

Adult Education PMF Task Force

November 13, 2014

Meeting Notes

LEA/Agency	Attendees
Academy of Hope	Marco Panelli, Patricia DeFerrari
Briya	Lorie Preheim, Karen Hertzler (phone), Cara Sklar
Carlos Rosario	Patricio Sanchez, Ryan Monroe
Community College Prep	Connie Spinner
LAYC Career Academy	Andrew Schwabb
Maya Angelou YALC	Sarah Navarro, Sarah-Jaine Szekeresh, Mario Jackson
Next Step	Melvin Freeman
YouthBuild	Andrea Hinson
PCSB	Rashida Tyler, Erin Kupferberg, Sareeta Schmitt, Taunya Nesin, Naomi DeVeaux

Agenda:

- Task force norms
- Today's voting items vs. discussion items
- Technical Guide Updates:
 - NEDP
 - Floors and targets
 - ESL Level 6
- Tiers
- Mission Specific Goals

Notes:

- Rashida clarified what things are voting versus discussion items
- National External Diploma Program (NEDP)
 - Rashida shared a proposal for how to include NEDP results in the PMF
 - Briya asked about the denominator; will only students who exit be in the denominator?
 - Rashida noted that she can updated the language to include students who exit
 - There was some discussion about when a student would be included if she earns a diploma in SY 2014-15 and exits in SY 2015-16
 - Students in the assessment phase have to be tracked regardless of when they exit, so we would need to begin collecting data on this annually

- This is so we can keep track of who is in the assessment phase even if a student does not exit
 - Is this similar to how it is done for the GED?
 - The group mentioned that currently schools report students earning a GED only in the program year, not when they exit
 - Rashida noted that it might be useful to look at the same period of time
 - The group expressed a preference for how to include NEDP in the PMF
 - Numerator: Students earning the diploma in that program year
 - Denominator: Students who get the NEDP diploma plus any student in the assessment phase who exited without getting the diploma
- Tiering
 - Rashida discussed how the Adult Education PMF is distinct from the Elementary, Middle, and High School PMFs
 - Rashida recapped how the floor and targets were calculated
 - Rather than using an PMF overall score to determine tiers, PCSB is proposing something very different (see PPT slide 12)
 - Schools expressed concerns about how missing the 65% in one indicator makes a school automatically Tier 2
 - Schools asked why this big change
 - This shows that each indicator is very important
 - Rashida shared that she spent a lot of time looking at the data and questions arose about whether the targets were too low for certain measures (e.g., Mission Specific)
 - PCSB has concerns about the message it sends when that schools who scored highly overall, but did not score well in very key areas (i.e., Student Progress) are labeled Tier 1
 - It would not be fair to change the floors and targets at this stage
 - PCSB did not make this decision based on wanting to see a certain number of schools in any particular tier
 - Maya: Would any schools would not be Tier 3 using this?
 - Rashida shared that there would be two Tier 1 schools, one Tier 3 school, one new school that wouldn't have been tiered, and the rest Tier 2
 - Briya share a concern that a handful of students who exit before earning the NEDP, for example, might end up determining the tier of a school
 - Rashida clarified the distinction between needing to earn at least 65% for each indicator (e.g., Student Progress), not each measure (e.g., ABE 1)
 - Maya: Can a school with an N/A still be a Tier 1 school?
 - If a school had an N/A in Student Achievement, then it can still be counted as Tier 1
 - An N/A in any other indicator would take a school out of the running for Tier 1
 - There was some discussion about allowing schools to omit Student Achievement and whether this stays true to the philosophy of the PMF
 - LAYC expressed concern that a lot of weight is placed on reaching students who have exited because not meeting the 50% response rate would mean that a school cannot be Tier 1 even if everything else is solid

- Rashida asked the question of whether it is fair for a school that does not meet these benchmarks to be labeled Tier 1.
 - Naomi also discussed that Tier 1 is something that is hard and means something, which requires high expectations.
 - Next Step feels that the 50% threshold for the response rate is operational rather than about student outcomes
 - Briya proposed that we look at 50% overall rather than for both obtained and retained
 - Rashida noted that this would create a validity issue on the data that we would be reporting on
 - PCSB will look at how the GED rates compare to national averages
 - Rashida noted that we used at the Maryland plus one rule
 - LAYC share a concern that contacting exited students is beyond the schools' control
 - Rashida shared that the data from the pilot years shows that this can be done
 - Maya feels that the population they serve in a ward with high unemployment puts them at a disadvantage
 - Academy of Hope: Is there another way to do follow up?
 - PCSB will explore getting an MOU with DOES
 - Every school does not collect SSNs from all students
 - CC Prep shared that she would prefer third party data, like the Jacob France Institute
 - Other schools expressed concern about undocumented students
 - Carlos Rosario shared some best practices
 - Will Mission Specific have floors and targets?
 - Rashida shared that PCSB will propose making it display-only this year
- Updated Floors and Targets
 - PCSB is proposing that the floors and targets are revisited every two years rather than annually as the ES, MS, HS PMFs do
 - Use the same methodology, looking at the lowest performing states and Maryland plus one
 - At the end of the SY 2014-15, we will have 2012-13, 2013-14, and 2014-15 data to look at in addition to national data
 - Maya: The GED scores may drop with the new assessment
 - Rashida: maybe we should only look at one year of data
 - Naomi shared that PCSB is not moving toward a hold harmless clause for the new GED (or N/A) because the formula already has it built in that only students who are ready count
 - Schools shared that students have not been passing the practice test, so they are not going to sit for the GED
 - Maya: Are there business rules to keep the floors and target from moving too much?
 - Yes, PCSB would use the same business rule of not moving them more than +/- 33% in a given year
- ESL 6
 - A student would have to get a score one point higher than the maximum range to qualify as progressing beyond ESL 6
 - Carlos Rosario noted that in the higher levels the expected gain is only 3 points
 - Briya: Will the ABE level 6 calculation be the same as last year?
 - There is no floor and target for ABE 6 and it's not in the calculator

- Mission Specific Goals
 - Rashida recapped the process for choosing a Mission Specific Goal
 - We will try scoring of the Mission Specific Goals in a non-punitive way by making it display-only
 - Schools will indicate their plan for Mission Specific Goals on the voting sheet
 - Maya: Are schools required to include every certification they offer?
 - No, it is not required
 - It is encouraged
 - AOH has a visually impaired students who could not take the CASAS because no appropriate accommodation exists and sought feedback on how to deal with this challenge
 - This effects 3-4 students at AOH
 - These students are progressing, but there is no way to test their EFLs
 - PCSB may have to consider a business rule to remove from the denominator students who may not be able to take the CASAS due to a disability
 - **PCSB will help investigate other assessment options**
 - Maya expressed concern about opting in without knowing the floors and targets
 - Rashida reminded the group that this form is opting in for SY 2014-15 which is display-only
 - Schools will be able to revisit their Mission Specific Goals every year
- There will be time for public comment on these proposals as they go through the Board

Next Steps:

- Send in voting sheets by Monday, November 17 at 12 noon
- Submit descriptions, rubrics, or other artifacts about school Mission Specific Goals by Monday, December 1