

PCSB Early Childhood PMF Task Force March 19, 2013, 9:30am – 11:00am Minutes

Goal of Early Childhood PMF Taskforce: To produce a taskforce-generated, board approved Early Childhood PMF that measures school progress towards preparing students to be successful learners in schools serving PreK-3 through second grades*

Meeting Objectives:

- a. To review and discuss the performance and progress indicators for each grade and subject
- b. To discuss and finalize weights for each category, grade, and subject.

Attendees:

PCSB – Erin Kupferberg
Tembo Consulting – David Stewart
Howard Rd Academy – Latrice Hicks
Hope Community – Gabrielle Montgomery
Eagle Academy – Kathy McKeon, Jeff Cline, Tiffany Robinson
Community Academy – Colin Welch, Toosdhi Tucker
Friendship – Zac Morford
DC Prep – Hilary Dauffenbach-Tabb
KIPP DC – Irene Holtzman
LAMB – Laure Fleming
AppleTree - Anne Malone
Capital City- Megan Reamer
Education Strengthen Families – Cara Sklar, Lisa Luceno
Center City – Michon Floyd
Washington Yu Ying – Maquita Alexander
Ingenuity Prep – Aaron Cury
Mundo Verde – Dahlia Aguilar
Shining Stars – Ayize Sabater

1. Welcome
2. Discuss visually separating Pre-K section of EC PMF from K-2 grades, EC PMF will still have one outcome. Overall, group in favor of visual separation, this may change with different layout variations.
3. Performance indicators for each grade level that will be measured

*For schools serving up to the 3rd grade, 3rd grade will be included.

- a. Group discussion clarified that just because they are assessed does not mean each grade will be shown on EC PMF. Structure of EC PMF will be determined after weights and indicators are decided upon. *Also, today the task force is working on individual measures and weights for each grade level, the EC PMF will likely show one score for a grade band, not individual grade scores.
 - b. Grades 1 and 2: Group generally agreed that EC PMF would measure both math and reading for progress and achievement.
 - c. K – Task Force group fine with math and reading progress. Some discussion on Achievement for both. Achievement was optional for grade K in the pilot. As groups went to small group work to discuss weights, they could weight achievement zero for K grade if that was what small group decided. David helped to clarify- were groups uncomfortable measuring achievement at the K grade or uncertain about showing the results as part of the PMF. Most schools seemed to agree that they did already measure achievement at K level, that the question of the results being part of the EC PMF was worrisome. One suggestion – weigh achievement at K grade very little when working on indicator weights.
 - d. PreK 3&4: Group seemed to agree that “reading” should be replaced with “literacy”. Achievement for both math and reading at this level would stay not applicable. Group debated keeping CLASS or another “input” assessment in the EC PMF versus just on outcomes. Other states using a combination of mostly inputs with some outcomes in their accountability models. Erin pointed out that the charter school board generally only measures outcomes but for EC this may be a point to consider. As groups worked together, they were going to come up with various plans for entire group to discuss more. Also, possible home work: to look at other states using assessment outcomes as part of accountability and see how other states account for all. Overall- group did not seem interested in the “check off” input quality system.
4. Small Group Break-Out – Groups discussed their proposals for possible weights for indicators

*For schools serving up to the 3rd grade, 3rd grade will be included.

a. PreK

i. **Proposal 1:**

Grade	Literacy Progress	Math Progress	Attendance	Mission Specific	Social Emotional Progress #
PreK3	25%	25%	10%*	15%	25%
PreK4	25%	25%	10%*	15%	25%

*Group would like attendance target of 88% lowered

Group had CLASS with a question mark (Group was considering using CLASS instead of Social Emotional assessment)

ii. **Proposal 2:** In this proposal- Schools would opt into class or not, then percentages would be the following

Grade	Literacy Progress	Math Progress	Attendance	Mission Specific	CLASS (optional)
W/O Class (both grades)	40%	40%	10%	10%	0%
If Schools choose to conduct CLASS on all classrooms in their school, one of the following options is proposed:					
Possibility 1: With CLASS: PreK3 & PreK4	25%	25%	10%	10%	30%
OR Possibility 2: With CLASS: PreK 3 & PreK4	35%	25%	10%	10%	20%

*Group would like extra points for attendance percentage rating above 88% (bonus points)

*For schools serving up to the 3rd grade, 3rd grade will be included.

b. Grades K-2

- i. **Proposal 1:** *Note states “Ideally roll multiple grades together (as opposed to reporting each grade separately).”

Grade	Reading Progress OR Reading Achievement	Math Progress OR Achievement	Attendance	Mission Specific
K	35%	35%	10%	20%
1 st	35%	35%	10%	20%
2 nd	35%	35%	10%	20%

For example: each child achieves at X level or grows X amount

Rationale:

- Achievement at all levels – expect students to learn at a certain level at end of K-2
- The combinations gives schools flexibility depending on program

- ii. **Proposal 2:** All grades would be “lumped together”

Grade	Reading Progress*	Math Progress*	Reading Achievement	Math Achievement	Attendance
K -2	25%	25%	20%	20%	10%

*Progress needs to exclude students who already achieve advanced status in the fall without penalizing school

- iii. **Proposal 3:** Schools would have a choice to weigh a certain grade more than another, depending on their program. The outcome would be that achievement and progress would equal 90% but schools could choose from Option A, B, or C.

Option A

Grade	Reading Progress	Math Progress	Reading Achievement	Math Achievement	Attendance
K	30	30	15	15	10%

*For schools serving up to the 3rd grade, 3rd grade will be included.

1 st	20	20	25	25	
2 nd	15	15	30	30	

Option B

Grade	Reading Progress	Math Progress	Reading Achievement	Math Achievement	Attendance
K	20	20	25	25	10%
1 st	20	20	25	25	
2 nd	20	20	25	25	

Option C

Grade	Reading Progress	Math Progress	Reading Achievement	Math Achievement	Attendance
K	15	15	30	30	10%
1 st	20	20	25	25	
2 nd	30	30	15	15	

Rationale: Give schools weighting options based on grades served.

Wrap-Up –:

1. The date of the next meeting will need to be changed, Erin will send out an announcement as soon as possible.
2. The next meeting's topic will be a data discussion based on David Stewart's analysis

*For schools serving up to the 3rd grade, 3rd grade will be included.