WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS
Agenda

• Approved 2017-18 PMF Changes
• 2018-19 Student Progress Proposal
• Mission Specific Goals Proposal
• College and Career Readiness Discussion
• “Missing” GED Students Discussion
• 2019-20 Student Progress Proposal
• Next Steps
• Student Achievement Proposal (specific to NEDP schools)
APPROVED 2017-18 PMF CHANGES
Approved 2017-18 PMF Changes

• Schools must post-test at least 60% of eligible students
• ABE students must be tested in reading and math
• Will count relevant GED subject test passage as proof of growth
• Earned secondary credential floor is 40%
• High-level certification attainment display only

Please see the 2017-18 PMF Policy and Technical Guide for details.
2018-19 STUDENT PROGRESS PROPOSAL
Proposal: Adjust ESL Growth Expectations

Eliminate growth expectation for ESL students who pre-test at educational functioning level (EFL) 6.

• Per NRS Technical Assistance Guide, there are only 6 EFLs for ESL
• If a student pre-tests as ESL EFL 6, he/she should not be included in the metric
• Once a student post-tests as ESL EFL 6, we will no longer look for growth to “EFL 7”
Current ESL EFL Language

2017-18 Language

- If a student has a pre-test score that is in ABE 6 or above ESL 6, the student is not included in the measure.
- Students with a pre-test score in ABE 5 or ESL 6 must score at least one point above the score range to qualify as progressing beyond ABE 5 and ESL 6.
Proposed ESL EFL Language

2018-19 Adjustment

• If a student has a pre-test score that is in ABE 6 or above ESL 6, the student is not included in the measure.

• Students with a pre-test score in ABE 5 or ESL 5 6 must score at least one point above the score range to qualify as progressing beyond ABE 5 and ESL 5 6.
### Modeling Proposal with 2016-17 Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Current Rule (Including ESL 6)</th>
<th>Proposed Rule (Excluding ESL 6)</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MISSION SPECIFIC GOALS PROPOSAL
Proposal: Mission Specific Goals

Align PMF-reported goals with goals in your charter agreement.

- Eliminates duplicative reporting
- Establishes firm business rules
- Eliminates confusion during reviews and renewals
- Creates consistency between schools with similar goals
Proposal: Mission Specific Goals (cont.)

• Schools can display up to three goals from charter agreement.
• Could implement this sooner than 2018-19, if schools interested.
Discussion: CCR Out of Labor Force

- Recall WIOA conversation in Spring 2017
  - “Out of labor force” phased out
  - Considered removing out of labor force exemption
- Since then
  - NRS Technical Assistance (TA) Guide released
  - Clearer collection and reporting expectations
CCR NRS TA Guide Overview

• “Barriers to employment” replaces the “out-of-labor force” designation
• Agencies to report exit outcomes for ALL participants, and disaggregate those outcomes by barrier
• Sample barriers
  • ELL/low literacy level
  • Low-income
Decision Point: No Change to CCR

- Barriers are broad and capture nearly 100% of AE population
- Heavier data reporting burden if we implement NRS guidance
- For now, comfortable leaving out of labor force exemptions as they are
“MISSING” GED PREP STUDENTS
“Missing” GED Prep Students

- DC PCSB aims to capture majority of students in Progress and/or Achievement categories
- In 2016-17, over 300 students enrolled in GED programs had neither Progress nor Achievement data to report on the PMF
## 2016-17 Data on “Missing” GED Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Total in GED Programs</th>
<th>Total in Progress Denominator</th>
<th>Total in Achievement Denominator</th>
<th>Total in Neither Measure</th>
<th>% of GED Students “Missing” from Progress/Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 6</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 7</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1693</strong></td>
<td><strong>1273</strong></td>
<td><strong>344</strong></td>
<td><strong>306</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.1%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion: “Missing” GED Prep Students

- What may explain why GED prep students aren’t being captured on PMF?
- Pre- and post-test participation rules should boost count of GED prep students in Progress measure.
- What else can we do to capture students in Progress and/or Achievement?
2019-20 STUDENT PROGRESS PROPOSAL
Proposal: Report Literacy and Numeracy Growth

For ABE, report performance in literacy and numeracy.

• Per 2017-18 PMF Guide, all ABE students must be tested in math and reading
• Historically, measure has been math-dominant
• More comprehensive look at growth
Proposal: Report Literacy and Numeracy Growth (cont.)

- Report both subjects, not just the lowest scoring subject
- Schools will still get credit when students grow 1 or more EFL
- Weight still based on number of test takers
# ABE Student Progress Reporting by Subject

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABE Subject</th>
<th>2015-16 % Reported in Student Progress Measure</th>
<th>2016-17 % Reported in Student Progress Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literacy</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numeracy</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Reportable Subtests for ABE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Reportable Literacy Subtests</th>
<th>Reportable Numeracy Subtests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CASAS Life Skills</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASAS Employability</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASAS Life and Work</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABE 9 &amp; 10</td>
<td>Reading or Language</td>
<td>Applied Math and Math Computation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABE 11 &amp; 12</td>
<td>Reading or Language</td>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps

• Will confirm next meeting(s) soon
  • Hold February 22 (conflict with OSSE meeting?)
  • Hold March 7 (Charter Leaders Meeting)
• Feedback Form due no later than 5:00 pm on February 7
STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT PROPOSAL
(SPECIFIC TO NEDP SCHOOLS)
Considering NEDP Adjustment

- Reviewed national, local, and charter NEDP data
- Concluded inappropriate to adjust floor and target

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earned Secondary Credential (GED or NEDP)</td>
<td>Based on # of test takers</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## NEDP Attainment Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Year</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>DC</th>
<th>Charter Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposal: Adjust NEDP Denominator

Restrict denominator to students who are further along in the Assessment Phase.

- Current denominator may be too large
- Includes all NEDP students who’re ABE 4 in math and ASE 5 in reading
Proposal: Adjust NEDP Denominator (cont.)

- Option A: Limit to students who’re in the Portfolio Review phase
- Option B: Limit to students who’ve completed 50% of their Performance Tasks
- Option C: Limit to students who’ve completed 50% of their Post-Task Assessments
Proposal: Adjust NEDP Denominator (cont.)

- Difficult to identify appropriate alternative rule for denominator
  - Lack detailed Assessment Phase data
  - Need more data from LEAs
  - Need feedback from LEAs