

PCSB EC/ES/MS PMF Task Force Meeting  
April 2, 2015 1:00 pm – 3:00 pm  
Minutes

**Attendees:**

Naomi DeVeaux (PCSB)  
Rashida Tyler (PCSB)  
Erin Kupferberg (PCSB)  
Charlie Sellew (PCSB)  
Nayamka Long (Creative Minds)  
Kenli Okada (EL Haynes)  
Karen Dresden (Capital City)  
Amanda MacLellan (Mundo Verde)  
Jessica Smith (Excel)  
Wendy Edwards (Early Childhood Academy)  
Tiffany Robinson (Eagle)  
LaTricea Adams (Cesar Chavez)  
Erika Lovette (Imagine Hope)  
Roger Kligerman (DC Scholars)  
Tasia Bhegana (Friendship)  
Anne Herr (FOCUS)  
Larua Berger (Center City)  
Josh Boots  
Rich Pohlman (El Haynes)  
Jenifer Olin (Washington Yu Ying)  
Michelle Pinto (EdOps)  
Laura Montas (EdOps)  
Hilary Dauffenbach-Tabb (DC Prep)  
Pam Faulcon (Early Childhood Academy)  
Golnar Abedin (Creative Minds)

**Meeting Objectives:**

1. Discuss the proposed PK-8 Frameworks
2. Obtain school input on proposed changes

**Agenda**

1. Weights
  - a. Weights equal by indicator, or rebalanced based on weight on each grade
    - i. Question: Would we have CLASS beyond PK?
      1. EK: Not at this time.

- ii. Comment: Having some schools with less weight on one indicator than other schools have reduces the comparability between schools' PMF scores.
  - iii. Comment: For PK3-2, because they were not using PARCC, that might be a reason to lessen the weight on achievement.
  - iv. Comment: Maybe this could be true for schools ending just in K. If you have just one grade, that's a lot of weight on just K, but if you have more grades, I think the distribution is better.
  - v. Comment: Worried that this might create an incentive for a campus for break into a PK3-2 configuration in order to gain points by having more weight on school environment.
  - vi. ND: Are people comfortable in general that schools with CLASS have an indicator distribution of 35/35/30, while those without CLASS have 40/40/20. Does this feel reasonable?
  - vii. Comment: We are PK3-3. My concern is that PK has a lot of weight.
    - 1. ND: Well, it's about the same proportionality as the weight on K-3 achievement and progress.
  - viii. Comment: To me, the doubling of CLASS based on having one more or one less grade feels like a lot to me.
- b. Option to include NWEA MAP for schools that also have ESMS grades
- i. Comment: I think it's a good idea, but I think we need to wait for PARCC.
    - 1. ND: I agree that there would be a Phase Two where we do more direct equating between assessments, so part of this to our Board is not to tier this year. So I think we can do something this year that is less public as a Phase One.
  - ii. Comment: The concern that I have is that for schools ending in 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, and 4<sup>th</sup> grade, there really is a huge difference in distribution across indicators and measures.
  - iii. Comment: While do not like using NWEA MAP at all, I understand the bargain you are making with schools ending below 3. But I very strongly disagree in incorporating with schools which do have PARCC scores. Nor do I like the idea of making it optional. From an autonomy perspective, I don't want schools to feel pressure to pay for and offer an additional

assessment. There are a lot of strong safeguards with PARCC, and you can't say the same thing for MAP when it's implemented at the school level.

1. Comment: So where would you get data on K-2 from?
  2. Comment back: We wouldn't have it. It's unfortunate that the grades aren't captured annually, but I don't think there is a viable alternative to that.
  3. Comment: To have CLASS so highly weighted for PK, but then not have much weight K-2, but then have a huge weight on 3-8 seems weird to me.
  4. ND: Also, we're considering doing monitoring NWEA similar to what OSSE does on PARCC.
- iv. Comment: In the existing framework, there is a sharp distinction between ending in 2 and 3. We've addressed that, but now we have a gap for later grades, and that seems like that is the reason for this proposal.
- c. Achievement/Gateway – for schools without PK
- i. No comments.
2. Attendance & Re-enrollment
- a. No comments.
3. 2-Year CLASS measure instead of 1-year
- a. Comment: Our biggest concern was the time of year the CLASS team came. There seemed to be a wide range for when it was administered.
    - i. EK: This year, all observations will be within a 3 month window. In the future, trying to compress even more.
  - b. Question: Have you talked about the weights for CLASS between years, would they be evenly weighted?
    - i. EK: We've considered other ratios, but right now we were thinking equal weight.
    - ii. Follow up: The longer a school uses the CLASS tool, the better they do. Maybe more weight on recent year.
    - iii. EK: I hadn't considered it that way, I'd looked at it by number of teachers, but that's worth considering.

- iv. ND: Of course, the issue of getting better over time could be said for everything, including a state assessment.
      - v. Comment: CLASS really is a teaching tool for schools to develop teachers and so hopefully schools will improve even faster than the might happen on an assessment given to students.
    - c. Question: With K-2, could we do CLASS in later grades?
      - i. EK: That would be ideal, but there are no funds there. So not for now.
- 4. Specific issues for schools ending in K-3
  - a. NWEAP MAP: including K-2 achievement for schools ending in 3<sup>rd</sup> grade
    - i. Comment: We end in 3 and so I like the idea of adding in K-2 data, but I'm wondering what happens down the road as schools switch assessments and what that means for comparability.
    - ii. Question: Are we selecting NWEA because schools use it, or because it's a strong assessment?
      - 1. EK: Both.
    - iii. Question: What about going back to setting our own targets at the school level?
      - 1. ND: That's what the EC PMF tried, but we couldn't make it work.
    - iv. Comment: Need to think about how to reduce ability to "game" the PMF by opting in or out of different assessments or grade configurations.
    - v. Question: Is it possible to exclude 3<sup>rd</sup> grade from growth? Two high stakes assessments in one grade seems like a lot of testing.
      - 1. EK: We had originally proposed K-2, but some schools asked for K-3 to capture growth in 3<sup>rd</sup>, but you bring up an excellent point so please be sure to note that in your feedback to us.
  - b. Floor and Target business rules
    - i. Comment: I think it's really valuable to use the national data.
    - ii. Question: Will there be a more standardized window for when you are comparing NWEA Fall/Spring, Spring/Spring, etc.?
      - 1. ND: Maybe we could do spring to spring for everyone, even if that might mean not having growth in K.