

DC PCSB PK-8 Task Force Meeting
March 21, 2019
Meeting Notes

1. Attendees: Irene Holtzman (FOCUS), Josh Boots and Kenli O'kada (Empower K12); Aaron Cuny (Ingenuity Prep); Alexandra Pardo (TenSquare); Zac Morford (Friendship); Ed Han (KIPP); Natasha Parrilla, Jamie Miles, and Rebecca Kimport (AppleTree); Alexander Rose-Henig (BASIS); Katherine Park (Breakthrough); Dominique Coote (Capital City); Laura Berger (Center City); Hilary Dauffenbauch-Tabb (DC Prep); Stu Wulsin and Amber Schlik (EL Haynes); Tiffany Robinson (Eagle); Marla McGuire and Carolyn Davis (Hope Community); Kelly Brown (Inspired Teaching); Susan Flora (Paul); Pam Faulcon (Early Childhood Academy); William West (Rocketship); Curtis Lawrence (Democracy Prep); Kelly Smith (Perry Street)

DC PCSB attendees: Pete Petrin, Erin Kupferberg, Naomi DeVeaux

2. Described DC PCSB's priorities of the changes
 - a. Is at risk correlation still a priority? It is not listed.
3. Reviewed Changes and impact for SY2018-19
 - a. Schools like the visual of slide 10, the transition to the table with the same information needed to be explained.
 - b. Where is DC PCSB comfortable with at risk correlation.
 - c. All closing schools are included in all analyses, same group of school
 - d. What percent of schools are meeting 50% threshold who are less than 50% at risk- **We will send out after presentation.**
 - e. Did we look at scores that school much more at-risk?
 - f. **At risk students and performance on NWEA MAP. - Data ask.**
4. Proposals for 19-20 (**Slide 16- fix the three domains of class- CO listed twice**)
 - a. **Are the changes between A and B statically significant. Can you show schools with MGP that have CLASS and don't. Follow up with at-risk information on our handout.**
 - b. Separate achievement measures by elementary and middle schools
 - i. Does math include all tests? Yes –
 - ii. How do you define outlier? 1.5* IQR. Outliers excluded in each of three years of weighted calculation.
 - iii. Why is target still only using charter data instead of all DC schools? Open to discussion for 2021-22
 - iv. Some conversation about a school ending in
 - c. Replace gateway with Growth to Proficiency
 - i. At risk correlation increased in this area this year which added to the increase overall.
 - ii. STAR moved to n-size for a K-8 because there will be more weight on 4-5 and 6-8.

- iii. Gateway- there were a strong rationale to use those measures, strong philosophical research to show that these are important points. When the task force worked to change gateway 4 or 5 years ago, our Board was not interested. Current climate of our Board is ready to make this change.
 - 1. Last time we talked, many LEAs wanted to get away Gateway, more to do with philosophy that you were not testing a terminal grade and one group of students was weighted more.
 - 2. Is there an option C- we know option A and B will be approved. If you do want something else, we are not sure what will be approved.
 - 3. Particularly in grade 8- test scores don't see to be as predictive as other factors should be focused on (like attendance, etc)
- iv. Why did we align with OSSE's targets for Growth to Proficiency and not achievement? DCPS schools push out floor and target, what is the impact on included vs excluded them.
- v. Setting floors at zero sets a more normally distributed measure. Floors are currently at zero and don't have a rationale to change.
- vi. Tried to model prior years data but didn't have all of the data for all students in prior years.
- vii. Concerned about the validity of the Growth to Proficiency metric- that this defines quality undermines validity of PMF
- viii. Charter group supports the construct validity of this framework. This does decrease the correlation with at-risk. If we don't make a change, then we have to live with the correlations.
- ix. Schools ending in grade 3 will stay the same as it now. Schools ending in grade 3, have a much lower at-risk correlation and grade 3's gateway measure is lower correlated.
- x. Another look- look at at-risk students separately- look at subgroup performance specifically, appears that at-risk students perform better at lower performing over-all school. Our PMF has philosophically been that every student achieves. We do not hold separate floors and targets for subgroup students.
 - 1. Can we add transparency how to calculate PMF by subgroups?
- xi. What if PMF as Goals has an equity criterion- if at-risk students meet STAR standard, it is another way to meet goals?** Look at other ways to look at the PMF as Goals lens.
- xii. Or for other schools where at-risk students are doing better and closing achievement gap.
- xiii. Josh is asking OSSE for every STAR metric for non-at risk and not-SPED for every measure.

xiv. If we are discussing Gateway – why are we switching gateway to a growth measure.

xv. **Let's run what it looks like without Gateway.**

d. CLASS Options

i. Average score nation wide is a 2. To increase the target well over threshold of quality. Later article has adjusted to 2.75. What was the program quality to adjust.

ii. CLASS Administration is a mess right now. Should pause, we are just moving the goal posts. It is ok that our EC schools are better than norm. Research does suggest that high emotional support score is key to start with. We don't want EC schools to just be academics.

iii. Looking to stretch schools in CLASS,

iv. Why are we changing something that seems to be working?

v. Our study rolls up the data to high.

vi.