

PCSB Early Childhood PMF Task Force
February 11, 2014 9:30 am – 11:30 pm
Minutes

Goal of Early Childhood PMF Taskforce: To produce a taskforce-generated, board approved Early Childhood PMF that measures school progress towards preparing students to be successful learners in schools serving Pre-K-3 through 2nd grades (for schools serving up to the 3rd grade, 3rd grade will be included).

Meeting Objective:

- a. Discuss and vote on K-2 floors and targets
- b. Mission Specific Criteria - discussion and possible vote

Attendees:

PCSB
Tembo
Bridges
Briya
CAPCS
Capital City
Cedar Tree
Center City
DC Prep
Eagle
EW Stokes
Excel
FOCUS
Friendship
Hope Community
Ideal
Ingenuity Prep
Inspired Teaching
KIPP DC
LAMB
Mundo Verde
Washington Yu Ying
WEDJ

Agenda:

1. Welcome
2. Recap vote from January
3. K-2 Norm Referenced Achievement Metric- prior to implementation of business rule
 - a. 40th percentile or 45th percentile- task force discussion and consensus

Discussion – Participants felt comfortable leaving norm-referenced achievement metric as 40th percentile. That way there will not be one more change before the business rule is implemented.

4. K-2 Data Analysis: Floors and Targets

Task force member question: Will this be consistent or change every year? Erin, PCSB, replied that the intention is for the floors and targets to remain consistent for the next three years. Business rules will be implemented but other large changes will not occur unless the task force votes for them. The reason is the EC PMF has been through many changes in the last few years and this will provide consistency. Additionally, there may be changes made once PARCC is fully implemented in DC. Annually, the task force will review the data and make sure the floors and targets are aligned with current and previous data. If there is a big shift in outcomes, the task force will discuss the implications.

Over summer (2014) during data analysis, a member asked if we could analyze the 10th and 90th percentiles for norm vs criterion in K-2 metrics. To make sure there are no big differences. This information will be brought to the task force in early fall. All floors and targets for 2015 will be sent to the PCSB Board by November 2015. This aligns with schools' requests to know all PMF changes by the fall annually.

If the 10th and 90th percentiles are chosen via the vote, the three year weighted average will be implanted. There will be some adjustments year to year but the task force and EC schools will be clear the floor and target is based on schools' performance.

Question: Are we trying to define quality or show the worst performing schools. By schools choosing their own assessments, there is an opportunity to show quality. Also, if the floors and targets are fairly constant, quality will also be able to show. In nature of tiers, the EC PMF (same as the other PMF frameworks) will also show the worst performing schools.

Member proposed floor of 50 and target of 90.

By general group agreement, the vote is between:

1. 10th and 90th percentiles with 3-year weighted average.
2. Floor = 50 and target = 90.

Many members expressed agreeing with the static floor and target so the bottom 10th percentile does not increase annually.

5. Mission Specific Criteria

a. Discussion

This conversation is continuing from the January meeting because the vote was split. The comments from the last meeting are posted on the wiki site. The group continued today talking about the benefits and worries about including the mission specific goal as part of the EC PMF. By including the goal, it does continue to hold schools accountable to achieving their goal. The opposite view, the purpose of implanting the EC PMF was to consistently and more fairly compare schools. The mission specific goal does not fit into that purpose. The goals based on program missions are very diverse and creating goals that are equal with equal floors and targets is impossible. The group began to brainstorm mission topics that may be similar to start working with: immersion programs, programs with an external assessment, also goals that are growth versus static.

Pulling out the mission specific goal and publishing it on the EC PMF- schools will still have to negotiate a goal and the percent met will be published. This will remove the need to equate the mission specific goals.

One member brought up that we could hold the mission specific goals out of the framework for the next year or two until we have data to work with and then talk again about including the goal within the framework.

Another member stated that schools that have strong mission specific goals should be able to produce data from past years to work on goals, floors and targets between May and July.

Vote:

1. Display the Mission Specific Goal with achievement of goal (percent achieved) but not include it in the framework of points. This would hold through the 2014-15 school year. In spring 2015, the topic would be brought before the task force again for discussion.
2. Keep the Mission Specific goal as part of the framework as an optional 10%

March Meeting Prior Work:

1. EC PMF layout thoughts – Erin handed out an example of a possible EC PMF layout. This was created in Word and is one sample of how the framework can be published. Prior to the March meeting, Erin asked if members who want to can mark up the document and send it back to Erin with thoughts before the March meeting. The document was also emailed to the EC PMF task force distribution list so members could type in thoughts and send it back. Feel free to mark it up or rearrange the entire framework. Erin is looking for ideas to present to the group.

At the end of the meeting Kathy, from Eagle, wants PCSB to reconsider the target of 25% for advanced scores on the 3rd grade DC CAS. She passed out information on average performance on DC CAS Advance for the last few years.