Decision Points								
Summary Program Score Scale			Option 1		Option 2	Committee Developed Option	Decision Delayed until October Committee requesting a range, qualitative language for Level 4 (and that bonus points shouldn't artificially inflate)	
Weighting Options			Option 1		Option 2	Option 3 Some committee members are requesting teacher evaluation data, other are concerned that the VAM percentage will be increased b/c teacher evaluations already include VAM measures; also if teacher evaluation data is included, find a way to normalize scores across districts to equalize ratings		
Placement Data	Should all programs be on the same scale?		Yes	DACP -	No, DACPs should be on a different scale - NA, focus on retention	Committee Developed Option	Suggestions that placement rate be weighted at 10%; federal government already requiring teacher prep programs to report; perhaps separate public v. private institutions; question of moving beyond narrow in- state definitions of placement	
Retention Data	What scale should be used? Which Retention Metric should		Option 1 Option 1		Option 2 Option 2	Option 3 Committee Developed Option	Committee Developed Option	

	be used?				
	Should all	Yes	No, DACPs should be	Committee Developed	
	programs be on		on a different scale	Option	
	the same scale?			- Option	
	Continuously	Option 1	Option 2	Committee Developed	NA
	Employed -			Option	Committee Selected 3 rd
	What scale				Yr Placement Metric
	should be used?			Use standard deviations to	
				identify outliers 2 standard	
				deviations (FL state averages)	
				from the norm	
	3 rd Yr Placement	Option 1	Option 2	Committee Developed	NA
	– What scale			Option	Committee Selected
	should be used?				Continuously Employed Metric
	Rule of 10	Program	Committee Developed	Decision	
		uses overall	Option	Delayed	
		institution performance		until October	
Employer	Are there	Yes	No		Reexamine survey response
Satisfaction	sufficient data?				rates after the survey is
Data					redesigned around FEAPS to
					see if the tool is now useful;
					remove from performance
					side, retain in continuous
					improvement
	What standard	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Committee Developed
	should be used?				Option
	What scale	Option 1	Committee Developed		
	should be used?		Option		
			Change Level 2 from a 38%		
			confidence level to a 68%		
VAM Data			confidence level (maintain		
			95% confidence level at Level 1		
	Dula of 10		and Level 4		
	Rule of 10	Program	Committee Developed	Decision	
		uses the	Option	Delayed until October	
		institution's reading		until October	
		and math score combined			
		combined			

Decision Points – Bonus Areas								
	What standard should be used?		Option 1		Option 2	Committee Developed Option		
Student Performance by						Convert from bonus to metric; requesting that DOE run numbers		
	What % of subgroups must meet standard for bonus?		Option 1		Committee Developed Option			
Subgroup	Which subgroups should be considered?		Certain selected subgroups		8 subgroups identified for federal school performance reporting	Committee Developed Option		
	Data in a minimum number of subgroups?		Data must be lable in at least of 8 subgroups		Committee Developed Option			
	All decisions will b							
	Which metric should be used for ITPs?		ITP Production		ITP Composite	Committee Developed Option		
Critical Teacher Shortage Area	Should the same cut point be used for all programs?		Yes		No, DACPs should be on a different scale	Committee Developed Option		
	What is the recommended cut point?		Option 1		Option 2	Committee Developed Option		

Decision Points									
Weighting		Option 1	Ор	tion 2		Option 3		Committee Developed Option	
								ng weighting in response ng student sub-groups as	

		a metric; will consider weighting options after DOE provides sub-	
		group information	
Name Level 4	Full Approval with Distinction		