- Introductions
- Objectives: No votes today, feedback only. There will be no change to the 2015-16 AE PMF from 2014-15 AE PMF.
- Sareeta gave a summary of the public comment received and how DC PCSB is addressing it
- Sareeta clarified that there was never an intention to change the Student Progress measure
    o The change to the denominator in the metric section was a typo
    o DC PCSB appreciates schools' careful read through and alerting us to any typos that we missed
- A school asked about the scale score cuts in the appendix
    o For the TABE only reading was listed but math and reading are not same scale score cuts. In the 2014-15 Tech Guide, there was an issue with the table when it was converted to a PDF. The scale scores for math were there but not visible
    o This has been corrected for the 2015-16 Tech Guide
- A question was raised about GED pass rates and whether students who took the GED on their own should be included.
    o The topic was tabled until GED the section of the meeting
- College and Career Ready Surveys
    o Purpose of survey questions was to have common questions asked to ensure comparable information across PMF.
    o The group provided feedback on the draft questions:
        ▪ Clarified that the secondary credential needs to be transferrable in the US
        ▪ In the workforce question if a student is not in the workforce, does that count for the AE PMF?
            • DC PCSB noted that if 30% of students, for example, in one program are out of the workforce it would raise questions about why given the goals of programs.
            • DC PCSB is following the federal guidelines and we want to monitor to make sure this is not being abused.
    o A school asked: Do schools have to use this survey?
        ▪ The goal is for schools to use this but DC PCSB is not mandating that every question be asked this exact way
        ▪ We want to make sure we have these answers for AE PMF.
        ▪ The goal is to provide guidance for new schools/school personnel and ensure comparability across the survey results.
    o The group discussed questions to ask at entry
        ▪ The group noted that asking about labor force status at entry may not be sufficient since this status can change by the time of the follow up

- ▪ Briya stated that NRS collects jobs at entry and not back end.
  - o The group recognized the differences in the ways that schools are asking and when the schools are asking the survey questions
- Student Achievement: GED measure
  - o Working towards capturing if students who are ready to earn the GED are earning the GED.
  - o Naomi stated surprise at the 2014-15 results because it was apparent that schools had different rationales on when a student was ready to take the GED.
  - o Some schools were liberal in sending student to take the test and others were not.
  - o Schools expressed not wanting students to get frustrated with multiple failures.
  - o Naomi shared that it would be unfair if some would hold students back and have an n-size less than 10. She implemented the Tech Guide change to create a level playing field.
  - o We will hold the rules for this year the same as 2014-15, but we hope that the group works together to find a common rule for encouraging students to take the GED.
    - ▪ We regret scaring you with the change but the conversation that resulted was great. We are looking for agreement on how students are counted.
  - o DC PCSB shared a proposal using an idea that is similar to how the HS PMF includes AP, IB, and dual enrollment in its framework
    - ▪ In high school and IB diploma is difficult to get, but schools get credit for students passing individual exams.
    - ▪ Can we look at GED in a similar way? Award credit for students passing one test at a time.
    - ▪ This is similar with how we used to do it on the accountability plans
  - o Schools noted that this is a departure from how NRS does this metric
  - o How tied are we to federal? How flexible is PCSB to the federal guidelines?
    - ▪ The NRS his is ultimately DC PCSB's adult education framework,
    - ▪ there are things we've already changed – attendance, combination of CCR measures
    - ▪ CC Prep: We feel constrained with the framework being aligned to NRS and NRS never changing
    - ▪ Naomi: This is a living document
- Transitioning the GED Metric
  - o Schools proposed GED Ready in their public comments
  - o All GED schools use GED Ready.
  - o Schools shared that the publisher makes it easy to use, but a few schools had concerns about the social studies section
  - o The group discuss their thoughts on the predictive power of the GED and whether the "Likely to pass" score seemed more or less rigorous than the GED.
  - o One school has a buffer that a 155 is ready to take the GED. Another school uses the likely to pass score on each content from the publisher.
    - ▪ DC PCSB will work with schools to collect data on how each school determines whether students are ready for the GED.

- o The GED Ready does not score the writing section, so the group discussed the possibility of sharing and helping to grade writing prompts and
- o The group also discussed FOCUS pooling the GED Ready data if given anonymously to help look at different readiness targets.
    - Data collected would include age and whether it is the Spanish or English GED
- o One request is to have this conversation once data is collected.
- o Schools shared that is not easy to access the data in GED manager; schools have to open, click on each student, and then write down the data. Students have to give schools access and the password for each student. This is for both GED and GED Ready.
    - DC PCSB will bring up this concern when they speak with OSSE
    - *Follow-up: OSSE says that this is a way for schools to download an Excel file with all the data. OSSE will get back to DC PCSB on who schools should reach out to for GED Manager training*
- o The group came back to the conversation to look at credit for individual test passing. The denominator could be a set group of students. A student may be able to go into the numerator multiple times for passing tests.
- o A possible denominator could be students who score in the likely to pass range.
    - Some schools are using additional info to know who should take GED ready- English language skills, typing skills (Speed of 25 words per min), lexile level (1100), mouse skills, use of Dropbox. Other schools just use GED ready.
    - In the feedback form, include your ideas. Naomi suggested giving access to feedback responses so schools can see other responses and give input on what the group is doing.
- o There was a suggestion to split Student Achievement into two measures
    - one measure for individual tests
    - one measure for earning the GED
- o For NEDP we need to look at an appropriate transition for this assessment as well.
- 12 Hour business rule
    - o This would apply only to CCR
    - o The group discussed the two-week/40 hour proposal
        - Next Step: If we are going to start changing rules, they need to based on something solid. Student commitment is slippery. We have students committed to their education but stuff happens. We discussed 100 hours as meaningful and the tipping point.
        - DC PCSB: Going to 100 hours is not aligned to our goal. The 100 hours is making an economic impact, but we are looking at whether students are committed
    - o Naomi: All of the other measures capture the work you are doing, ELL, GED, etc. We cannot move to a denominator of only students who make it to 100 hours. The data shows a lot of students who don't stay very long. Four years ago, it was 12 hours and a 100% response rate. Schools said that was impossible. We got to sampling on the response rate at 70%. There were a lot of comments and we moved to a 50% response rate. We divorced from the guidelines. Schools were

very appreciative at that point. Now schools are very frustrated again, messages from schools are all about the 12 hours but no information about the 50%. We need to also look at response rate.

- o There group had some discussion about different lengths of orientations
- o A couple schools expressed concern that this felt like a proxy for retention
- o Now that we have data for two years, we can look at employment, hours there. We would just need a little more information about the programs.
- o There was a suggestion to consider a percentage of your program, maybe if the student is there for 5% of the program. We would need to look at what the program means.
  - ▪ It is complicated which is why DC PCSB proposed two weeks or 40 hours.
- o The group agreed that the fundamental questions are: When do schools become responsible for students? At what point is it fair to count?
- o We are open to looking at the percent of students you follow up with and the number of hours before you need to follow up.
- o Maya YALC: Engagement is measured many ways in the PMF, for us this is about impact. It takes more than 12 hours. Why not just pick 40 hours or two weeks?
  - ▪ DC PCSB was trying to be flexible. We can commit to one of the other if the group agrees.
- o Challenge with two weeks, some don't attend right away because of unusual issues.
  - ▪ The school can un-enroll the student and re-enroll them when they are ready to come back.
- o Another school supports the 40 hours, two weeks. One suggestion is 10 days present or 40 hours present.
- o AOH: The NRS does say 70% response rate. Meant to be random sampling.
  - ▪ We are at a non-random sampling of 50%.
- Feedback
  - o Form will be updated to help capture today's conversation.
  - o Feedback on survey needs to be sent by Friday at noon. These are potential adjustments for 15-16 tech guide.
  - o In feedback, please be clear on data requests so DC PCSB can be proactive for the January task force meeting.