



## **Adult Education Task Force Meeting**

January 30, 2018

### School Leaders and Organization Representatives:

Elizabeth Bowman (Briya PCS), Lawrence Bussy (The Family Place PCS), Amber Eby (LAYC Career Academy PCS), HollyAnn Freso-Moore (Carlos Rosario PCS), Andrea Gallegos (The Family Place PCS), Thomas Gerkin (Briya PCS), Nicole Hanrahan (LAYC Career Academy PCS), Karen Hertzler (Briya PCS), Janalee Jordan-Meldrum (YouthBuild PCS/Ten Square), Matthew Layton (Academy of Hope Adult PCS), Sasha Lotas (Academy of Hope Adult PCS), Terese Lowery (The Family Place PCS), Jonathan Mathis (The Next Step PCS), Christie McKay (Briya PCS), Julie Meyer (The Next Step PCS), Ryan Monroe (Carlos Rosario PCS), Oluremi Olufemi (YouthBuild PCS), Marcos Pantelis (Academy of Hope Adult PCS), Preety Patidar (FOCUS), Lorie Preheim (Briya PCS), Rachel PremDas (Community College Prep PCS), Audrey Reese (Academy of Hope Adult PCS), Adrianna Rodriguez (Maya Angelou PCS), Patricio Sanchez (Carlos Rosario PCS), Tanyr Seay (The Next Step PCS), Connie Spinner (Community College Prep PCS), Shannon Webster (Community College Prep PCS), and Haley Wiggins (The Family Place PCS)

DC PCSB Staff: Paul Capp, Naomi DeVeaux, Erin Kupferberg, Melodi Sampson, Brandon Sibilia, and Pete Petrin

### **Overview of Approved 2017-18 PMF Changes**

- Student Progress:
  - Schools must post-test at least 60% of eligible students
  - ABE students must be tested in reading and math
- Student Achievement:
  - Will count relevant GED subject test passage as proof of growth
  - Earned secondary credential floor is 40%
  - High-level certification attainment is display only
- See 2017-18 PMF Guide for details, we are happy to talk through changes 1:1.

### Questions and Answers:

- Community College Prep PCS: There are always sweeping changes to the AE PMF every year. When will these changes stop or at least decrease? When DC PCSB revises the PMF Guide, we must invest a significant amount of money in response to the changes.
- DC PCSB: Our intention is not to have sweeping changes every year. The AE framework is new when compared to the other Frameworks. Our aim is to improve the Framework so that it accurately captures performance among AE schools. Hopefully we can get to a point where we have a stable framework, but we aren't there yet. I don't believe the changes we approved

for the 2017-18 Guide were sweeping, and the changes we're proposing for 2018-19 are minor.

- Community College Prep PCS: Adjusting the Earned Secondary Credential floor to 40% is not minor. I want to go on record vehemently opposing these changes. Adult schools are not PK-12 schools. I don't see these differences accounted for in the AE Framework.
- DC PCSB: We hear you, we don't want to dismiss your concerns. For now, let's plan to discuss this offline. I'm happy to talk with you about the changes our Board approved.

### **Proposals for the 2018-19 Framework**

- Student Progress
  - Eliminate growth expectation for ESL students who pre-test at educational functioning level 6
- Mission Specific Goals
  - Align PMF-reported goals with goals in your charter agreement
    - Schools can display up to three goals from their charter agreement or
    - Could implement this for 2017-18. If interested, please let us know via feedback form

### **Questions and Answers:**

- Carlos Rosario PCS: Does this mean we have to amend our agreement so it includes the goals we have been reporting on the PMF?
- DC PCSB: Our aim is to get schools to choose to display goals on their PMF that are already part of their charter agreement.

### **CCR Out of Labor Force Discussion**

- Per WIOA, barriers to employment replaces the out of labor force designation
- NRS requires agencies to report exit outcomes for ALL participants, and disaggregate those outcomes by barrier
- Heavier data burden if we implement NRS guidance
- For now, PCSB is comfortable leaving out of labor force exemptions as they are.

### **Questions and Answers:**

- Maya Angelou PCS: If we don't align with NRS, what data will we use to set the floors and targets? I don't want to vote on this until I have a better understanding of how non-adoption of these designations could impact/not impact floor and target calculations.
- DC PCSB: That's a critical question that we need to answer. This isn't a voting option on the feedback form (because we aren't proposing any

changes). Let's circle back on this item at the next meeting I want to give some thought to how to move forward.

### **"Missing" GED Prep Students Discussion**

- Over 300 students enrolled in GED programs in 16-17 had neither progress denominator nor the achievement denominator
- Pre and post-test participation rules should boost count of GED prep students in Progress measure
- What may explain why GED prep students aren't being captured on PMF? What else can we do to capture students in Progress and/or Achievement?

### **Questions and Answers:**

- Carlos Rosario PCS: Students in Spanish GED take an assessment for progress (currently Spark3000, formerly Supera) but DC PCSB doesn't recognize it.
- The Next Step PCS: This is true for students taking the TABE Spanish assessment.
- DC PCSB: Let's clarify—we don't accept those assessments in progress because they are not federally-recognized. Our Progress measure only includes NRS-approved tests. We should distinguish between Spanish and English GED prep students to get a better idea of how many non-Spanish GED test takers are not counted towards PMF. Are you seeing larger sets of English test-takers taking test but not counted towards progress?
- Carlos Rosario PCS: The only students we don't test are those that registered and didn't show up or registered and dropped before we could take them. There are no students taking classes who aren't testing.
- Maya Angelou PCS: For the most part, missing students are those who don't have a post-test.
- DC PCSB: What is the number of students who leave the school/drop the class before the post-testing window begins?
- Maya Angelou PCS: We shouldn't have a discussion before we account for students exiting before post-test window and Spanish GED test-takers
- Community College Prep PCS: What kind of vetting is done on the frontend to know the student truly belongs with us? We had a student who expressed interest in our GED program, but he never showed up and the student appeared in our GED data that you got from OSSE.
- DC PCSB: That sounds like an enrollment reporting issue. If that student registered but did not attend your school, he should not have been coded as a Stage 5 enrollment. We don't know why students would appear as taking a GED test and be enrolled in your school.
- Carlos Rosario PCS: There are students who enroll in a non-GED program and study for the GED on the side. They aren't part of our GED program, but

if they take any GED subtests, OSSE shares that data with you and they count in our GED population.

- Community College Prep PCS: These seem to be two separate conversations. This is a retention issue.
- DC PCSB: It is tied to retention, yet these students are likely included in the retention denominator. These students are not included in the denominator for Progress or Achievement.
- Community College Prep PCS: Are you saying these students did not make EFL gains in Progress?
- DC PCSB: No. These students did not have a pre- and/or post-test and are therefore not included in the Progress denominator. We want as many students as possible to appear in the denominator of at least one of these categories. That is why we're having this conversation.
- Maya Angelou PCS: Could you please provide us with our student-level data of "missing" students? I want to see the list so I can compare with our records and find out why they may not be included.
- DC PCSB: Yes, we will share the student-level data in a follow-up.

### **2019-20 Student Progress Proposal**

- For ABE, report performance in literacy and numeracy
- Provides a more comprehensive look at growth
- Report both subjects, not just the lowest scoring subject

### **Questions and Answers:**

- The Next Step PCS: I think this is great. The more comprehensive the measure the better. Can we also think about breaking down ESL tests into separate domains?
- Maya Angelou PCS: I need to discuss further with my instructional staff before weighing in. Doing it this way will significantly increase the administrative time with testing. To get high outcomes, there needs to be a lot of administrative time and instructional time spent. I'd be concerned about doubling that work.
- Carlos Rosario PCS: Agreed. For us, it would be impossible to add another test.
- Briya PCS: National data is using either or, so we need to keep that in mind when creating floors and targets if we go in this direction
- DC PCSB: We need to continue discussing this, particularly concerning how to report on both subjects. We have some data we can share from 2016-17. We will send out more information by next week and will plan to discuss this again at the next meeting.

### **Next Steps**

- Will cancel that 2/22 meeting due to conflict with OSSE LEA Data Meeting
- The 3/7 meeting is at 8:00, right before the Charter Leaders Meeting
- Please send comments due no later than 5:00 PM on 2/7

### **Questions and Answers:**

- Maya Angelou PCS: What is PCSB's timeline for moving us from national data to DC data for setting floors and targets (like you do for the other frameworks)?
- DC PCSB: Our concern with using local data only is that DC's AE population small. A smaller pool gives us less confidence. PK-12 schools want us to start using nationally. The 2018-19 floors and targets are forthcoming. We will probably give you an update at the next task force meeting.

### **Student Achievement Proposal (Specific to NEDP Schools)**

- After reviewing NEDP attainment data, we concluded it isn't appropriate to adjust floor and target
- Proposal: Adjust NEDP denominator
  - Restrict denominator to students who are further along in the Assessment Phase. Here are options we discussed with OSSE:
    - Limit to students who are in the Portfolio Review phase
    - Limit to students who've completed 50% of their performance tasks
    - Limit to students who've completed 50% of their Post-Task Assessments

### **Questions and Answers:**

- Academy of Hope PCS: It seems like these proposals came from paper-based test, that is no longer in use. With computer-based test, phases are not as distinct. We need to define what "Performance Task" and "Post-task Assessment" means. We need to determine when to count students in Portfolio Review—when they submit or when the submission has been approved by the reviewer?
- DC PCSB: Does adjusting the denominator feel like the right next step?
- Briya PCS: If the floor is 40 and the target is 100, then I think adjusting the denominator is correct.
- DC PCSB: Then the next question is how much progress within the portfolio review phase is enough to count towards denominator?
- Academy of Hope Adult PCS: Being in x numbers of area when is something else to similar when determining the denominator
- Academy of Hope Adult PCS: How many years of data do you need?
- DC PCSB: If possible, we like to run things for three years of data. If that's not possible, then preferably two.



- Briya PCS: We could reach out to CASAS (because they oversee NEDP) and see if they could provide a report, data, input, advice, etc.
- DC PCSB: In that case, let's check-in in two weeks to review the data. Our hope is to have enough data to draft a new denominator we're all comfortable with by the time of our next meeting.