commissioner of Education participated in the discussion but did not have a vote on the final document.</p> <p>The plan establishes an advisory group to monitor the development and implementation of portions of the grant. The advisory group could also recommend legislation.</p>
<p>Impact on salaries/compensation- Increases or reduction?</p>	<p>Explicitly prohibited the use of experience (seniority) and advanced degrees in determining the salary schedule. This provision was not subject to collective bargaining.</p> <p>Required differentiated pay for teachers in hard to staff schools and subject areas.</p> <p>Didn't provide any additional or new funding for future increases in salary.</p> <p>Repealed the Merit Award Program (MAP).</p>	<p>Prohibited the use of years of experience and advance degrees in determining salary increases.</p> <p>Required all schools in a district to establish new pay schedules without beta testing or piloting prior to district-wide implementation.</p>	<p>It speaks to the implementation of an evaluation system which could eventually lead to a valid and reliable way to compensate teachers based primarily on student performance.</p> <p>Doesn't provide any additional or new funding for increases in salary only the development of a system for potential alternative compensation (includes differentiated pay, supplements and bonuses).</p>

	Repealed the Dale Hickam Program better known as the National Board Program.		Districts may scale-up the compensation system beginning with a cohort of schools, such as the persistently low-performing schools or the lowest 5% in the state, as long as the compensation system ultimately applies district-wide by 2014-2015.
Impact on teacher certification renewal requirements.	Teachers could only recertify <u>IF</u> they had been rated as effective or highly effective in 4 of the 5 previous years prior to recertification and it was based on student test scores.	Did not address re-certification.	Doesn't address re-certification.
Collective bargaining impacts-	Severely limited and/or prohibited the union's ability to negotiate and craft language which affects employee's wages, terms and working conditions.	Was restrictive in language regarding pay schedules. Did not address concerns with impasse and imposition procedures if locals were unable to successfully negotiate provisions of the grant.	Allows for the union to bargain every aspect of the plan that affects terms, wages and working conditions to suit local needs. Limits school board's ability to impose elements of the grant which are not currently in law. States that fail to negotiate terms or conditions

			necessary for full implementation of the plan WILL result in termination of the grant.
Does this apply to all schools and do we have to do everything in the plan?	If passed, the draconian requirements found in SB 6 would have been the law of the land and would have applied to all school districts, schools and employees.	All aspects of the <i>Scope of Work</i> applied to all schools in the participating LEAs.	Allows flexibility for school districts to target their resources based on individual school needs, district capacity and funding. The plans should ultimately address ALL schools but implementation should first be focused primarily on the lowest performing schools. Allows for the plans to be locally negotiated and tailored to individual schools and employee needs.
Funding-	Created a Performance Fund were the FLDOE would withhold 5 percent of all operating funds from each school district's <u>existing</u> FEFP funds (estimated to be in the \$900 million-\$950 million range).	The FLDOE requested \$1 billion to fund the grant proposals. The FLDOE would have kept 50% of the funds.	If approved by the USDOE could provide from \$350-\$700 million for the development and implementation of the plan based on your district's Title I allocation. If granted \$700 million FLDOE is allowed to retain 50% (\$350m) for their

<p>Teacher evaluation/appraisal systems</p>	<p>The language says the decision shall be based primarily upon the employee's performance as provided in s. 1012.34 which would have been defined as 50% of a student's performance on a test. It also struck the language which makes this pursuant to the terms of a collectively bargained agreement, where one exists.</p>	<p>Similar to SB6 in requiring 50% of the evaluation would be based on student test scores. Did not specify that input on development of the system would be beta tested/piloted or validated before implementation district/state wide.</p>	<p>responsibilities. Requires that districts design, negotiate and implement an evaluation structure based on student growth measures or student achievement for at least 50% of the evaluation. By 2014-2015 school year, student growth based on test scores would be 40% of the evaluation, and student growth on locally determined measures would account for the remaining 10%. This would be a phase in process to begin in 2011-2012, primarily focused on teachers and subjects where FCAT data is available, starting at 35% student growth measures based on test scores and student growth on locally determined measures would account for the remaining 15%.</p>
---	---	--	--

<p>Impact on special programs for teachers-</p>	<p>Eliminated in 1012.22: Must consider the prior teaching experience of a person who has been designated state teacher of the year by any state, and must consider prior professional experience in the field of education gained in positions at the district level and instructional and administrative positions.</p> <p>Section 1009.54 is repealed: Critical Teacher Shortage Program</p> <p>Section 1009.57 is repealed: Florida Teacher Scholarship and Forgivable Loan Program</p> <p>Section 1009.58 is repealed: Critical Teacher Shortage Tuition Reimbursement Program</p> <p>Section 1009.59 is repealed: Critical Teacher Shortage Student Loan Forgiveness Program</p>	<p>Did not address elimination of the programs.</p> <p>Did not specify how the evaluation systems would be structured.</p>	<p>Doesn't affect any of these programs.</p> <p>Allows for the district to develop a system of evaluation that recognizes the unique situations in which all teachers teach and how students may learn. This includes, but is not limited to school demographics, additional academic responsibilities, critical shortage areas (including STEM areas and Exceptional Student Education), and level of job performance difficulties (including working in high-poverty, high minority, or persistently lowest-achieving schools).</p>
---	--	--	---

	Section 1012.72- Repealed or severely limited funding for the Dale Hickam Excellent Teaching Program		
Impact on seniority rights and job assignments-	Districts would base decisions surrounding reductions in staff (RIFs) for all teachers based on being rated effective or highly effective.	Districts would base decisions surrounding reductions in staff (RIFs) for all teachers based on their level of effectiveness on the newly developed appraisal system. When this factor yields equal results, seniority and other factors may be used in the decision.	Districts would base decisions surrounding reductions in staff (RIFs) for all teachers based on their level of effectiveness on the newly developed appraisal system. When this factor yields equal results, seniority and other factors may be used in the decision.
Development and implementation of end-of-course exams-	The bill and language found in <i>SB 4- High School Graduation Requirements</i> would have required the development or acquisition of end-of-course exams for all subjects taught at each grade level over a short period of time. Neither piece of legislation	Required the development of end-of-course exams which measures growth based on the performance of students on state-required assessments and, for content areas and grade levels not assessed on state-required	Requires the development of end-of-course exams which measures growth based on the performance of students on state-required assessments and, for content areas and grade levels not assessed on state-required

	spoke to additional revenue sources to implement this unfunded mandate.	assessments.	assessments. The district would use the FCAT or district-selected assessments that are aligned to state standards and developed or selected in collaboration with district stakeholders, or will use valid, rigorous national assessments. Funding for this could possibly come for the funds allocated to the FLDOE.
Impact on new teachers-	Required that teachers hired after July 1, 2010 would be on annual contracts for their entire career.	Not addressed in the <i>Scope of Work</i> .	This is not mentioned in the plan.

<p>Impact on tenure-</p>	<p>Would have essentially eliminated tenure or PSC or CC for veteran employees based on their evaluation ratings. Veteran teachers could only recertify and continue employment <i>ONLY IF</i> they had been rated as effective or highly effective in 4 of the 5 previous years prior to recertification and it was based on student test scores.</p>	<p>Not addressed in this plan for elimination. However, a LEA must develop a “multi-metric” evaluation system which, at a minimum, includes the teachers who are in the year prior to a milestone career event, such as being awarded a multi-year contract, promotion, or a significant increase in salary.</p>	<p>Not addressed in this plan for elimination. However, a LEA must develop a “multi-metric” evaluation system which, at a minimum, includes the teachers who are in the year prior to a milestone career event, such as being awarded a multi-year contract, promotion, or a significant increase in salary.</p>
--------------------------	---	--	--

