



DC Public Charter School Board
 Adult Education PMF Task Force Feedback:
 May 25, 2017 Meeting

➤ **Student Progress Category Proposal 1**

Adopt the following business rule: Schools that do not post-test at least two-thirds (66.7%) of eligible students will receive zero points on the Student Progress category.

Survey Question

Do you agree with DC PCSB's proposed post-test participation rate business rule? 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.
12.5%	87.5%

LEA Written Response

We would like to support the proposal of a 60% threshold that was proposed at last week's meeting.

We support the alternative proposal to use 60%.

As per our meeting we all agreed that the participation rate would be at 60%. Carlos Rosario agrees with 60% participation rate.

██████ agrees that a participation rate is necessary for this measure. ██████ does not agree with the post-test participation rate of 66.7% because if a school's participation rate is lower than that rate, an automatic zero is assigned to the entire student progress indicator. If partial points for the indicator are not possible based on levels of post-test participation, then we are proposing a lower post-test participation rate than the one proposed in Proposal 1. We are proposing a participation rate of 60% starting in SY 17-18 as was discussed during the AE PMF task force meeting.

60% alternative for "being tested" not 66.7%

Should lower to 60%; there should be some form of credit given for schools that reach at least 50%; zero points for not meeting DC PCSB's proposal is too punitive.

I can support the 60% compromise.

While we agree with Proposal 1 for the 2017-2018 PMF, we would like to request further clarification on how you would handle continuing students. For example, we have several students who have tested 3,4, maybe 5 times, and then do not "post-test" again before leaving. However, they have post-tested several times before that

LEA Written Response

point. This most often happens when we have a student post-test in the summer term of the prior program year, continue in the fall, and then withdraw mid-semester. How would you handle these students and would there be a business rule to guard against this potentially impacting our ability to achieve the metric?

Revised DC PCSB Staff Recommendation

Following task force feedback, in which 87.5% of schools proposed changing the post-test participation rate to 60% instead of 66.7%, DC PCSB staff propose adopting the following business rule (revision bolded):

Schools that do not post-test at least **60%** of eligible students will receive zero points on the Student Progress Category.

➤ **Student Progress Category Proposal 2**

Adopt the following business rule: Positively count pre-tested ABE 5 or lower students in Student Progress who

1. Pass the GED subject test that corresponds to their lowest performing ABE subject during the program year, and
2. Do not post-test.

Survey Question

Do you agree with DC PCSB's proposal to accept an alternative for demonstrating growth? If you disagree, choose "No" and write an explanation in the space below.

LEA Vote

Yes, I agree with the proposal.	No, I disagree with the proposal.
87.5%	12.5%

LEA Written Response

We would like PCSB to consider altering the business rule to include the following (in red):

Positively count pre-test ABE 5 or lower students in the Student Progress category who

1. Pass the GED subject test that corresponds to their lowest performing ABE subject during the program year, and
2. Do not post-test **OR Have a final post-test date that is earlier than the date that the student passes the corresponding GED subject test.**

We feel that the original business rule as written would apply to very few students. Based on our understanding, schools could only apply this rule for students who: 1. passed their corresponding GED sub-test in the first few weeks after taking their pre-test or 2. do not happen to post-test according to school and publisher guidelines.

If the true spirit of the rule is to allow schools to demonstrate student growth in this alternate way, then we should also be able to count students positively in the growth metric if they have a post-test date that is earlier than the date that the student passes the corresponding subject test.

LEA Written Response

We propose that students who earn a high school diploma through the NEDP program similarly be credited with demonstrating growth to meet the progress measure and that they count as post-tested for the progress and retention measures.

Revised DC PCSB Staff Recommendation

Following task force feedback, DC PCSB staff propose adopting the following business rule (revision bolded):

Positively count pre-tested ABE 5 or lower students in Student Progress who

1. Pass the GED subject test that corresponds to their lowest performing ABE subject during the program year **or attain the National External Diploma Program (NEDP) credential during the program year**, and
2. Do not post-test **after passing the corresponding GED subject test**.

➤ **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%	14.3%	71.4%	14.3%

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%	14.3%	28.6%	57.1%

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

We liked that the AE Task Force was attached to the Charter Leaders Meeting so we went to one meeting instead of two.