

PCSB Early Childhood PMF Task Force May 21, 2013,

Minutes

Attendees:

PCSB – Erin Kupferberg
Tembo Consulting – David Stewart
AppleTree – Michael Samuel
Briya – Lisa Lucino, Cara Sklar
CAPCS – Toosdhi Tucker, Colin Welch
CCPCS – Amy Wendel
Center City – Michon Floyd
DC Prep – Hilary Daffenbach-Tabb
Eagle – Jeff Cline, Kathy McKeon (by phone)
EW Stokes – Julia Senerchia
Excel – Courtney Redding, Nikki Stewart
Focus – Anne Herr
Friendship – Dawnica Green, Zac Morford
GWU EC Professor – Dr. Jennifer Frey
Home Community – Gabrielle Montgomery
Howard Road – Latrice Hicks
Ingenuity Prep – Aaron Cuny
Miriam Colderon
Mundo Verde – Dahlia Aguilar
School Readiness Consulting – Kimberly Cooke, Lindsey Allard
Shining Stars – Maria Fenton
TeachStone – Rebecca Berlin, Virginia Vitiello (both by phone)

Minutes:

1. CLASS Call with Rebecca Berlin and Virginia Vitiello from TeachStone:
An overview of the conversation with TeachStone:
 - For smaller schools with fewer classrooms, more teachers should be observed. If the school has 2 or fewer classrooms, all teachers observed for accountability.

- One option for sites with a single classroom is to observe over 50% of the classrooms in that LEA and come up with an LEA score for that campus. The group did not agree since every campus is assessed individually on the PMFs.
- Number of Cycles (each cycle is 15-20 minutes of observation and 5-10 minutes of coding) – for program accountability, it is recommended that at least 4 cycles are completed for each observation. Doing 4-6 is fine or just staying with 4 cycles is appropriate. More cycles does not improve scores just more accurate.
- Scheduling tips states are using: do not go into classrooms during the first or last month of the school year, avoid the first half hour of the day (task force discussed they would like flexibility in the first half hour of day because instruction starts off as soon as students arrive). The task force can standardize protocol around observations – looking for the average experience for the average child across the day for each program is the point.
- Another protocol option- teachers are randomly selected then distributed randomly across month of year to be observed. Then one month ahead consultants would contact school to give two week window the teacher or school would be observed, principal then gets two days to ask observers not to come because of PD, field trip, sub, etc.
- States are not giving feedback for each teacher, not feasible with the number of teachers being observed. States are trying to give feedback based on the program level.

2. Social-Emotional Assessments- Criteria outlined by the working group on May 16, 2013

- a. Norm or criterion referenced
- b. Publisher prescribed growth targets
- c. Research based (studies of documented validity and reliability)
- d. Publisher determines that assessment is measuring SEL – not strictly parent reported

3. Social-Emotional Assessments – Dr. Jennifer Frey-

An overview of our conversation with Dr. Frey:

- For data accuracy- for any assessment inter-rater reliability, it is ideal to have a second person observe, score, etc for 30% of students assessed.
- Much of SEL assessment depends on the measure chosen to use. Many assessments, starting in 2008 or 2009 started to include a reliability index to help schools see if teachers were not scoring correctly.
- For growth- look at the technical manual and see if they are sensitive enough to measure change.
- Dr. Frey recommends norm referenced assessments to show growth. SSRS is one that is used frequently that is norm referenced.
- AEPS II is a popular criterion referenced test used nationally.
- Growth or progress makes sense for EC grades, especially PreK 3 and 4.

4. Pre-K 3&4 Grades

- The task force further discussed the use of social-emotional assessments. Many schools do not currently use one and would like time to pilot an assessment in this area to see if they would like it included. Some schools definitely want this included in the framework and some schools do not want it included at all. Due to the different philosophical beliefs around Pre-k programs, the following compromise was made:
 - o LEAs can chose between the following two options

▪ 1:

Progress		Teacher Interaction	Social Emotional	Leading Indicator
Language and Literacy	Math	CLASS		Attendance
20%	20%	30%	20%	10%

▪ 2:

Progress		Teacher Interaction	Leading Indicator
Language and Literacy	Math	CLASS	Attendance
30%	30%	30%	10%

- Many schools in the task force would like choose option 2 and pilot a social –emotional assessment year 1. They could then opt to switch to option 1 after the first year. Once a two year cycle is complete, the task force would reconvene to

study the data from the first two years to see if the task force would continue to include social emotional assessments.

- Providing the options was probably the only way the group was coming to consensus for the PreK3/4 framework.
- PreK3/4 Assessment Performance Indicators – the task force agreed to leave the performance indicators as the developmentally appropriate growth targets set by the publisher. In future years, with more data, it may make sense to revisit this policy, but without data to support change, the group voted to leave as is.
- CLASS: The task force discussed a few parameters that would be included around CLASS:
 - For the first year, while PD is in place by OSSE and LEAs, not start class observations until after the winter holidays and end before the last month of school. In future years, CLASS observations would not start until Oct 15.
 - Schools would be informed of a possible two-week window of observations one month ahead of time, the principal or head of school would be able to elect two days the observers would not come due to PD, Sub, field trip, etc.
 - PCSB/OSSE would observe at least 50% of teachers. If a school has 2 or fewer PreK teachers, all would be observed.
 - Schools can elect to pay for additional CLASS observations and the additional data would be included for the PMF as long as the school used a third party observer (with parameters)
- 5. Participation: the task force agreed that 5% overall would be assigned to participation rate. If the school assesses 95% or more of their students then the school receives the 5%. If a school assesses fewer than 95%, then the school does not receive the 5%.
- 6. Schools that end in 3rd Grade: Three schools stayed to discuss accountability for schools that end in 3rd grade. Schools agreed they were fine with either of the two options and simplicity may be best.

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

OR:

DC CAS	Reading (P&A)	Math (P&A)	Attendance	Re-Enrollment
3 rd Grade	40%	40%	10%	10%

Next Meeting: June 6 – 9am-11:30am- Last meeting until Sept.

Decision that need to be made by the task force:

1. Business Rules:
 - a. N Size – 10 like standard PMF?
 - b. Student Attribution to Schools – FAY?
 - c. New Schools – No tier 1st year
 - d. Floors and Targets – TBD in Sept- top 90% percentile for target and bottom 10% percentile for floor
 - e. Weighting of scores across grades
 - f. Tiers
2. 3rd Grade- Decide on option- Erin will obtain feedback from PCSB leadership
3. CLASS Parameters
4. Assessment Performance Indicators- draft distributed during May 21 meeting.