



Adult Education (AE) PMF Task Force Meeting Notes

Tuesday, May 15, 2018, 1pm – 3pm

Attendees

LEA/Support Organization Representatives: Amber Eby (LAYC Career Academy PCS), HollyAnn Fresno-Moore (Carlos Rosario PCS), Nicole Hanrahan (LAYC Career Academy PCS), Irene Holtzman (FOCUS), Leicester Johnson (Academy of Hope Adult PCS), Janalee Jordan-Meldrum (YouthBuild PCS), Sasha Lotas (Academy of Hope Adult PCS), Juan Carlos Martinez (The Next Step PCS), Ryan Monroe (Carlos Rosario PCS), Oluremi Olufemi (YouthBuild PCS), Rachel PremDas (Community College Prep PCS,) Oscar Ramirez (The Next Step PCS), Adriana Rodriguez (Maya Angelou PCS), Patricio Sanchez (Carlos Rosario PCS), Tanyr Seay (The Next Step PCS), Connie Spinner (Community College Prep PCS), Andrew Touchette (YouthBuild PCS), Shannon Webster (Community College Prep PCS), Sadin White (Community College Prep PCS), Haley Wiggins (The Family Place)

DC PCSB Staff: Naomi DeVeaux, Erin Kupferberg, Melodi Sampson, Paul Capp

Opening

Naomi: We have been working with the national data and Briya proposed a different way of using the data to move forward. We have heard proposals to not tier the PMF, but that is off the table. We will continue to tier. A few years ago, we also discussed an overall tier vs the category score. As a task force we decided to keep the tier cutoffs at 65 and keep categories in isolation as opposed to adopting a summative score. If you are open to a summative score, that is open for the future, but not today. It is an 8-month process that can occur later.

Floor and Target Proposals

Student Progress: Focus is to make sure tier 1 cutoff is national growth rate plus 1%.

Q. Connie: Why are we using national growth rate? You are comparing urban students to national data. That's comparing apples to oranges.

A. Melodi: In previous proposals, we set expectations based on state performance. We're now setting expectations based on student performance which eliminates the focus on how states are performing. We aren't comfortable basing floors and targets in this measure on local performance

because there are only 8 schools in our portfolio. We're used to using a more robust pool of data when we set Progress floors and targets.

A. Naomi: We ask that you listen to the proposals today then we have allowed time for questions later.

Q. Nicole: Has the PMF as Goals Policy been adjusted?

A. Naomi: Tier 1 has always meant high performing. We did bring a new proposal in February, but the task force asked not to focus on that as we adjusted the floor and target business rules. We will revisit once this discussion is finalized.

Q. Patricio: For ESL level 6, when students pre-test in fall, is it ok to not post-test them?

A. Melodi: If you're still providing services, we will still expect them to persist at your LEA. We can discuss ways to demonstrate persistence aside from post-testing (perhaps number of instructional hours as we've done with other non-NRS tested students). Let's talk offline about how to show persistence for those students.

Q. HollyAnn: Since the focus is on national average plus 1, can we reconsider the data set later? Especially given the change in assessments?

A. Melodi: Yes, this is the data set for the next three years. We will have a few years to look at the data set and the new data being released to see if we want to move forward and adjust business rules in three years.

College and Career Readiness: Move the floor and target to the 10th and 90th percentiles of national performance, respectively.

Leading Indicators: Set the floors and targets for attendance at 50% and 70%, respectively. Change "Retention" to Persistence. Set the floors and targets for persistence at 45% and 80%, respectively.

Overall Impact: If we do a phased transition, two schools would change tier from 1 to 2. If we do an immediate transition, three school change from tier 1 to 2.

Q. Karen: Making the changes you're proposing is making targets more aspirational. Can we change tiering structure? Making targets aspirational in progress and is a big issue. For high-level certification, has the potential to change us from tier 1 to tier 2. Can we consider a high-level certification floor and target for 19-20 instead of 18-19?

A. Naomi: We are open to discussing potentially changing tiering.

A. Melodi: We just changed the tiering beginning with school year 2016-17. We hear from the task force that there's an interest in seeing a more stable

framework. We would compromise stability if we try to create a new tiering system in the next couple of weeks.

Q. Irene: If the tiering isn't right, you should change it in the interest of improvement despite concern for stability. If it is the consensus of adult ed schools and PCSB is okay with it, be open to being more aggressive in the timeline.

A. Melodi: Our tiering is not necessarily wrong. We could potentially improve it, but it will take time to find the right way to tier.

Q. Naomi: Does anyone remember the initial conversation to try and roll up the tier?

A. Karen: Yes, the task force favored a summative score, but DC PCSB staff didn't want to move in that direction.

A. Naomi: We originally envisioned an overall score. Later, we determined we could either create aspirational targets or tier by category. We can start this work, but it is going to take time. If the task force wanted to do a phased approach for Progress, we can do a shift in tier structure by the third year. Other frameworks built on a completely different methodology. We want this to be useful on a national level and for the authorizer. We also to be fair representation of what is happening in your schools.

Q. Karen: We need more modeling. The impact analyses are helpful. Now we could take the data and play with alternative tiering. Could we work to a year 2 tiering shift?

A. Naomi: AE programming is so different between schools. For PK-12, all programs are offered to all students. If we have a unified way of how we value the programs AE schools offer, we are open to it.

Q. Sasha: If stability is a concern, why not keep it the same? There are so many changes for WIOA, test changes, why do we need to change.

Q. Adriana: Why not hold the 2017-18 floors and targets for 2018-19?

A. Naomi: The theory we built the framework on is broken because Maryland's performance is so low. To offer stability while the nation changes, we use the past three years of data for the next three while national data does change moving forward. We can't hold the floors and targets because they don't work: tier 2 is very small.

Q. Janalee: It is incredibly hard to move students in Student Progress. We have built a new system to make sure students are making progress and earning a GED. We worry about the new targets.

A. Naomi: With the new rules, no one falls in tier 3. We paid close attention to that. Not everyone has a big drop. Yes, it is harder to be in tier 1 but it

saves schools from falling into tier 3. Not denying there is a big drop for some schools, but because this is not holistically scored, we are looking at change in the category's tier.

Q. Rachel: For high-level certifications, do the weights, floors and targets need to be set for 2018-19 or 2019-20?

A. Melodi: We are working for 2018-19, but if it doesn't feel right, we can look to 2019-20.