

HS PMF Task Force Meeting Notes
November 17, 2015

Attendees Representing:

DC PCSB – Sareeta Schmitt, Naomi DeVeaux, Rashida Tyler, Erin Kupferberg, Adam Bethke
BASIS DC PCS
Capital City PCS
Cesar Chavez PCS
E.L. Haynes PCS
Friendship PCS
IDEA PCS
KIPP DC PCS
Maya Angelou PCS
National Collegiate Prep PCS
SEED PCS
Thurgood Marshall PCHS
Washington Latin PCS
Washington Math Science Technology PCHS
FOCUS

Meeting Notes:

- PARCC Floors and Targets
 - Question: Did DC PCSB find a difference between paper and computer based testing?
 - Based on DC PCSB analysis, we saw a very similar distribution of results in each level for ELA and slight difference for Math but not a significant difference.
 - A couple schools questioned this because top performers were paper based.
 - There was not much of a difference to change what we are discussing today, and we cannot do a full analysis because the so few school used the paper-based test and the samples are not random or representative samples
 - Schools asked what percent of high school students used computer vs paper. DC CPSB will follow up.
 - Propose to maintain floor of 0. Look at 10th percentile when the state has more PARCC data.
 - Since schools asked us to meet today to look at targets based on PARCC, the group discussed DC PCSB's proposals. Target to 100 for 3+ and schools' proposal for 4+.
 - Eventually, in 3-5 years, we will move to 4+ and 5.

- Question: In moving to 4+, can we move to using the 90th percentile?
 - We can look at that
 - We may want to consider what it would mean if the target is very low, particularly for the high school math
 - Question: Is it possible to keep aspirational targets, but play around with 65% and 35% tier cut-offs?
 - PMF as Goals Policy is locked around the tier cut-offs
 - Also, these cut points have been established for 5 years and would be confusing to change
 - We are talking about eventually shifting the weights towards 4+ and away from 3+ which would likely achieve the same goal
 - Question: Sometimes targets are aspirational and other times they seem to be based on numbers actually seen. Why not evaluate charters where they are in sector?
 - We could set the targets at the national 90th percentile
 - DC PCSB could agree to setting 3+ there.
 - We are looking to keep the amount of points the median schools earns similar to past and controlling for the change. The PARCC is here and a level 4 has been set at the level by the state and the consortium. We are honoring 3+ now but we need to think strategically of the shift.
- Shifting the weights to focus on level 4 and above
 - The group wants to look at how long until the shift to 4+ only.
 - Is PCSB seeing an aspirational target for 4+? If no, then faster seems easier.
 - Schools expressed wanting to be cautious about impact of economically disadvantaged
 - Another hold harmless year is off the table. We need to move forward with a PMF, we can keep the floors and targets as stated in the tech guide or move forward with a change that we are discussing today.
 - Achievement is about the bar in which students land. We are far from that bar now, the optics of a slow transition are trickier than a quick transition,
 - FOCUS: PARCC is a criterion-referenced test, so there is a bar and it does not seem unreasonable that we would determine a bar and try to reach it
 - We need to work with a progression to ratchet up with expectations
 - HS PMF pacing does not have to match EC/ES/MS PMF.
 - A couple schools suggested that we hold weights for this year since the data is new but then plan change for following three years.
 - The group discussed other possibilities: Putting all points on 4+ and none on other levels.
 - A school suggested looking at the variance in the data, not just the 50th percentile to view the distribution
- Outcomes – Voting items
 - Proposals to move the weights to start out on a plan

- Floor and target proposals- do you want a change for 2015-16 or wait until 2016-17?
- Attendance – no change to calculations. Target is set at 92% based on high school data.
- 9th grade on track – no change to the summer school part of the measure.
 - Some schools have higher requirements than the state.
 - One member shared that we should allow students to take summer school every year because a year is 365 and if the student graduates in 4 years, then that should count.
 - DC PCSB is just clarifying the language in the tech guide reflecting that DC PCSB does follow the schools graduation guidelines.
 - Clarifying the practice of how 9th grade on track has been handled.
 - New language is better but are repeating 9th graders included in the rate.
 - This has not been changed.
 - We want schools to get credit the second time for these students since the school did not get credit the previous year if this student was at their school and will not get ACGR credit.
- College going Gateway measures
 - Not including students who qualify for NCSC – DC PCSB agrees with this request, and proposes including all college-going measures.
 - The task force was generally in agreement with this
- Conditional/provisional college acceptance letters
 - This only effected 35 letters out of 1124
 - DC PCSB feels that the test should whether a student can take that letter an go enroll at the school
 - Exceptions: non-academic related matters (background checks), also when final transcripts need to be sent since this is always the case.
 - Would also like included as an exception things the student needs to do once enrolled, like earn a 2.0 in the first year on GPA.
- Voting Items
 - Proposal for weight change
 - Change or no change for 15-16 for weights
 - If change, choose from the options (the two PCSB brought and the third brought up today to step down 5 (2.5 for ELA and math, respectively) points each
 - Proposal for floor/target change for Level 4+
 - No change (use the approved 2014-15 floor and target)
 - Use the 25% of the gap between the 90th percentile and 100% (the “Josh Boots” target)
 - Removing students with intellectual impairments (those who qualify for the NCSC assessment) from the college-going Gateway measures