

August 19, 2015

EC/ES/MS PMF Task Force

Vote Results

Measure	LEAs agreeing with Proposal	LEAs Disagreeing with Proposal	Comments
PMF Advisory Committee (PAC): Smaller group of school leaders to discuss details of potential PMF changes			
PAC Proposal – Any comments or feedback to strengthen the proposal?	NA	NA	<p>Overall I think the advisory committee is a good idea. There were many times it was very challenging in full task force meetings to move proposed changes through because so much time was spent back tracking or re-explaining for participants who were new. I think a focused group that meets regularly could be more effective. I like that PCSB would be intentional about finding a representative group. It would be helpful if the notes/minutes or items for discussion that happen in the advisory committee could be shared out (maybe posted to the new PMF webpage), with the broader group on a more frequent basis than the whole group PMF meetings happen.</p> <hr/> <p>This sounds like a good plan. I like the focused nature of the group and would love to be part of it.</p> <hr/> <p>Proposal looks strong so long as individuals outside of charter LEAs who are strong charter and accountability advocates, like Irene and Josh, are still eligible to participate.</p> <hr/> <p>Eagle believes that it is important to have a diverse set of individuals on the committee to represent overall opinions and perspectives of the charter community. We would like to propose that schools be able to nominate not just individuals from their organization but also individuals that are outside their organization who have proven to support the best interest of our LEA. Eagle would like to nominate Josh Boots as a representative on this committee.</p>
Proposed re-enrollment change: Only count students who actually re-enroll at the school, simplified process.			
Re-enrollment – New: NOT APPROVED	(3) LEAs	(11) LEAs	I think that while it would be nice to reduce the documentation burden, this is one of those cases where documentation burdens are extremely necessary and

			<p>legally/ethically/morally important for us to keep in place so that we can make sure that all charters - and not just the KIPPs, Friendships, EL Haynes, etc but also the new, smaller, less capacity charters - are properly keeping track of the children whom they are responsible for. Perhaps a good hybrid would be a redefinition of what documentation is actually needed - rather than needing a formally signed form, something more electronic that still shows proper acknowledgement (an email, etc?) that can be verified could be used. I just think we need to keep track of these students, for their sake, for ours.</p> <p>In some ways, this proposed policy would create perverse disincentives to NOT unenroll improper students (ie, those who live in MD) since they would count heavily against this metric. And I always think of the worst case scenario - what if a kid who we previously needed to document but no longer was required to do so actually ended up in a situation that was negative, which could have been prevented if we had documentation requirements, etc.</p> <hr/> <p>DC Prep does follow up with all of our no-show families, and with families that submit a withdrawal form to confirm enrollment at another school. We would continue this process whether or not we needed to for re-enrollment calculation purposes. Therefore, this proposal would not ease any burden on our staff. We would like to keep the re enrollment rate calculation method the same as it currently is.</p> <hr/> <p>I think it will unfairly disadvantage certain LEAs. The documentation burden is not too significant as long as we know well ahead of time what will be collected.</p> <hr/> <p>First off, we do not have major issues the status quo, and have several concerns / areas for improvement with this proposal. I assume the problem that we're trying to solve is that, if our schools are amazing, then families should be staying and not going to other schools, including moving to MD/VA. This makes sense, but there are many extenuating circumstances somewhat unique to DC. In particular, we have a lot of parents that are moving far from DC based on work, including military families, hill staffers, etc. While this would not allow the elimination of documentation (which we don't see as a huge obstacle), perhaps exemptions for military families and for families moving more than 50 miles from the school?</p> <hr/> <p>I am open to the idea, but fundamentally we believe that re-enrollment should not include students that move out</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>of state. We also like consistency, so if this metric is not truly broken, then we would prefer not to change it.</p> <hr/> <p>Our only concern is children not being counted against a school's re-enrollment if they move out-of-state.</p> <hr/> <p>We appreciate PCSB taking steps to reduce the compliance documentation for LEAs. For re-enrollment rate, we believe there is not enough data presented to the committee to decide at this time. It looks like some schools' rates would drop by more than 10%, and with a narrow PMF scoring range, those drops are closer to 40-50% of the PMF points for re-enrollment. Another option for moving this idea forward is to use the re-enrollment audit file and seeing whether students enrolled at a public school in DC. This would keep a modified re-enrollment measure from adversely impacting schools where families move to Maryland and are no longer eligible for free schooling in DC while reducing the compliance burden on schools and PCSB.</p> <hr/> <p>What about students that transfer for a year or even part of a year then come back?</p> <hr/> <p>Based on the information that was presented during the meeting for the proposed changes we would like to see additional data and information regarding the impact of this proposal on LEA's. From the data that was presented it wasn't clear of the full impact on LEA's. As it did show that some LEA's could be adversely affected by this proposal. Additionally, the overall burden of producing the correct documentation was minimal and the current policy around re-enrollment was sufficient.</p> <hr/>
<p>CLASS: Proposed business rules to calculate the floors and targets annually</p>			
<p>CLASS floors and targets</p> <p>APPROVED</p>	<p>(9) LEAs</p>	<p>(5) LEAs</p>	<p>We are wondering the rationale for the huge jump on the instructional support Target from the 90th percentile. 3.4 to 4.0 is a big leap especially considering the overall low scores in instructional support. The other areas' were very close to their 90th percentile scores, but instructional support was over a .5 jump. Is it possible to have it closer to a .2 or .3 gain over the 90th percentile? It feels as if schools are being set up to fail.</p> <hr/>

		<p>I would still propose keeping the floors and targets for CLASS relatively constant, especially for Emotional Support and Classroom Organization. For these, the floor of 4 and the target of 6 align very well with what the publisher of the tool indicate are good benchmarks for a PMF like ours. I think a minimum spread of 2 points also allows for (a) rigorous standards that (b) still acknowledge the range of quality in DC. Furthermore, I think it's good for a school that gets a 5 on these metrics to earn 50% of the points rather than 33% (if the floor were 4.5). If the end goal of the PMF is to identify quality on an objective scale, than this seems to be the best way.</p> <p>For Instructional Support, I would do something closer to what is proposed, using 4 and 6 as the ideal goals, but working our way up there over the years (since this is a true area of growth for everyone) using the 10th and 90th percentile business rules. I think in reality this will remain in the floor = 2, target = 4 range for a while, which I think is FINE, given the relative newness of this work. I would also say that these floors and targets should be developed with all organizations' data included, including the noncharter/district schools since they're also the competitors for the services we provide.</p> <hr/> <p>We like that a minimum gap has been proposed for each of the CLASS domains.</p> <hr/> <p>Setting the floor at the 10th percentile of performers would seem to make this a fairly meaningless statistic and one only aimed at almost negligent performers. If the range is that broad, should the PCSB/DC consider a different assessment?</p> <hr/> <p>There are national norms for CLASS and my understanding is that there is research around what CLASS scores correlate with improved outcomes for students. Instead of norming relative to DC charters, wouldn't it be better to base floors and targets according to scores that will improve student outcomes? If this is not possible, a minimum gap between floor and target of 1.5 seems small. We could have a large fluctuation of points when our teaching and classrooms don't actually differ very much. I'd be happy to look more into this if you'd like some assistance.</p> <hr/> <p>I have some more significant concerns about setting 4 as the target for Instructional Support on CLASS. The average</p>
--	--	---

			<p>90th percentile data is much lower than 4 and it seems like a big stretch to jump from a 2 to a 4.</p> <hr/> <p>I don't agree with the Instructional Support Target. The national average is 3.6.</p> <hr/>
<p>NWEA MAP: 2015 growth norms published in July 2015, should the PMF reflect growth on the 2015 norms?</p>			
<p>NWEA MAP</p> <p>2015 Norms</p> <p>Not approved based on received publisher guidance (received after task force meeting)</p>			<p>2015 Norms but stay with current floor (40) and target (70) 3 LEAs</p> <p>2015 Norms only if NWEA releases growth by percentiles for schools (updated 10th and 90th) by October 15, 2015 7 LEAs</p> <p>2011 Norms and current floor (40) and target (70) 2 LEAs</p>
<p>Additional input on NWEA MAP</p>			
<p>Do you have additional feedback and/or concerns regarding NWEA MAP growth?</p>			<p>If we can get the growth percentiles updated from NWEA, then def use them, but otherwise, I think the 40/70 floor/target works just fine for the purposes of the PMF. no need to overcomplicate this one.</p> <hr/> <p>I think we should move to the 2015 norms sooner rather than later. However, I do see the concern about using floors and targets of 40 and 70 which were derived from the 2011 norms with the 2015 norms. If the 2011 norms are used this year, I think we need to give school plenty of lead time that the 2015 norms would be implemented for the 16-17 PMF so that there is not another year of delay. I am interested in exploring the move to conditional growth percentiles in future years, to bring it in closer alignment to the MGP used with the PARCC tested grades.</p> <hr/> <p>We would like more information regarding NWEA MAP growth. We don't feel comfortable voting on this issue since we are new to the NWEA MAP assessment.</p> <hr/> <p>The school year has already started, and NWEA MAP is still refining 2015 norms for at least kindergarten. I believe we should continue with the 2011 norms for this school year, while exploring the full impact of 2015 norms on schools this fall/winter.</p>

			<p>With the new school year currently underway and pre-service completed, we've already communicated and committed our school community (parents, staff/teachers, and leadership) to campus and LEA level academic goals for 15-16 under 2011 NWEA norms. Also, as we just recently received the full 2015 norms from NWEA, we haven't been able to perform a full analysis on the impact of switching to 2015 norms versus 2011. Additionally, NWEA is still performing ongoing work to update Kindergarten norms which have had issues since the shift to the 2015 norms which is delaying even further analysis of this grade level in particular which seems to be the most affected by the norms update.</p>
<p>Task Force Survey Question: Additional topics to continue to discuss</p>			
<p>What conversations, issues, or topics would you like to continue discussing or add to a future discussion?</p>			<p>I would like to discuss ways to make the CLASS observations more authentic and meaningful to what is really happening in classrooms. One 2 hour observation does not truly give you an idea of what happens in a classroom over a given year. If the overall score in the instructional support area is so low, something seems to be wrong with this tool or the measurement happening in the classrooms.</p> <hr/> <p>CLASS, NWEA and PARCC.</p> <hr/> <p>Re-enrollment should continue to be a discussion topic if additional information and data can be provided on the impact of the proposed changes on LEA's.</p>
<p>Task Force Survey Question: Additional comments on this meeting</p>			
<p>Do you have additional comments regarding topics covered in the meeting?</p>			<p>The instructional support goal of a 4.0 seems unreasonable, especially if, over the past 2 years, the 90th percentile of schools only reached a 3.4. National averages for CLASS are typically lower than a 4, so it does not make sense to set a target higher than that.</p> <p>The attendance rate target should be 10th-90th percentile until the sector reaches a threshold for quality. All PMF targets with 10th-90th percentile as the main business rule should include this stipulation, like CLASS. For attendance, we believe the upper limit should be 95%.</p>