

School	GED Subject Test Flr/Tar	GED Subject Test Flr/Tar Comments	Flr/Tar Business Rules for SP and CCR	Flr/Tar Business Rules for SP and CCR Comments	Tier Proposal	Tier Proposal Comment	Satisfied with today's meeting	Meeting is good use of time
1	No	A target of 100 is higher than the highest national GED rate. We recommend 95%	Yes	none	LAYC	Our concern is that the tier not be based on one indicator. We are open to how that is achieved	4	5
2	Abstain	In general we think it is preferable and more prudent to start with a display one measure for a new measure before settling on a floor and target since the PMF is such a high stakes evaluation	Yes	We agree with these updates bulleted above. We do not agree with the proposed language to update the 17-18 target for the Earned Secondary Credential measure. We believe the task force should review 15-16 and previous data before settling on a floor and ceiling for 17-18. Language could be included that says the task force will consider updating the 17-18 floor and ceiling for this measure using the 90th and 10th percentiles of AE school performance pending review of the three years of data.	LAYC (1st), CR (2nd), AOH (3rd)	We feel that any of the proposals takes care of the problem with being tiered based on your lowest measure while respecting all of the work previously done to establish the current PMF. We like Option 4 best because of its simplicity and how it looks at overall performance rather than taking the lowest measure as the Tier indicator. Option 3 is also very strong in that it maintains nearly all of what already exists-just allows one Tier 3 rating to be balanced by one or more Tier 1 ratings in order to result in a Tier 2 rating. We also think this option may be attractive to the Board to reserve Tier 1 for those who have all Tier 1	4	
3	Yes	none	Yes	none	LAYC	none	4	4
4	No	The proposed floor and target does not take into account students who don't [take] the test. We need more comparable data to determine the right floor and target	Yes	none	LAYC	We would happily support 1) Option 3 or 2) Option 3. We think all of the proposals represent an improvement	4	5
5	No	The range floor-target doesn't seem to be grounded in data nationally or from the DC smaple. GEDTS says that 70-75% of people who earn LTP on the Ready then passthe GED and 38% who get LTP don't take the official GED. While we are eliminating some of the reasons why students don't test (maternity, etc.) we aren't addressing them all. Therefore, it is not appropriate to set 70% as the midpoint when we know that statistically, less than 70% who earn LTP will pass the GED. Our DC smaple reports even lower figures. Therefore, we believe this should be revisited.	Yes	none	LAYC	My LEA prefers Option 4. However, if this option is not selected by our peers or deemed unfavorable by PCSB, we would prefer ans would support Option 2 & 3 over the current tier structure	4	3
6	No	We would like to see a deeper analysis of GED data, specifically the Spanish vs. English scores	No	We would like to see the comparable numbers for CCR before adding these rules	AOH	none		
7	Not yet	missing information Comments or questions about the proposed floor and target: - IF we can review the OSSE rules to determine the rules for who can take GED. Will need to see these rules prior to committing to a vote. Second, don't have enough information to determine impact of non-test takers. IT is not clear how the floor/target took into account the known third of non-test takers. Third, need to see what will be needed to verify GED from other states for students who move. The concern we have that if the typical 1/2 of test takers don't take the test, then that moves the school automatically into Tier 2 and near Tier 3	No	None	CR	none	3	4