

**EC PMF Task Force
Achievement Metrics Vote Summary
December 12, 2013**

1. 3rd Grade DC CAS Reading Floors (proficient and advanced):

ES PMF 3rd Grade Gateway Reading floor: 17.4%	EC PMF 3rd Grade Reading Floor (voted Nov. 15): 18.7%	Comments:
14	1	None submitted

2. CLASS Business Rule: Based on TeachStone recommendation, CLASS scores for 100% self-contained classrooms will not be included into EC PMF results

Agree	Disagree	Comments
15	0	None submitted

K-2 Achievement and Progress: Please place an “X” in the box that intersects with the achievement and progress metrics for norm referenced assessments, with the goal of equating assessments for comparison. If you are using a criterion referenced assessment, please see business rule below.

* Business Rule: Norm referenced tests: make the achievement target the 50th percentile/stanine 5 unless the probability of students subsequently scoring proficient on the DC CAS is less than 50% at that level and the probability increases substantially at the next decile/stanine.

Criterion referenced: Keep the achievement target as approved unless the probability of students subsequently scoring proficient on the DC CAS is less than 50% at that level and the probability increases substantially at the next scoring level

Maintain current achievement Level (implement business rule 2014-15) and Maintain progress as zero NCE where applicable	Maintain current achievement Level (implement business rule 2014-15) and implement Decrease path to achievement by 1/3	Implement Business rule 2013-14 and Maintain progress as zero NCE where applicable	Implement Business rule 2013-14 and implement Decrease path to achievement by 1/3	Comments* See below
8	2	0	4	

Comments (individual comments copied, some LEAs gave multiple comments):

1. We think there should be a minimum n-size in the business rules.
2. 3rd Grade DC CAS Cut Score issues – Josh’s prior research at KIPP DC aligning MAP scores to DC CAS showed significant differences in the relative national percentile performance on MAP that correlated to DC CAS proficiency across the grade levels. In 3rd grade, students needed to be at the 50-60th percentile to have a 50-50 shot at being proficient in math and reading. The correlated percentiles in 4th and 5th grade were much lower and continued a downward trend through 8th grade where students performing at the 20-30th percentile had a 50-50 chance of DC CAS proficiency.
3. Sample Size of Equating Research – We are concerned about the quality and size of the samples used for equating upon which we are asked to make high stakes decisions. While there may be argument over assessment publishers’ guidelines for developmentally appropriate achievement target, the body of research and evidence they collect to make those determinations are significantly larger and more diverse than those used by Tembo and PCSB. All of the proposed assessment changes are based on samples of less than 1,000 students, and most are much less than that number.
4. Simplicity of Equating Methodology – Tembo used a fairly simple method for equating the assessments, looking at one prior year of performance and looking at the percent of students scoring proficient on DC CAS by assessment category. We believe a more robust method of equating should be used before making any final decisions on changes.
5. Establish a minimum N-size – We think 1,000 students in an assessment equating sample is the ideal number. Recognizing our limitations, there is probably a lower value we can settle upon that is still reasonable for high stakes decisions.
6. Use a more robust equating method – Tembo could use raw or scale scores from the EC assessments and DC CAS to create multi-level statistical models for each assessment that estimate the probability of a student being proficient on DC CAS. The advantages of this methodology include smoother results and controlling for a greater range of student performance instead of just using student categorical determinations. Analyzing multiple years of data (K-2nd grade) on the front end and multiple years of DC CAS performance (3rd-5th grade) would strengthen the results.
7. Use a different DC CAS result for equating – Given the 3rd grade DC CAS cut score issues, we recommend that Tembo use a different grade level or different cut score as the baseline for equating. Tembo could analyze cohort data for students with DC CAS scores for 3rd-5th grade, looking for a 3rd grade DC CAS scale score that equated to a 50% chance of being proficient by 5th grade and then use the new adjusted 3rd grade DC CAS “cut score” for equating EC assessments.
8. “Substantially” needs to be defined- is 5% substantial? Or 10%? Also, I think that if the point really is to normalize results to equate achievement metrics on different tests, then we should look also at lowering bars as well (TerraNova Reading, for example).
9. Comment next to Criterion-referenced tests: (What about if the probability increases substantially scoring levels other than the next level? Do we cap the increase? Is there an opportunity for a decrease if the data indicates it?) Also, I would be much more comfortable with the business rules if we were using some sort of more nuanced data to indicate probability of proficiency on the DCCAS and/or some sort of N-size limit (i.e. we will alter the achievement target if there is an increase or 10% or more with an N-size of 15 or more scoring at both achievement levels). What if the students scoring at 28 on the DRA all had the same below-average 3rd grade teacher, and that’s why they weren’t proficient on the 3rd Grade DCCAS, not because the 2nd grade bar is too low?
10. Need to define “increases substantially”, also Need to maintain the ability to lower targets if the analysis shows this still leads to success on the DC CAS
11. Our LEA fully supports all efforts for more rigorous standards of academic excellence across the District

12. Before agreeing to a business rule that includes all norm-referenced tests, we would like there to be analysis and discussion of the PPVT and TEMA. If the business rule only applies to assessments that have been publicly discussed by the task force and does not include the PPVT or TEMA this year, we have no objection to the business rule being applied in 2013-2014.
13. Before changing the progress goal, we would also like there to be analysis and discussion of the PPVT and TEMA, particularly since progress is measured differently than it is on the other norm-referenced tests.