

# EC PMF Task Force Achievement Metrics Vote Results January 14, 2013

# 1. Updated K-2 Achievement Metrics:

- Norm referenced tests Business Rule: \*Make the achievement target the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile/ stanine 5 unless the probability of students subsequently scoring proficient on the DC CAS is 45% or lower at that level and the probably increases substantially (above 55%) at the next decile/stanine. The level can be lowered if the research supports this finding. For the first three years, the achievement level will not be increased or decreased more than one level above or below the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile/stanine 5.
- <u>Criterion referenced tests:</u> use the publisher's guidance for achievement and progress until three years of data is collected to further analyze.

# Circle one of the following:

Option 1: Implement the business rule stated above if the power analysis is .8 or greater and the desired n has been met. If the power analysis and desired n is not met, keep achievement metric at 40<sup>th</sup> percentile.

Option 2: Keep the achievement metrics as stated in the pilot- 40<sup>th</sup> percentile/stanine 4 This means no assessment equating.

Option 3: Implement the business rule stated above if the power analysis is .8 or greater and the desired n has been met. If the power analysis and desired n is not met, keep achievement metric at 45<sup>th</sup> percentile.

Option 1: 40% + business Rules	Option 2: Keep at pilot status	Option 3: 45% + business Rules	
(9)	(1)	(8)	

# Comments:

• While we selected option 3 for question 1, there is not an option that addresses our concerns about the methodology fully. We would prefer an option that takes publishers' recommended definitions of "Meeting Grade Level Expectations" into account. While the power analysis being taken into account now begins to address this issue, the **sample sizes** for all of the data sets used to equate the assessments are still very small, some as small as 6 students. The publishers' guidance still has more rigorous, long-term research behind it. We understood that this year was to continue to be a pilot year, not in terms of participation but in terms of establishing a foundation of data and testing the business rules. We are uncomfortable agreeing to a business rule that is to be in place for 2014-2015 school year, without the opportunity to revisit this rule once we have incorporated 2013-2014 data into the equating analysis.

PCSB Response: This business rule only applies to assessments without publisher recommendations. Many norm referenced assessment do not have a publisher determined achievement or growth metric.

- **2. Updated K-2 Progress Metrics:** \*\* This applies to assessments whose pilot progress metric was make zero NCE or greater.
  - **Propose to leave metric as:** "make 0 or greater NCE"- PCSB proposed this to remain the metric (instead of decrease path to achievement by 1/3)

Agree	Disagree	No vote
(15)	(1)	(2)

### Comment:

- Prefer the more rigorous standard in order to drive academic excellence in all schools across the district
- **3. SPED Level 4 Eligible DC CAS-ALT students:** Proposed Business Rule: Students who would likely qualify for the DC CAS –Alt be allowed to take a developmentally appropriate assessment, geared for students of low cognitive ability.

### Criteria:

• This is optional, only for charter schools that want to work through this process with PCSB.

Agree	Disagree	No Vote
		(2)
(15)	(1)	(2)

### Comment:

• If schools elected to use an alternative assessment, there should be uniformity in the assessment that is chosen across the charter schools.

# 4. Mission Specific Options (please circle)

a. Keep as optional 10% - work with schools to define challenging floor

- b. Keep as optional 10% create floor as zero
- c. Include Mission Specific Goal but outside of the framework: school will still negotiate goal with PCSB but no floor or target will be assigned. Way for school to show an alternate measure.

a.	Keep 10%, define floor	b.	Keep 10%, floor is zero	C.	Show mission specific goal, points not included	No Vote
(9)		(2)		(6)		(1)

## Comments:

- After Tuesday's meeting, I expected one if the Mission Specific options to be "Keep as an
  optional 10%; Schools have the option to work with PCSB to define a challenging floor and
  ceiling that takes into account the rigor and purpose of the chose assessment."
- It seems to potentially messy to include as high-stakes in the PMF.
- Our school feels strongly about this option.
- BUT (write in) goals should be in line with high externally accepted and agreed upon standards and benchmarks.