

High School PMF Task Force CTE Working Group Meeting Notes
Meeting 4: May 13 2014

Meeting attendees: Doranna Tindle (Friendship), James Waller (Friendship), Robyn Bessler (Capital City), Sarah Jaine Szekeresh (Maya Angelou), Irene Holtzman (KIPP DC), Kenli Okada (E.L. Haynes), Sareeta Schmitt (PCSB), Rashida Tyler (PCSB), Erin Kupferberg (PCSB), Charlie Sellew (PCSB), Mikayla Lytton (PCSB)

Agenda:

- Review the voting results from the March meeting
- Share HS PMF scorecard layout feedback
- Proposed Career Readiness formulas and business rules
- Weights/point values for the Career Readiness metric
- 4- and 5-year ACGR points
- Voting options for Career Readiness & ACGR metrics

Notes:

Scorecard Layout:

- Sareeta shared with the group the draft scorecard that most LEA favored
- She noted that the Future Metrics section at the bottom will not have points or the floors and targets bar because the floors and targets will not be calculated for the new metrics until November after the 2014 PMF is published
- Kenli asked what the percentage displayed would be, and Sareeta responded that it is the actual rate or score that the school earned (e.g., the 5-year graduation rate) as calculated by the formula
- Sareeta also informed the group that PCSB is moving toward an online platform for the PMF rather than printing the big books
- Rashida noted that schools will still receive a pdf of their scorecard

Career Readiness Formula and Business Rules:

- Sareeta caught the group on where they had ended in March with the two-tiered approach to the metric and she shared the proposed formulas
- Doranna asked whether the completers would most likely be 12th graders; there was a short discussion and the group concluded that it depends on the program
- The group discussed how different CTE programs has different requirements (i.e. nursing requires students to be 18 years old) and different schools set up their programs for students complete in different grades, so the term “completer” works because it can apply to any grade level
- Kenli asked why don't we just look at certifications over participants?
 - Sareeta responded that since many participants are not eligible, the rate would not truly reflect the outcome.

- Kenli followed by noting that it would reflect what is accurate in this city.
- Sareeta noted the balance is with Completer Rate. Using the two equations, encourages kids to complete.
- Irene brought up a question about capturing the number of students who do not participate in either college or career readiness programs at a school.
- Doranna shared that she felt that would be overly punitive. She likes the metric as it is because students who are dual enrolled will also be captured if they delay completion for dual enrollment.
- Kenli asked why we did not consider making the denominator the total number of seniors.
- Sareeta and other task force members noted that CTE programs are not necessarily for every student and will be optional for schools.
- The group was comfortable moving forward with both metrics to calculate Career Readiness.
- Sareeta also noted the business rule that if a career sector is not on the Strategic Plan list and a school wants to include it, the school can petition to PCSB to have it included so long as the school can show that the career sector meets the high skill, high wage, high demand criteria used by OSSE's CTE Working Group.
- Kenli clarified that choosing to opt into the Career Readiness measure would be decided on a campus level. He also asked that the minimum n-size, which will follow the general PMF business rule of $N \geq 10$, be explicitly stated

Career Readiness Points:

- Sareeta shared with the group that making the College Readiness measure optional is not an option at this point
- Kenli asked whether there is current data on whether a school that is doing poorly in AP could easily pick up points in the Career Readiness measure
 - Sareeta shared that this should not be a major issue because Career Readiness does not completely replace College Readiness, but it de-emphasize it slightly depending on how many points it is worth
 - The data is not currently available since this would be the first year that PCSB collects data on CTE programs
- Kenli expressed general concern about splitting up the 5 points for College Readiness
- Sareeta shared that splitting the points seemed to be the best way to include CTE without shifting points in all other indicators.
 - If CTE was only 1 point, it would not be worth opting in.
 - James noted that most of Friendship's CTE programs are STEM, college going careers. These programs help prepare students for college.

- The group generally agreed that college readiness and career readiness are not at odds with each other
- The task force members planned to vote on the points split at the end of the meeting

ACGR Points:

- Sareeta presented and explained OSSE's formulas for calculating ACGR
- Currently graduation is worth 7.5 points
- Sareeta shared two proposals on how to split the points: 50-50 and 60-40 with more weight to the 4-year rate
- There was some discussion on the best way to split the points:
 - Irene shared that she believes it is most fair to split the points evenly for schools who serve recovery students. She noted that both rates are valuable and having an equal split will not make a difference to KIPP DC, but it could make a world of difference to schools who serve recovery students.
 - Kenli asks whether it is possible to weight the 5-year rate more than 4-year.
 - Rashida noted that last year this was presented and the group was not comfortable with a 50-50 split.
 - Irene added that now OSSE has made it clear that the receiving school is responsible for the graduation of a student who enters in his/her fifth year and the points make sense as Proposal 1.
 - The group generally favors the idea of weighting the 5-year rate more than the 4-year.
 - James adds that with many 9th graders, completing in 4 years is challenging. He believes that weighting the 5-year rate more than the 4-year acknowledges that we get students where we get them. Any school that takes kids in 9th grade is at risk with accepting students with zero credits. He argued that in terms of getting students ready for college and knowing that we receive many kids who would need to repeat, it makes more sense to weight the 5-year rate more.
 - Irene asked: Does it keep perverse incentives to keep kids for 5 years? She noted that for KIPP it does not. We want them to graduate.
 - Rashida asked the group to give PCSB the point breakdown with comments, then give the backup vote to go to the board with.
 - Sareeta reminded the group that vote forms not due until Friday, and the LEAs who could not participate in the meeting today would receive the notes and have the opportunity to vote on the ACGR points by Friday as well.
- The group agreed to remove Proposal 2 and wrote Proposal 3: 60-40 split with more weight on the 5-year rate
- There was some discussion on the ACGR calculation:

- Sarah Jaine noted that there no data set to distinguish drop-outs. Is this a way to shape policy? She expressed concern that for the 5-year ACGR, OSSE didn't have a verification process. Maya Angelou PCS had three graduates left off.
- Robyn noted that for most LEAs there wasn't much change and they didn't want to draw attention to it. LEAs could have challenged it.
- Sarah Jaine shared that she wants OSSE to take 5-year as seriously as 4-year.
- Irene noted that LEA data meetings are an important place to note issues with OSSE
- Sarah Jaine suggested that the voting sheets sent out to members not in attendance be amended to include the new proposal.

Conclusions and Next Steps

- Generally, the group liked the Career Readiness metric and
- Members of the Task Force CTE Working Group will discuss the voting sheet with colleagues at their LEA and return the voting sheet no later than COB Friday, May 16