



DC Public Charter School Board  
 Adult Education PMF Task Force Feedback:  
 March 23, 2017 Meeting  
 March 30, 2017 Meeting Addendum

**Achievement Category**

- 1. Secondary Credential and GED Subject Test Measures** - Please indicate whether you agree with DC PCSB's proposal to align the business rules for calculating the floor for these measures, resulting in a floor equal to 40. If you disagree, choose "No" and write an alternative proposal in the space below this question.

**LEA Vote**

Yes, I agree with the proposal.	No, I disagree with the proposal.	Abstained
71.4%	28.5%	12.5%

**LEA Written Response**

Rather than voting no, we wish to abstain from the vote on this measure because we do not have a GED program. We look forward to continuing to look at what floors and targets should be for NEDP as the data used to form the existing floor and target only represents GED.

DCPCSB Proposal - Bullet 1: Continue using 16-17 GED Subject Test floor-setting business rule on 17-18 PMF. [REDACTED] We agree with continuing to use 16-17 GED Subject Test floor-setting business rules on 17-18 PMF. DCPCSB Proposal - Bullet 2: Apply 16-17 GED Subject Test floor-setting business rule to the 17-18 Secondary Credential measure. [REDACTED] We are proposing an alternative floor to the Secondary Credential measure for the 17-18 PMF. We would like to propose a more gradual approach to increasing this floor. An increase from 0% to 40% from one year to the next is a large increase. Instead, we would prefer for 17-18 to have this floor set to the mid-point of current 16-17 floor (0%) and the suggested calculated floor (56.2%) that was presented in the March 23 AE PMF meeting. This would mean that we are proposing the new floor for the Secondary Credential measure to be 28.1% for the 17-18 PMF. It would be based to some degree on current local data (albeit a limit sample) and it would be a gradual increase towards the new much higher floor to be calculated in 18-19. In addition, we would like to consider adjusting the business rule requiring adult education students who score 'likely to pass' on a GED Ready test to have to take the corresponding GED Subject test if the 'likely to pass' score is 150 points or higher, and not the current 145 points or higher. We find it a better practice to ask students to take the GED test when their GED ready tests are

at that level. If that is not a possibility, we recommend lowering the target for the Secondary Credential measure from 100% to 95%.
For the Secondary Credential, keep floors and targets as they currently are. (School Year 16-17)
At this point, ██████████ disagrees. While we appreciate the PCSB's effort to look at both DC Charter Sector and national data, we believe that it is too early to revise the floor based on the data we have. First, we do not yet have DC Charter Sector data on the subject test floor, since the new floor was only put into place for the 16-17 school year. And, it does not appear that we will have validated data before the beginning of the 17-18 school year. Second, the national data that PCSB refers to in the revised PowerPoint deck appears to reference data in the GED Testing Service's Technical Guide, p. 121. While these data are very promising, it is unclear from the Technical Guide how many test takers are represented in the sample – if only 180, as referenced on p. 120, they would clearly not be representative of the broader national GED test-taking population. It is also unclear if any of these data represent Spanish test-takers, or how many times test takers took the Ready and the full Subject Tests to get to these percentages. Additionally, we would point out that the GED Testing Service has since lowered the passing threshold for each subject test, from 150 to 145, clearly based on updated data. Before we can make a change as substantial as this, we would ask that we have access to at least two years of valid and reliable data about overall student outcomes. We would propose that the PCSB wait to reevaluate this measure until next year, when we have at least one full year of subject test data from the DC Charter Sector. Additionally, we would propose that PCSB (along with Adult Charters) continue to work with the GED Testing Service to obtain updated national data.
We propose to maintain the current floor of 0 through 2017-18 for the Secondary Credential measure and revisit the discussion for the 2018-19 school year. We feel that an adjustment of the floor for one year with another change predicted in the 2018-19 year prevents the intended PMF audience from making meaningful comparison of school performance from year to year.
I don't necessarily disagree with the proposal, but agree we should view another year of data before implementing new floors/targets.

**DC PCSB Staff Recommendation**

DC PCSB should move forward with aligning the floor-setting business rules for these measures on the 2017-18 PMF. Our recommendation is to apply the GED Subject Test floor-setting business rule to the Secondary Credential measure, resulting in a floor equal to 40% (up from 0%). Our rationale for moving forward with this proposal is captured in two points:

- 1) A floor equal to 0% is no longer appropriate given DC charter GED attainment data from 2014-15 and 2015-16 (regardless of n-size) and GED Testing Service data from 2014.
- 2) A floor equal to 0% is particularly inappropriate now that the Secondary Credential measure's denominator is limited to students who've been approved by the LEA to take the GED or who're likely to pass the GED per performance on the GED Ready.

2. **Earned High-Level Certification Measure** - Please indicate whether you agree with DC PCSB's proposal to display this measure for an additional year.

**LEA Vote**

Yes, I agree with the proposal.	No, I disagree with the proposal.
100%	0%

**Leading Indicator**

1. **Attendance Measure** - Please indicate whether you agree with using OSSE's validated in-seat attendance (ISA) rates on the PMF instead of DC PCSB's ISA rates. If schools agree to use OSSE's validated ISA rates, DC PCSB will create an appeal process to ensure ISA rate accuracy.

**LEA Vote**

Yes, I agree with using OSSE's validated ISA rates on the PMF.	No, I disagree with using OSSE's validated ISA rates on the PMF.
50.0%	50.0%

**DC PCSB Staff Decision**

DC PCSB will continue to validate attendance data separately from OSSE for the 2017-18 PMF. We will revisit the option to transition to using OSSE's validated ISA data in the future, particularly if LEA's express satisfaction with OSSE's attendance collection and validation process.

**Meeting Feedback**

1. On a five-point scale, where "5" is extremely satisfied and "1" is extremely dissatisfied, how satisfied are you with the 3/23/17 meeting?

**LEA Vote**

1	2	3	4	5
0%	0%	37.5%	50.0%	12.5%

2. On a five-point scale, where "5" is strongly agree and "1" is strongly disagree, please rate your thoughts on the following statement: The 3/23/17 meeting was a good use of time.

**LEA Vote**

1	2	3	4	5
0%	0%	12.5%	62.5%	25.0%

3. Write any additional comments or concerns regarding this Task Force Meeting below

Regarding the attendance measure: We wish to continue to use data validated with the PCSB for the PMF because of our history of technical problems with OSSE's data system. We feel that PCSB is much more accessible to deal with and resolve validation issues. We wish to validate with PCSB until we have a stronger track record of OSSE's system correctly receiving and calculating our data. Ideally what we validate with PCSB will continue to be the same as what is validated with OSSE, but we need to have more confidence in that process for the high stakes PMF.

Regarding data validation in general: In response to the data shared on out of labor force and in seat attendance at the task force meeting, I would like to ask that data tabulated about schools to be shared with PCSB staff, board, or the task force be confirmed with the individual schools for accuracy. We've shared via email our concerns about these two data sets.

Also, when we see data listed anonymously for each school in the task force meeting we don't have a way of knowing which data represents us to confirm its accuracy or fully understand what we are seeing. Perhaps some kind of key could be shared with individual schools so they can look at their own data.

When possible, it would be helpful to see the slides for the meeting ahead of time so we have additional time to consider what will be discussed at the meeting.

Could we obtain DCPCSB's PMF proposals or recommendations one week prior to our meetings so that we can participate more actively and not find out what is being proposed during the meetings?

In the slide show Presentation Addendum GED pass rates: Can you share the source of the national test section passing rates?

When will the calculator for the SY16-17 PMF be available?

During the AE Task Force meetings, when the AC fan comes on, it becomes harder to hear. Please be sure to speak up and repeat participants' questions.

Our comments are not focused on the meeting per se, but on next steps.

First, we would also ask that schools be given the option of having the attendance rate be recalculated, if the 15-day rule calculation exceeds that of OSSE's calculation and results in a Tier change.

Second, we would ask that the PCSB reexamine the TABE/CASAS post-test retention requirement for students who earn their GED during the testing year. While we certainly understand the need to demonstrate that schools are retaining students, we encourage PCSB to consider using GED passage during the testing year as an alternative measure of retention. This would enable students who pass the GED early in the year to count as "retained" and not require that they take the post-test. Students who pass the GED early in the school have very little interest in taking the TABE a second time; they are focused on transition preparation, taking the Accuplacer, ACT/SAT, completing the FAFSA, and often looking for placement.

Finally, instead of using summer meetings to consider raising the floor for the 18-19 GED Achievement Measure, we would ask that PCSB consider holding summer/fall AdultEd PMF Task Force meetings to discuss overall Tiering, and how measures can be looked at together to determine school PMF Tiers. This would give us time to consider the measures as a whole, with additional context from the results over the last couple of years – looking at what constitutes excellence across the sector, and how the Tiering structure can be used to continue to promote and support excellence.

Thank you!

Regarding the attendance metric, we are in support of using OSSE's rate if they will leave the attendance feed open through the end of our program year, and PCSB implements a robust validation process with the schools. Last school year, there were so many issues with OSSE's attendance rate that we had to submit our full attendance data files directly to Tim in order to validate the Equity Report and PMF rates. If the issues are resolved, the feed remains open, and we can validate the rate with PCSB, we are comfortable using OSSE's rate.

Regarding using OSSE's validated attendance rate, while it is appealing to have one less step in the process, at least a month of our data would be missing from it. Our school year runs 4-6 weeks after OSSE quits collecting attendance data. That is why I would want to keep using the PCSB rate.

**Career and College Readiness Category**

1. [This question is only for schools that conduct follow-ups in Q1 and Q3 (e.g., Carlos Rosario PCS, LAYC PCS, Maya Angelou PCS, Next Step PCS, Youth Build PCS).] Are you willing to do follow-ups in Q2 and Q4 beginning with school year 2017-18? If your answer is "No," please give an explanation in the space below.

Yes, we are willing to do follow-ups in Q2 and Q4.	No, we are not willing to do follow-ups in Q2 and Q4.
20.0%	80.0%

2. If you answered "No" above, please give an explanation in the space below.

This question does not apply to us, but we support schools having the choice of first and third or second and fourth quarter follow up. We are concerned about whether our follow up rates will go down as a result of delaying the calls process to second and fourth quarter and we will analyze that data going forward.

The new proposal would delay the follow ups by one quarter for each type. The longer the time span between exit and follow up the more challenging it becomes to reach our students.

The more time we have between students exiting and us following up the greater the chance is that we will not reach them. It's difficult to keep up to date information while they are enrolled. If we follow up a year after they leave the program it would significantly impact our response rate.

We strongly prefer to continue doing follow-ups in Q1 and Q3 due to the challenges of reaching students. Our student population is highly mobile, with many students changing phone numbers and addresses several times

throughout the year. We have even faced difficulty in securing Q3 follow-ups for students because so many change their contact information after the Q1 follow-up. We feel that we will be able to secure a higher response rate and gather more data to inform our programming and for use on the PMF if we continue to conduct our follow-ups in Q1 and Q3.

I prefer to maintain our current Q1 and Q3 follow-up schedule. The less time that passes before we follow-up, the more likely we can reach a student.