

## HS PMF Task Force Feedback Form Results

Meeting on August 20, 2015 | 1:00-2:30pm

Question #	Question	Feedback
1	Do you agree with the proposed floor and target for the Career Readiness: CTE Program of Study Completer Rate?	Yes: 5 No: 2 Abstained: 2
1a	If no, please share your concerns and/or an alternate proposal.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Concern about target at 75% because it is higher than the available data</li> <li>▪ Question about how multi-year programs of study are handle               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A: Most programs of study are multi-year. This measure is not calculated until students complete the entire program of study.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2	Do you agree with the proposed floor and target for the Career Readiness: CTE Certification Rate?	Yes: 6 No: 1 Abstained: 2
2a	If no, please share your concerns and/or an alternate proposal.	
3	Do you have any comments on the plan for moving forward with the Redesigned SAT and PSAT?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Would like adequate time to examine the concordance tables/white papers before any final plan for PMF purposes</li> <li>▪ The plan makes sense. Since the new tests sound very different, it is not clear how scores will compare. Hopefully floors and targets will be revised.</li> <li>▪ Could we hold off on using the PSAT/SAT on the scorecard if school's overall scores drop or increase dramatically (90<sup>th</sup> or 10<sup>th</sup> percentiles change by 10 or more)? This would be similar to what we did for the graduation rate change to ACGR. The</li> </ul>

		<p>concordance table may not be precise or accurate enough for this purpose.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The College Board has published college readiness standards that demonstrate different expectations for 12th graders on the SAT from 11th graders on the PSAT. They've equated a 1550 on the SAT to a 142 on the PSAT for 11th graders. That represents a reduction of 8.39%. A correction should be made to the threshold as defined in the concordance. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ PCSB clarification: Currently, PCSB does not use the 1550 benchmark (approximately, 500 per section for reading, math, and essay combined). We use a benchmark of 800 (approximately, 400 per section reading and math combined)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
4	Do you agree with the re-enrollment proposal with implementation for SY 2015-16?	<p>Yes: 0 No: 7</p>
4a	Please share your comments or concerns with the re-enrollment proposal, particularly if your voted no.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Keeping this documentation is a necessary responsibility for charters anyway, and taking this accountability tool could be detrimental to how we serve students</li> <li>▪ As a dependent LEA, the withdrawal of students to DCPS is often done to meet least restrictive environment. Last year, we had seven students fall into this category and saw a spike in students moving out of state. Schools should not be negatively impacted by the out-of-state transfers.</li> <li>▪ Would like more discussion</li> <li>▪ We would take large hits if this passed and won't be able to exclude these kids: 1) kids moving out of state; 2) kids who</li> </ul>

		<p>are expelled for “Gun-Free Schools” acts; 3) kids who “age out”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ PCSB clarification: Students expelled for violations of the Gun-Free Schools Act would be excluded from this measure.</li><li>▪ Though the re-enrollment rate is a burdensome to calculate, to move to a system where we are penalized for out of state transfers and transfers to adult ed would be unfair. This is especially relevant to our school as we serve a highly mobile population, have an adult education campus within our school network, and are located 4 blocks from the Maryland border. If we do not mark the above students as ineligible, PCSB will penalizing schools who serve students on the border of the state and overage-undercredited youth.<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ PCSB clarification: Students transferring to adult education programs are not excluded currently except in the case of an intra-LEA transfer.</li></ul></li><li>▪ Schools that serve a higher at risk population who are disproportionately affected by this policy change. In addition, a student that chooses to violate federal law by bringing a gun to school, should not be included in the re-enrollment rate because that was a decision over which the school had no control.</li><li>▪ The rationale to change the rate solely for the purpose for eliminating the burden of producing documentation, is not the basis for which a decision such as this should be made, particularly since the target will be based on the 90th percentile. There are schools</li></ul>
--	--	--

		<p>that serve a higher at risk population who are disproportionately affected by this policy change. In addition, a student that chooses to violate federal law by bringing a gun to school, should not be included in the re-enrollment rate because that was a decision over which the school had no control.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ During each task force discussion about re-enrollment, LEAs provided feedback requesting fairer, more specific removals from the re-enrollment calculations. This decision ignores that feedback.</li> <li>▪ We request that all transfers within LEA be excluded from the calculations.</li> </ul>
5	Do you have any additional comments regarding topics covered in the meeting?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The timing of this meeting was not good. There were too many important topics covered and this was held right before school opening.</li> </ul>
6	On a five-point scale, where "5" is extremely satisfied and "1" is extremely dissatisfied, how satisfied are you with today's meeting?	<p>Two votes for 3 One vote for 1</p>
7	On a five-point scale, where "5" is strongly agree and "1" is strongly disagree, please rate your thoughts on the following statement: Today's meeting was a good use of time.	<p>One vote for 3 One vote for 2 One vote for 1</p>
8	What are your main takeaways from today's meeting?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We need to stop changing the PMF. It is no longer predictable and the PCSB continues to make changes.</li> </ul>
9	What conversations, issues, or topics would you like to continue discussing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A holistic redesign of the high school PMF as opposed to piecemeal tweaks</li> <li>• What targets can we set for the next 3-5 years to see how the sector is really improving?</li> </ul>