



## Adult Education PMF Task Force Meeting Notes

January 20, 2016 | DC PCSB | 10:00-12:00

### **Attendees:**

DC PCSB: Sareeta Schmitt, Naomi DeVeaux, Rashida Tyler, Erin Kupferberg, Adam Bethke, and Alyssa Sutherland

Academy of Hope: Marcos P and Charlie Riebeling

Briya: Karen Hertzler (phone), Christie McKay, Cara Sklar, and Lorie Prelam

Carlos Rosario: Allison Kokkoros, Ryan Monroe, and Patricio Sanchez

Community College Prep: Shannon Webster

LAYC Career Academy: Nicole Hanrahan and Angela Stepancic

Maya Angelou PCS – YALC: Sarah Navarro and Nora Shetty

The Next Step PCS: Julie Meyer and Melvin Freeman

YouthBuild PCS: Alexandra Pardo and Andrew Touchette

FOCUS: Irene Holtzman

### **Meeting Notes:**

- DC PCSB walked through the major inconsistencies among schools' practices with the AE PMF
- The group reviewed the anonymized AE data in the packet

#### Two-Week Rule

- DC PCSB proposed a two-week rule to replace the 12-hour rule that would address inconsistencies in enrollment and pre-testing
- YouthBuild: Would attendance count for the first two weeks? DC PCSB: Yes, just removing students who are not enrolled on the first day of the third week
- The task force was generally in agreement with the proposal
- LEAs noted sometimes they pre-test students outside of two weeks because of attendance or reasons related to ensuring an ideal testing environment
  - The group discuss having some flexibility on pre-testing all students in the first two weeks
- LAYC raised a question about whether SPED students and students under 18 can be un-enrolled for having less than 60% attendance
  - DC PCSB: LEAs would still need to follow applicable regulations regarding those students
  - Suggestion from LAYC: Follow OSSE's rule (25 days), and allow those students to be removed from PMF measures
  - Question from Briya: Could we do two weeks or 12 hours? We have some students who attend fewer days per week and need a little more than two weeks
- A question was raised about whether the two weeks would be cumulative enrollment
  - DC PCSB: Yes, that was the intent

- Maya YALC and LAYC expressed a preference for the two-week rule to not be based on cumulative enrollment
- LAYC: We should not include students in if they have not been there long enough to receive a treatment
- FOCUS: You don't want to include them in the treatment
- DC PCSB: If students enter and exit multiple times throughout the year but never stay beyond two weeks at a time, it would be concerning to not capture this in the AE PMF; it is a retention issue, but this student would not be captured in
- LAYC Proposal: We should remove students who stop-in and stop-out.
- DC PCSB will add to the comment form thoughts on how to handle repeaters/stop-outs
- Comment from LAYC: I don't believe students who hit an NRS 6 should have to pre-test. The pool should be students who need to show growth, especially schools with a career / tech focus. The pool should change.
  - Sareeta: This is a follow up conversation for the retention discussion next meeting, not this conversation. For now, this issue is addressed by noting that all *eligible* students should pre-test in the first two weeks. We can discuss next meeting whether this situation you're bringing up constitutes an eligible student or not.
- Question from Maya: What if we don't test the student during their two-week window? We switched from using TABE to GED Ready to place students in class. We've done a lot to improve our testing environment, but it may be that we put them in an academic class, but don't have a testing window. This means that when we have students out (at court, on the construction site).
  - YouthBuild, Carlos Rosario, and Briya agree
  - Carlos Rosario noted that they test in Week 3 (they do their own pretests first)
  - Rashida: Is anything wrong with the first four weeks of enrollment?
  - Sareeta: We can be flexible, but we need to have a number so that we are not in a situation where we have the current problem with inconsistencies in how schools are doing this
  - YouthBuild: For us, it's four weeks
  - Maya: If a student doesn't make it within that timeframe, what's the cost?
    - DC PCSB: The student would be weighted as a zero in the score roll up
- Briya: How do we deal with students who enter later in the year and don't have enough time to post-test?
  - We could remove students from the retention measure that don't have time to post-test
  - Briya noted that they follow publisher guidelines, but they feel that it doesn't completely work to go with the publisher guidelines; students are expected to gain about three points, but that may not be an EFL level

#### Out of the Labor Force

- DC PCSB shared a proposal to develop a list of reasons to classify students as out of the labor force based on the federal definition but recognizing that the federal definition has a very different purpose, which can in cases contradict the purpose of the AE PMF
- A question came up about adding immigrants who cannot legally work
  - The group agreed that concerns about privacy are paramount

- DC PCSB suggested outlining the list of reasons for being out of the labor force and asking students if any apply (not which reasons apply) to ensure everyone applies the same conditions
- Carlos Rosario recommended looking at the way we display the performance reporting on the scorecards; it's complex and takes a lot of time to explain it to people
  - Erin: We would be glad to get your input; we're really taking a deep dive and trying to figure it out the best way to display the information, so we'd welcome suggestions
  - Erin asked that schools print out a copy of their scorecard, mark it up with suggestions, and email it to her ([ekupferberg@dcpcsb.org](mailto:ekupferberg@dcpcsb.org))
  - DC PCSB will send a separate follow-up to schools about feedback on the scorecards