**Adult Education PMF Task Force Meeting**Wednesday, June 20 at 1 PM

* **Attendees**:
  + **LEA/Support Organization Representatives**: Josh Boots (Empower K12)Amber Eby (LAYC Career Academy PCS), Nicole Hanrahan (LAYC Career Academy PCS), Anne Herr (FOCUS), Lecester Johnson (Academy of Hope Adult PCS), Janalee Jordan-Meldrum (YouthBuild PCS), Matthew Layton (Academy of Hope Adult PCS), Sasha Lotas (Academy of Hope Adult PCS), Ryan Monroe (Carlos Rosario PCS), Oluremi Olufemi (YouthBuild PCS), Alexandra Pardo (Ten Square), Lorie Preheim (Briya PCS), Rachel PremDas (Community College Prep PCS,) Karen Rivas (Carlos Rosario PCS), Adriana Rodriguez (Maya Angelou PCS), Tanyr Seay (The Next Step PCS), Andrew Touchette (YouthBuild PCS), Heather Wathington (Maya Angelou PCS), Shannon Webster (Community College Prep PCS), Sadia White (Community College Prep PCS)
  + DC PCSB Board/Staff: Rick Cruz, Naomi DeVeaux, Erin Kupferberg, Melodi Sampson, Paul Capp, Pete Petrin, Ashim Agarwal
* **DC PCSB Considerations**
  + DC PCSB states that its commitments are to maintain year-to-year reliability and holding schools to high standards, and that the following proposals reflect a modified version of the schools’ proposal with these priorities in mind.
* **Student Progress Proposal**
  + DC PCSB proposes collapsing measure into one reporting overall growth with one floor and one target. Maintain business rules for demonstrating educational gains, continue to collect all ABE and ESL test data (which will allow continued growth reporting by program area).
* **Summative Scoring Proposal**
  + DC PCSB proposes summative scoring, with 60% weight on Student Progress & Achievement (weighted based on n-size), 20% on College and Career Readiness, 7.5% for Attendance and 12.5% for Persistence.
  + Weight on Achievement/Progress emphasizes city’s investment in adult literacy.
  + Weighting options for Student Progress and Achievement: **Option 1)** weight based on straight n-size, **Option 2)** double the Student Achievement n-size before weighting, or **Option 3)** separate out ABE, ESL, and GED before weighting.
    - Q: How is separating out ESL/ABE make this different?
    - A: Changing floors and targets.
    - Q: Can you clarify weighting as it relates to unique students?
    - A: Students can count more than once in the different achievement measures (e.g., different GED Ready tests), but the number of unique students would be the n-size for weighting.
* **Floor and Target-Setting Business Rule Proposals**
  + For **Student Progress**, set target at 100 and floor at the 10th percentile with a two-year transition period in which the floor is set at 20.
    - Using percentiles for floor allows for biannual floor calculation to allow for adjustments based on actual performance, and using transitional floor allows for maintaining reliability in the short-term.
    - DC PCSB notes that 33.3% change rule will apply (e.g., if 10th percentile stays near 50, the change in two years will be +33.3% of 20, or 26.6%).
    - Q: Is this the same business rule for floors/targets as PK-8?
    - A: Yes.
  + For **Student Achievement**, maintain current floors and targets (40 and 100) for SY 2018-19, then move floor to 10th percentile (with same 33.3% change limitation)
    - Q: Why the one-year hold?
    - A: Both for reliability and prevent all AE measures from seeing adjustments in floors and targets simultaneously.
    - Q: And then this 10th percentile rule begins in SY 2019-20?
    - A: Correct.
    - Q: What is the maximum floor? What if 10th percentile of Subject Achievement Test exceeds say 80?
    - A: DC PCSB open to negotiating floors (no immediate suggestions by task force).
  + For **College and Career Readiness**, set targets at 95 and floors at the lower of national or local 10th percentile
    - Q: 95 appears to be a significant jump; is that appropriate?
    - A: Allowing for 50% response rate does not penalize schools for failing to follow-up with part of cohort; this flexibility goes beyond national guidelines and thus higher expectations are appropriate.
    - Discussion of the 50% response rate business rule. Schools note that they’re following up with 100% of students, just not getting through to all of them, so the perceived flexibility isn’t really there. DC PCSB expresses openness to counting all eligible students in denominator and then using 90th percentile for target.
    - Task force discusses the appropriate nature of the current response rate given the challenges of student follow-up, emphasizing that this conversation should not be about the changing the response rate but transitioning the target from aspirational to the 90th percentile.
  + For **Leading Indicators**, use 10th and 90th percentile for floors and targets, respectively.
    - Using 90th percentile for target instead of aspirational target because of adult student barriers to attendance and enrollment.
* **Impact Analysis**
  + In SY 2016-17, both **Option 1** and **Option 2** resulted in the same tiers as assigned on the 2017 PMF, with Option 2 resulting in slightly higher summative rates
  + Q: Can DC PCSB share out a de-identified version of analysis with individual schools?
  + A: Yes.
* **Next Steps**
  + Contact Melodi or Paul to set up follow-up conversations
  + Feedback form due no later than June 25
  + Proposed SY 2018-19 PMF Technical Guide Timeline
    - Open for Public Comment: June 29
    - Public Hearing: July 23
    - End Public Comment: July 30
    - Board Vote: September 17