



Adult Education PMF Task Force July 30, 2015 Meeting Notes

LEA/Agency	Attendees
Briya	Karen Hertzler, Cara Sklar, Christie McKay
Carlos Rosario	Patricio Sanchez, Ryan Monroe
Community College Prep	Connie Spinner
LAYC Career Academy	Andrew Schwabb, Angela Stepancic
Maya Angelou YALC	Sarah Navarro (in-person)
The Next Step	Melvin Freeman, Julie Meyer
YouthBuild	Janalee Jordan-Meldrum (in-person)
PCSB	Rashida Tyler, Sareeta Schmitt, Naomi DeVeaux, Eunji Kim

Agenda:

- Introductions/Norms
- Recap of floor/target setting
- Business rules for EC/ES/MS/HS
- Sample business rules
- Timeline for proposing new business rules

Notes:

Recap of floor/target setting

- Rashida gave an overall summary and explanation of how the floors and targets were calculated
 - National performance data and MD state data were used

Business rules for EC/ES/MS/HS

- Rashida explained how floors and targets are generally set for EC/ES/MS/HS PMF

Sample business rules

- Proposals:
 - Keep floors and targets at where they are currently for 2015-16 to see data for one more year
 - Use 2015-16 data to create floors and targets for 2016-17
- Rashida shared a preference of maintaining set floors and targets for two years or more
 - The Board has brought up the question of whether MD was still the best state to be looking at and considered looking into other states
 - Rashida suggested that schools also look into what other states might be considered

- The Next Step: Noted she doesn't have a clear picture on where the floors and targets should land eventually but suggested we look at our two years of data, though the first year was a pilot year. Why do we use national data?
 - Rashida: We used national data because we didn't have a place to start. Now, it is possible to consider that we only use our sector data and perhaps using national data is not necessary anymore
- The Next Step: Are the tier cutoffs always just 35 and 65?
 - Rashida: We started in that place because we were aligning it to tier cutoffs in other frameworks. After working with all the differences, we did end up in a different place concerning how tiers are assigned.
- LAYC: Is the national data and MD data for disconnected youth/adult education?
 - Rashida: Yes. She will forward him a link to the data.

Student Progress and Retention Measures

- They may be able to use similar business rules
- Rashida suggested that instead of using OVAE data from 2011-12, we use the available 2013-14 data or wait for 2014-15 data

Student Achievement Measures

- Rashida recommended we don't move this because we have little data on new GED

College and Career Readiness and In-Seat Attendance (Floors)

- Rashida suggested we only use our previous data because national data is not available
- Maya YALC: Would it be possible to do a simulation with the data we have? So we can see what it would look like since we have such a small cohort?
 - Rashida: Yes we can
- YouthBuild: Could you disaggregate the data based on the ages served since the standards to how we're funded differ based on the age range?
 - Rashida said she would look into that, but that the n-size might not make that possible
- The Next Step asked a question about using such a small n-size for the 10th percentile. Wouldn't the lowest 10th percentile basically be the lowest school?
 - Rashida: No because it'll be 24 different data points
- The Next Step also likes simulation idea. Can we run it for every measure? It seems unfair that AE schools are compared to higher performing states whereas other DC charter schools are only compared within DC.
- Briya: I'd like to look at all the data that is being used for the proposed floors and targets (national, state, and MD +1)
 - Rashida: We can do that with 2013-14 data and then once we're done do it with 2014-15 data
- The Next Step: Will you be revisiting tiering?
 - Rashida: No, right now we've moved forward and are focusing on the floors and targets, especially, for ESL 6 and the highest ABE level

Timeline

- Rashida discussed the proposed timeline of having new business rules ready to be implemented for 2016-17. If there was a vote to lock the floors and targets for two years, they would then come back in 2018-19 to re-establish new floors and targets.
- Rashida said that if anyone was opposed to this timeline and would like to re-establish new floors and targets sooner.
 - No schools voiced an interest in that
- Carlos Rosario: What happens if half the schools end up in Tier 2 or 3, will that cause you to revisit floors and targets for the future?
 - Rashida: This sounds similar to what I'm proposing. We keep the same floors and targets this year and then use that data to determine floors and targets for 2016-17
- The Next Step thought that more important than setting the individual floors and targets is that the goal should be to craft a PMF that evaluates schools in a full picture. We want to be evaluated by the whole PMF not our lowest category.
 - Rashida thanked her for the comment
 - LAYC seconded The Next Step's comments
- Maya YALC said that for fairness sake they should have an opportunity to address the drastic method of how Adult Ed schools are tiered and had thought that adjusting the floors and targets was supposed to be a way to address that.
 - Rashida answered that she understood the school's concerns and recognized how the Adult Ed PMF tiering ended up working out differently when many had thought that it would be identical to the other PMFs. She said that they would proceed as they proposed, look at the first year data and the schools' performance, and then work with that. She mentioned how this is a process that had to be done with every framework in the beginning and their goal is to make sure it's fair, rigorous, and aligned with schools' past performance.
 - Naomi added: As long as the targets were made to be more achievable than aspirational we no longer have a system of using 65 as our Tier 1 cutoff. She reiterated why we went the direction with the tiering system, and she agreed that we should give it another year and look at the data.
- Maya YALC expressed concerns about how burdensome the lowest category-based tiering system is stating that making it so high-stakes for school makes it really hard. She would rather have aspirational targets and show where they are strong even though another category might come out low because of certain things they can't control. She said that they're doing amazing things in the school and they're always going to be trying their best to well prepare their students, but that there are some things that just don't reflect the student's abilities, such as the city's employability. She said that being tiered by the overall PMF score would allow the school to have the opportunity to gain more points in areas that they are strong in and that would help a lot with lowering the burden of a category that might just be very difficult for the school because of the circumstances that they are given.
- The Next Step also said they would rather have more aspirational targets and be evaluated on the full picture than be graded on their lowest category. They prefer tougher targets and being scored globally.
- Maya YALC: Could we do the simulation and work on two proposals? 1) New floors and targets with the tiering as it is, and 2) Move targets to be more rigorous and use the same tiering as HS PMF.

- Rashida answered that she will do the first proposal and will make a decision about the second proposal after having a conference with Naomi. She said that maybe around late August they could come back with the data.

Closing Remarks

- Please provide feedback on the webinar format that was used today. It allowed more people to participate which was good, but there were some technical difficulties as well.
- There will be a Charter Leaders Meeting on August 18 and a slot for an Adult Ed session was secured. An email with more information should be sent out soon.
 - 1) Leicester (Academy of Hope) and Julie (The Next Step) are going to co-facilitate a discussion on an article about best practices in adult education. Please read article in advance for a fruitful discussion.
 - 2) There will be a brief presentation from DME about the Grad Pathways Project. They are doing research about disengaged youth and wanted to talk to Adult Ed schools specifically about gathering data on skill levels of students.