

**From:** Greenberg, Stuart  
**Sent time:** Wednesday, March 07, 2012 3:49:01 AM  
**To:** Cari Miller (Cari@excelined.org) <Cari@excelined.org>; Mary Laura Bragg (MaryLaura@excelined.org) <MaryLaura@excelined.org>; Greenberg, Stuart  
**Cc:** Stewart, Pam; Tappen, Mary; Costin, Loretta  
**Subject:** TEACHERS WITH CAR-PD COMPLETIONS BY DISTRICT & SCHOOL from the 2007-2008

---

Good morning,

We are in receipt of data from EIAS team. Please see the attached data. Provided data for TEACHERS WITH CAR-PD COMPLETIONS BY DISTRICT & SCHOOL from the 2007-2008 school year.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Greenberg, Stuart  
**Sent:** Mon 3/5/2012 9:13 PM  
**To:** Cari Miller (Cari@excelined.org); Mary Laura Bragg (MaryLaura@excelined.org)  
**Cc:** Stewart, Pam; Tappen, Mary; Costin, Loretta  
**Subject:** RE: K-2 FAIR

As of this evening at 8:30 the following requests for data and clarifications have been sent to the Florida Department of Education data warehouse and EIAS teams:

#### 1. Referral Rates

Referral rates for Special Education between 2000-2011, broken down by each category, for example, SWD, deaf/hard of hearing, visual impairments, etc., providing the number of students and percent of students, K-12.

#### 2. 3rd Grade Progression

Percent of first cohort of retained Level 1 students that are in 11th grade AND percent of first cohort of promoted Level 1 students that are in 12th grade - This was sent (Tab 2 in first attachment - thank you), but this information is requested for 2011-2012 as the first cohort of retained third grade students (if they haven't been retained since) would be in 11th grade this school year, and students promoted (although scored Level 1) would be in 12th grade.

GCE data summary, adding number/percent scoring Level 1, and add percentages

3. For each year, starting in the 2008-2009 school year and continuing through the 2011-2012 school year, a listing of the districts that offer/offered CAR-PD training/CAR-PD courses.

4. Reading Plan budgets for each district for each year of implementation - A request was placed with staff at FLDOE for each district reading plan budget from 2005-06 through 2011-12.

5. Reading Allocation - budgets for each district 2010-11/2011-12 and district amendments for the 2010-11/2011-12 school year requesting flexibility with reading allocation funds

As requested attached is FEFP Reading categorical revenue, expenditures, flexibility, and carry forward balances for the fiscal years 2005-06 through 2010-11. This information includes the 67 public school districts and does not include lab schools or the Florida Virtual School.

Florida Statute 1011.62 allows districts flexibility to transfer the funds for the FEFP research-based reading allocation if funds are urgently needed to maintain school board specified classroom instruction. Attached PDF's are the requested 2010-11 school board resolutions related to flexible spending of the Reading categorical funds. The word documents are the approved district amendments to the FEFP.

6. A request has been placed for the requested for the yearly coaching summary data.

From: Cari Miller (Cari@excelined.org) [mailto:Cari@excelined.org]

Sent: Monday, March 05, 2012 5:24 PM

To: Greenberg, Stuart; Mary Laura Bragg (MaryLaura@excelined.org)

Cc: Stewart, Pam; Tappen, Mary; Costin, Loretta

Subject: RE: K-2 FAIR

Hi Stu,

Mary Laura asked that I follow-up with you. First, a BIG thank you for sending all of this data along. We are making headway. Here's where we stand with the data request. Please note that I prioritized the request, and I've revised a couple requests based on your feedback in hopes of simplifying the work, and expediting the process:

We have received the following data requests:

K-2 FAIR

ü Received State level Broad Screen data; however, the data didn't include number of students assessed at each AP and in each year, so we request on February 23rd the number of students K-2 who took the FAIR for each AP for each year

ü Comprehension (Target Passage)/Fluency results since the first year of implementation

3rd Grade Progression

ü Dropout rate of first cohort (2002-2003) of retained Level 1 students and Level 1 students promoted

ü FCAT outcome data of first cohort's progression, retained vs. promoted Level 1 students, need data for those promoted for a comparison to those retained (show example that needs additional information)

ü Tracking performance of the first cohort of students retained vs. those promoted, but scored level 1; what percent of those retained scored Level 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 each year after the retention AND same data request for those promoted (show example template)

#### Reading Coaches

ü Received ALL District level reports on coach data; the report that reflects percent of coach time dedicated to each role on the PMRN Coach Log as a whole

ü Received: Number/percent of coaches Reading Endorsed or "certified in Reading" in each district as a whole

#### Professional Development

For each district, or school (if Department didn't serve entire district, rather select schools) that has received professional development from the Department/partners from first year of PD delivery to 2010-2011, student outcomes as measured by FCAT:

ü Comprehension Instructional Sequence (CIS) - (only 1 year of data would be available for this one)

ü Team Read NEFEC Districts - (only 1 year of data would be available for this one)

Following are the data requests that are still outstanding in order of priority:

#### 7.3rd Grade Progression

× Percent of first cohort of retained Level 1 students that are in 11th grade AND percent of first cohort of promoted Level 1 students that are in 12th grade - This was sent (Tab 2 in first attachment - thank you), but we need this information for 2011-2012 as our first cohort of retained third grade students (if they haven't been retained since) would be in 11th grade this school year, and students promoted (although scored Level 1) would be in 12th grade.

× GCE data summary, adding number/percent scoring Level 1, and add percentages

× How those promoted through alt assessment did compared to those promoted through portfolio from first cohort to present

#### 8.K-12 Reading Plan

9. Reading Plan budgets for each district for each year of implementation

10. Reading Allocation - budgets for each district 2010-11/2011-12 and district amendments for the 2010-11/2011-12 school year requesting flexibility with reading allocation funds

#### 11. Reading Coaches

× Received State Level coach data for 2011-2012, however the breakdown of Elementary, Middle, and High isn't displayed (this could be "user error" on my behalf); Also we have not yet received 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11- the state level report that reflects percent of coach time dedicated to each role on the PMRN Coach Log as a whole (see second attachment for sample)

#### 12. Referral Rates

× Referral rates for Special Education between 2000-2011, broken down by each category, for example, SWD, deaf/hard of hearing, visual impairments, etc., providing the number of students and percent of students, K-12.

#### 13. Professional Development

× Revising this request based on your feedback: For each year, starting in the 2008-2009 school year and continuing through the 2011-2012 school year, provide a listing of the districts that offer/offered CAR-PD training/CAR-PD courses.

Thanks Stu.

Sincerely,

Cari

From: Greenberg, Stuart [mailto:Stuart.Greenberg@fldoe.org]

Sent: Monday, March 05, 2012 2:08 PM

To: Greenberg, Stuart; Mary Laura Bragg (MaryLaura@excelined.org)

Cc: Cari Miller (Cari@excelined.org); Stewart, Pam; Tappen, Mary; Costin, Loretta

Subject: RE: K-2 FAIR

Attached please find the response to the request the number of students K-2 who took the FAIR for each AP for each year.

You may want to cross reference the school membership by grade for each year that is attached. FAIR is an optional assessment.

<http://www.fldoe.org/eias/eiaspubs/archives.asp>

From: Greenberg, Stuart

Sent: Monday, March 05, 2012 11:48 AM

To: Greenberg, Stuart; 'Mary Laura Bragg (MaryLaura@excelined.org)'

Cc: 'Cari Miller (Cari@excelined.org)'; Stewart, Pam; Tappen, Mary; Costin, Loretta

Subject: K-2 FAIR

K-2 FAIR

× Received State level Broad Screen data; however, the data didn't include number of students assessed at each AP and in each year, so we request on February 23rd the number of students K-2 who took the FAIR for each AP for each year

Request sent to the Florida Center for Reading Research on March 5, 2012.

This data almost complete the data requested below:

1. By district and state level Broad Screen and Comprehension/Fluency for K, 1 and 2 results from first year of FAIR to the current AP window..

The Excel file includes the mean PRS for each district by year, assessment period, and grade for each of the 74 districts. The data is for the fall of 2009 through winter of 2012 . Not all districts assess all students K-2 on FAIR. The use of FAIR is optional.

× Comprehension (Target Passage)/Fluency results since the first year of implementation

Predictive and Concurrent Relationships of the K-2 Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR) to the 3-12 FAIR and the FCAT

While we have had had FAIR operational for three years it was not until I became the Director did we ask for a predictive study of the K-2 FAIR to implications for Grades 3-10. Please see the attachment.

Comprehension (Target Passage)/Fluency results since the first year of implementation

The attached file includes the mean number of words read correctly for the first and second grade FAIR Reading Comprehension task for those students who read the target passage or above with 90% accuracy for the designated grade and AP. The file contains data for the last 8 completed assessment periods. To put the percent of students on or above the target passage into some perspective, it is important to note that the target passages changed from year 1 (sy0910) to year 2 (sy1011). The gains from year 1 to year 2 are more than likely a result in the reduction in the target passage. It is also important to note in Valencia et al.'s recent article (attached) in RRQ raises serious issues about the construct (both wcpm and prosody) and measures of oral reading fluency. Young-Suk and Barbara Foorman article in the Journal of Ed Psych (a premier APA journal) shows that wcpm peaks in utility (i.e., dominance) in predicting reading comprehension much earlier than we thought: growth in ORF peaks in G1 and initial status is useful in G2/G3. For this reason we are moving from a sole measure using words correct per minute aligning to aligning fluency measures to the rubric used by NAEP and the standards listed in the CCSS :4. Read with sufficient accuracy and fluency to support comprehension.

a. Read on-level text with purpose and understanding.

b. Read on-level text orally with accuracy,

appropriate rate, and expression on successive readings.

c. Use context to confirm or self-correct word recognition and understanding, rereading as necessary.

From: Greenberg, Stuart

Sent: Monday, March 05, 2012 11:42 AM

To: 'Mary Laura Bragg (MaryLaura@excelined.org)'

Cc: Cari Miller (Cari@excelined.org); Stewart, Pam; Tappen, Mary; Costin, Loretta

Subject: RE: Fwd: PRS Data Request

Good morning,

This is first in a series of emails that are responsive the requests that have been sent to me. After you review the data sets if you require further clarification let us know.

We have not yet received all data marked with an X:

Referral Rates

× Referral rates for Special Education between 2000-2011, broken down by each category, for example, SWD, deaf/hard of hearing, visual impairments, etc., providing the number of students and percent of students, K-12.

The data request was sent on February 20th to the Data Warehouse and The Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services.

Follow-up was requested on March 5.

From: Mary Laura Bragg (MaryLaura@excelined.org) [mailto:MaryLaura@excelined.org]

Sent: Monday, March 05, 2012 10:31 AM

To: Greenberg, Stuart

Cc: Cari Miller (Cari@excelined.org); Stewart, Pam

Subject: RE: Fwd: PRS Data Request

Stu,

Here is the list of data we still need.

Thanks.

ML

From: Stewart, Pam [mailto:Pam.Stewart@fldoe.org]

Sent: Monday, March 05, 2012 10:21 AM

To: Mary Laura Bragg (MaryLaura@excelined.org)

Cc: Greenberg, Stuart

Subject: RE: Fwd: PRS Data Request

It would be fine to work through Stu and cc me. Whatever works best for you. I don't want to be the impediment that holds things up.

Pam Stewart

Chancellor

Division of Public Schools

325 W. Gaines St.

Tallahassee, FL 32399

850-245-0509

From: Mary Laura Bragg (MaryLaura@excelined.org) [mailto:MaryLaura@excelined.org]

Sent: Monday, March 05, 2012 9:20 AM

To: Stewart, Pam

Subject: FW: Fwd: PRS Data Request

If you want, we can go straight to Stu, and just cc you.

Let me know.

From: Cari Miller (Cari@excelined.org)  
Sent: Monday, March 05, 2012 8:59 AM  
To: Mary Laura Bragg (MaryLaura@excelined.org)  
Subject: RE: Fwd: PRS Data Request

We received this already; what we asked for as a follow-up is the number of students that the state level data represented for each year, each grade, and each AP. 2nd X on attached document.

From: Mary Laura Bragg (MaryLaura@excelined.org)  
Sent: Saturday, March 03, 2012 9:14 AM  
To: Cari Miller (Cari@excelined.org)  
Subject: Fw: Fwd: PRS Data Request

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Greenberg, Stuart" <Stuart.Greenberg@fldoe.org>  
To: "Stewart, Pam" <pam.stewart@fldoe.org>  
Subject: Fw: PRS Data Request

K-2 FAIR data

Sent via BlackBerry by AT&T -----Original Message----- From: "Stewart, Pam" Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2012 06:39:52 To: Mary Laura Laura Bragg Subject: Fwd: PRS Data Request  
Sent from my iPhone Begin forwarded message: > From: "Greenberg, Stuart" > To: "Stewart, Pam" > Subject: Fw: PRS Data Request > > K-2 FAIR data >