



EC/ES/MS PMF Task Force
August 19, 2015, 1:00 pm – 2:30 pm
Minutes

Attendees

In person: Julia Semechia (E.W. Stokes), Josh Boots (Center City); Hilary Dauffenbach-Tabb (DC Prep); Irene Holtzman (FOCUS); Erin Kupferberg, Sareeta Schmitt, and Adam Bethke (PCSB)

Via Webinar: Amanda MacLellan (Mundo Verde); Colin Welch (Excel); Ed Han (KIPP DC); Kathy McKeon, Tiffany Robinson, and Emily Fitzpatrick (Eagle Academy); Pamela Faulcon and Thann Ingram (Early Childhood Academy); Maquita Alexander and Jennifer Olin (Washington Yu Ying); Carolyn Trice (Consultant); Rashida Tyler (PCSB), and three other callers not identified.

Minutes

1. Introductions
 - a. Newly combined PMF was approved by the PCSB Board on Monday Night
 - b. Today's goal – take care of items for the 2015-16 PMF
2. Announcements:
 - a. PK Only schools are going to be displayed as Display Only for 2014-15 PMF; plan is to propose a scored PMF in 2015-16 for these schools
 - b. Mission Specific Goals were approved as display only; if your school is interested in having mission specific goals, contact Erin to discuss the application process
 - c. PCSB is moving away from the wiki site; instructions are in the PowerPoint from today's webinar
3. Update for timeline for 2015-16 tech guide (see slides for timeline)
4. EC/ES/MS PMF Advisory Committee
 - a. Over the last year, asked schools to nominate individuals who are familiar with the assessments to work through the content
 - b. Want to formalize the process -
 - i. Can nominate yourself or others to participate in the framework
 - ii. Work with PCSB to work together more often to develop proposed business rules to be submitted for the vote of the full Task Force
 - iii. The advisory committee would be a group to have bigger and different versions of proposals for review
 - iv. The committee is a group of individuals associated with a diverse range of LEAs
 - c. Comment form has space for LEAs to provide feedback on the proposal
 - d. Task Force will still be the primary voting group
5. Reenrollment
 - a. PCSB worked on a plan to limit the burden of documentation for re-enrollment for schools
 - b. Charter Representative — LEA or School Level Reenrollment?
 - c. Erin – the rates displayed here are single campus, but we would be willing to get feedback on that
 - d. Exemptions – beyond exit grades, deceased, and graduated

- e. Charter Representative: CFSA still requires the documentation for over summer missing students
 - f. For schools that serve the most transient students — what do you do about homeless students who it might be in their best interest to go out of state? Why would you help them find the best school in Largo when you live out of state when it is going to hurt the LEAs
 - g. Charter Representative: Could you pursue an MOU for PG County? Since most students move out of state to PG county? That would get rid of most of the problems.
 - h. Erin — if you vote note, if you could explain what the concerns are and/or if you're interested in the rate staying the same
6. Update on Floors and Targets -
- a. Only fully updated rate change is attendance
 - b. Attendance target – 95.2%, floor is set at the ten point spread
 - c. CLASS – Looking to implement business rules for CLASS which work over the long term moving forward
 - I. Want to talk about the minimum gap — example, emotional support, the 10th and the 90th are less than a point apart
 - II. Proposal: target for ES and CO, should be the publisher guidance; floor be the 10th percentile, except in the case of a minimum gap, in which case it would be a 1.5 point spread. For IS, proposal is that the target is a 4.0 until the 90th percentile exceeds 4.0, at which point the target increases to the 90th percentile
 - III. EC Assessment Committee agreed the target should be what the publisher designated as a high score
 - IV. Charter Representative – I think we're thinking on the right track in terms of floors and targets and minimum gaps. This makes me think about what I tried to push on this group before – what is a general floor/target/minimum gaps? What I'd like to see is the variance in scores reflected in the minimum gap. For example, with CLASS, if they've done the reliabilities studies, what the natural variance. "Find some sort of variance that is appropriate for the measure itself, then multiply it by four" for example. I'd want to see that really.
 - V. Charter Representative – is there any way to see the entire DC population's score?
 - VI. Erin – there are some caveats – DCPS was allowed to choose which classrooms were observed. I can share out the data, but there are some limitations
 - VII. Charter Representative – would it be better to calculate the 10th and 90th on the entire city?
 - VIII. Erin – it's not that far off, I think CBOs generally struggle at instructional support
7. NWEA MAP Growth
- a. NWEA released 2015 norms; the report was available in July
 - b. Wanted to talk to this group to get a plan in place moving forward
 - c. NWEA strongly urges schools to move forward with 2015 norms; PCSB has always tried to move forward with the publisher recommendations, especially if established prior to the beginning of the school year
 - d. For 15-16, for schools that end permanently in grades K-3, use the methodology outlined to move forward

- e. Goal is to work through the updated growth data once it is available, to determine if it is reasonable to switch. Current plan is to continue to calculate the growth metric the way it has been in 2014-15, with the 40th to 70th target
- f. Charter Representative– I wonder, this norm set came out relatively recently – is it reasonable for schools to have adapted. I don't think there's enough technical assistance to support the understanding the changes in the 2015 norms. GRAPH of growth expectations based on RIT scores
 - I. Erin recap: Growth norms for 1-3rd graders, the growth norms should be similar. The difference is that the kindergartners have a greater growth expectations.
- g. Erin: Ideally, I'd like to use the 10th and 90th growth table not yet published. The second option was to move to 10th and 90th established in 2014, but with the 2015 norms. The third option would be to run the reports for 2015-16 on 2011 norms.
- h. Charter Representative – would like to see the updated growth norms table, because we're definitely going to use the 2015 norms in house.
- i. Charter Representative – percent meeting target vs. median growth percentile. I think it's worth noting and looking at sooner than later to get teachers into the mindset that all students' growth matters, not just whether or not they can "hit their growth target."
- j. Erin – to recap, the 2015 data has conditional growth projections. We could look at it at the student level or the school level. When Josh looked at the differences between median growth and MGP, they were relatively close. I like the idea more broadly, but there's a lot that I think schools need to work through what that would mean over the next few months.
- k. Charter Representative – I think there are a few more business rules that we need to iron out – we need to talk about the difference between Fall to Spring and Spring to Spring.
- l. Erin – I will change the comment options for NWEA, and then a comment box. The two options are:
 - I. If NWEA releases the updated school growth norms table, then we update the floor and target
 - II. If not, then stay on the 2011 norms and the 2011 floor and target