

PCSB Early Childhood PMF Task Force

July 8, 2013 3:00-4:30pm

Minutes

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

Meeting Objective:

- a. To finalize the EC PMF structure

Attendees:

PCSB - Erin Kupferberg, Naomi Deveau, Rashida Tyler, School Performance Department
PCSB Board- - Skip McKoy, Board Chair
Arts & Technology – Corbet Houston, Jennifer Moore
Briya – Cara Sklar, Lisa Luceno
CAPCS - Colin Welch, Toosdhi Tucker
Capital City – Megan Reamer
Cedar Tree Academy (formally Howard Road) - Latrice Hicks
Center City – Michon Floyd
Eagle – Kathy McKeon
Early Childhood Academy – Pam Faulcon
EL Haynes – Rich Pohlman
EW Stokes – Alejaundra Maudet
Excel – Courtney Redding, Brent Pencak
Imagine Schools – Gabrielle Fardwell
LAMB – Elizabeth Sauler
Mundo Verde – Dahlia Aguilar
Shining Stars – Ayize Sabater

Minutes:

1. Revisit PK-3 and PK-4 and take a vote on whether we can adopt the EC PMF for PK to be the Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS) for public charter schools. This requires agreement to use CLASS.
 - a. Compare QRIS and EC PMF (PK only)

OSSE is proposing a QRIS pilot for school year 2013-2014 that has the following framework for PK3 – PK4 programs in DC: CLASS - 40% (with Emotional Support 10%, Classroom Organization 10%, and Instruction support weight 20%) Accreditation 30%, Teacher Qualification 15%, and attendance 15%.

The Task Force was updated on PCSB events in the last two weeks: Scott Pearson and Naomi DeVeaux from PCSB met with Emily Durso and Jose Alvarez from OSSE to discuss combining OSSE's QRIS with PCSB's EC PMF so that PK charter programs in DC were measured by one framework and not two. OSSE was open to PCSB's proposal but made sure to note that CLASS was non-negotiable. OSSE would help fund CLASS so every PK teacher is observed at every program (charter, district and COBs) with PK grades.

The following was proposed by PCSB to OSSE to align one rating system for PK Charter Schools:

CLASS 30% (equal weights in each domain), Student Outcomes 60% (social-emotional optional), and attendance 10%.

OSSE also agreed that PCSB would be able to choose the CLASS observers and PCSB would be the contact with charter schools for CLASS observations.

OSSE mentioned that DCPS and PCSB do not want accreditation included in the QRIS and they are willing to remove that piece, but if there are two frameworks measuring PK, OSSE's would have teacher qualifications weighted at 45% without the additional input.

During the discussion, one task force member suggested the option of including teacher qualifications in the EC PMF framework for PK. Many schools had concern that a spreadsheet with teacher information on it would go to OSSE and released to the public. Also, charter schools, by the SRA, are in charge of their own hiring. Task Force members could indicate on the voting form if they wanted to include teacher qualifications as an option. One school did.

- b. Understand EC PMF proposal - This is the proposal that the task force voted on with the purpose of having one measure for charters with PK grades:

Option	Teacher Interaction	Student Progress Outcomes			Leading Indicator
	CLASS	Literacy/Language	Math	SEL	Attendance
1	30%	27.5%	27.5%	NA	15%

2	30%	20%	20%	15%	15%
---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

- i. Indicators – The indicators included on the proposal to OSSE are the same indicators that have been discussed throughout all Task Force meetings. Since CLASS is a non-negotiable with OSSE but every teacher will be observed, this was a good compromise for the charter school task force members. Many member voiced opinions of wanting all teachers observed. With CLASS not being an option, it brought the PK framework back to two options for schools that had been discussed at the Task Force meetings through may.
 - ii. Weights – PCSB offered a compromise with the weight on attendance with OSSE’s QRIS and suggested to the task force to consider attendance to weigh 15% instead of 10%. Task Force members were asked on the voting form if they had a preference.
 - iii. Targets and floors – to be discussed and determined in September with pilot data analysis.
- c. Discuss Floors and Targets for CLASS – slide 6 of the PowerPoint given out at the meeting and posted on the Wiki site discusses the floors and targets proposed at the Task Force meeting. Since this was new information, the group decided to postpone voting on the targets and floors until September when the Task Force will meet to decide floors and targets on all of the assessments. The Target for Emotional Support and Classroom Organization was set at 6 instead of the 90th percentile because the assessment is designed that a score of 6-7 is high.
- d. **Vote** – Task Force members were asked to vote on the above PK framework and were told that the selected framework would be used by PCSB during conversation with OSSE.

Agree	Disagree	Attendance Comments
15 LEAs voted in agreement	2 LEA disagreed	7 LEAs asked for attendance to be 10% 1 LEA voted for 15% weight for attendance

*Other comments made on voting forms (each comment was written once unless other-wise noted):

- It is necessary that schools have the choice of options 1 or 2 (mentioned by 3 LEAs as a write-in comment)
- Consider social emotional as mandatory for all schools or give schools opt out for math/reading- essential to outcomes augment
- It is crucial that the appropriate protection for data is in place.
- CLASS must be done multiple times over a period to capture the overall experience of children.
- Include teacher qualification in the measurement system
- As a Montessori school we strongly disagree with math and literacy assessments that are not used diagnostically

*Notes were typed as written on the voting form.

2. K-2nd EC PMF/ K-3rd EC PMF

- a. Goal: To prepare K-2nd grade students to score proficient on the DC CAS in 3rd grade

At the end of the last meeting, the Task Force had suggested K-2 grades also have a CLASS and social-emotional options. At the PK level, CLASS is in the framework to have a common indicator to look at classrooms, since most assessments for these grades are student taken and not teacher observed. Also, since CLASS observations would be organized through the LEA, there would not be consistency in these observations. PCSB leadership did not agree that CLASS observation should be an option the EC PMF k-2 framework.

PCSB leadership was open to social-emotional progress at a low weight. The following framework was presented for Task Force vote, members were asked to write in if they would like to maintain the option of social-emotional:

Option	Student Progress and/or Achievement			Leading Indicators	
	Reading A achievement or Progress	Math Achievement or Progress	Social- Emotional progress	Attendance	Re- Enrollment
1	40%	40%	NA	10%	10%
2	35%	35%	10%	10%	10%

Leading Indicator weights were kept at 10% to align with the ES/MS PMF.

- b. 3rd Grade PMF- for schools that end in 3rd grade

The following framework applies to schools that end in 3rd grade:

DC CAS	Reading (P & A)	Reading (A only)	Math (P & A)	Math (A only)	Attendance	Re-Enrollment
3 rd Grade	35%	5%	35%	5%	10%	10%

P – Proficient, A – Advanced

Targets and Floors will be based off all 3rd grade scores in DC Charter schools and will align with the ES PMF.

c. Vote

Agree	Disagree	Social-Emotional Option
17 LEAs voted in agreement	0 LEA disagreed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 LEAs asked for Social Emotional to be kept an option • 3 LEAs asked for Social Emotional to NOT be an option

*Other written comments(each mentioned by one LEA unless noted otherwise):

- Would like K-4 option to be put on the table
- Consider not holding schools who will take the PAARC to DC CAS testing expectations, targets. Support schools with PAARC alignment now for pilot with 2nd and 3rd in SY 2013, 2014

*All comments typed as written by school leaders on the voting form.

3. Assessments:

a. Social Emotional Learning (SEL) Assessment Update:

Approved for EC Assessment List: DECA, GOLD, CK Pat

Still working with publisher to obtain the technical manuals: TCRS, ECR

b. Review procedure to add assessments to EC PMF

Schools may still request to add an EC assessment annually by filling out the appropriate form and providing requested documentation.

c. Assessment Performance Metrics

PK Assessments – will stay at developmentally appropriate progress targets as set by the publisher. If students are already score at the assessment achievement metric at start of the year, they must either maintain or grow but one year's growth will not apply.

K-2 Assessments

Achievement: When possible, connect outcomes on K-2 assessment with DC CAS 3rd grade scores to align assessment achievement metric to demonstrate that proficiency in earlier grades will set students up to be successful on the DC CAS in 3rd grade. Task Force member discussed the possibility of connecting K-2 assessments with 3rd and 4th grade DC CAS results since achieving proficiency in 3rd grade. PCSB is going to discuss with Tembo.

Progress: progress is met when students decrease the path to achievement by 1/3. This will allow students to be successful on this assessment or the DC CAS within 3 years.

d. Vote

Agree	Disagree	Non-vote
11 LEAs voted in agreement	4 LEA disagreed	2 LEAs did not circle a vote

*Comments (comments by one LEA unless otherwise noted):

- We would like to go on record to communicate our apprehension of using child PK assessment to make high-stakes decisions regarding program quality. Not all assessments are normed for children from diverse backgrounds. Using these assessments in this manner makes it more attractive for schools to be selective, instead of scoring low in areas.
- DC CAS seems not to be a good measure especially since it is changing and isn't a great bar to begin with. Many of the assessments are very different from what the CAS is testing. Like the theory behind the proposal but am not comfortable with DC CAS being the measure.
- I find problematic: a. correlating achievement on a different assessment with DC CAS performance, b. total lack of consideration for a school's special education population and the need for various types of assessments for twelve students to capture progress.
- For K-2 proposed levels: 1. Increased rigor for 3rd grade DC CAS over other grade levels, 2. Pending change over from CAS to PARCC and potential significant drops in outcome scoring, 3. Major difference in assessment type (Ex. DIEBELS/TRC should not be used as a DC CAS

proficiency predictor). There is a reason why CAS begins at 3rd grade. Instruction and student achievement goals (and the assessments used) look much different for primary grades, 4. Would prefer to use publisher recommendations for targets and floors/progress and achievement.

*All comments typed as written by school leaders on the voting form.

4. Agree and vote on business rules for EC PMF – The following business rules were discussed and voted on (the task force removed “maintain assessment for three years minimum” which was a business rule from the EC PMF Pilot.):
 - a. Participation - 5% overall if school tests at least 95% of students
 - b. Missing Metrics - Fewer overall points
 - c. N Size – include all data but only display min. of 10 students
 - d. Student Attrition to Schools – FAY
 - e. New Schools – No tier 1st year (unless requested)
 - f. Floors and Targets – methodology developed after comprehensive review of actual performance data for assessments
 - g. Re-enrollment & Attendance – based on grade band data – targets and floors – 90th and 10th percentiles (similar to ES/MS PMF)
 - h. Tiers – methodology will be developed after floors and targets have been established for each metric in September meeting.
 - i. ~~*Maintain assessment for three years minimum (start year 1 of EC PMF)~~
 - j. *Ability to add assessments annually

Vote:

Agree	Disagree	Non-vote
15 LEAs voted in agreement	0 LEA disagreed	2 LEAs did not circle a vote

*Comments:

- Floors and targets for CLASS aligned with national averages.

*All comments typed as written by school leaders on the voting form.