



EC/ES/MS PMF Task Force Meeting  
Minutes  
November 20, 2015

In Attendance

DC PCSB – Scott Pearson, Naomi DeVeaux, Rashida Tyler, Erin Kupferberg, Sareeta Schmitt, Adam Bethke

Basis – Rob Biemesderfer  
Bridges – Erika Magana  
Capital City – Karen Dresden  
Center City – Laura Burger  
DC Bilingual – Rohini Ramnath  
DC Prep – Hilary Dauffenbach-Tabb  
DC Scholars – Jessica Morris  
Eagle – Tiffany Robinson  
EL Haynes – Franklin Wasmer  
EW Stokes – Julia Samerchia  
Excel - Colin Welch  
Friendship – Monique Miller, Dr. Marsha McLean, Zac Morford  
Ingenuity Prep – Will Stetzer  
Inspired Teaching – Kelly Brown  
KIPP DC – Ed Han  
Mundo Verde – Kristin Scotchmer  
Paul – Tomiko Graves  
Potomac Prep – Sharon Wright  
Roots – Dr. Bernida Thompson, Rasheki W.  
Seed PCS – William West  
Two Rivers – Maggie Bello  
Washington Latin – Ryan Benjamin  
Yu Ying – Jennifer Olin

FOCUS – Irene Holtzman, Anne Herr  
Empower K12 – Josh Boots  
TenSquare – Jess Sher

Data are embargoed. – Please do not share outside of leadership. Please do not scan.

DC PCSB has a targeted agenda for today. DC PCSB opened up the tech guide in September. In October, public comment was due. A number of schools submitted a letter with a set of requests. A big request in that letter was to talk about the business rules that create PMF at a Task Force meeting. Today, we're only talking about the 15-16 PMF. Today's goal is to look at the proposals that were made by a set of school. I want to honor that not every school signed off on that letter, so I want to make sure we talk about it here today.

We will resubmit the tech guide for public comment, and the tech guide will be voted on in January.

## Goals:

1. Discuss the impact of PARCC on the achievement and gateway measures
2. Decide whether or not to make changes to the 15-16 tech guide — right now, there are business rules. The group asked for us to consider whether or not we can make changes to the 15-16 tech guide
3. Offer feedback on the speed at which we move from 3+ to 4+ in order to minimize impact.

## Voting:

- First option for all options is to leave things as-is
- Questions:
  - Gateway – keep at 3+ or move to 4+
  - Achievement

## Looking at Charter Level Data

- Examining percentiles
- Reminder that 3+ and 4+ are what are going to be shown on the PMF

## What does this data mean?

- While not equivalent in scoring, there is still a 4:1 ratio between 3+ (previously proficient) and 4+ (previously advanced)
- Previously, very few schools were making the targets for advanced, and no schools were making the targets for proficient, as they were set aspirationally
- If you did better (more 3s+ than proficient+ on DC CAS), you'll do better with the 2014-15 PMF.
- If the task force votes for no change, the 14-15 targets will be the 15-16 targets for the PARCC assessments
- How were floors and targets calculated?
  - For 14-15, they were calculated by finding 90th percentile, and multiplying by the multiplier from DC CAS calculations
  - Proposal from the schools (the Boots formula) is to take the 90th percentile, and add on 1/4 of the difference between the 90th percentile and 100%
  - **DC PCSB is not comfortable with a lower target for approached expectations** – DC PCSB staff proposes, since 3+ is parallel to proficient, that the target for any 3+ measures is 100%.
- **Our priority for the PMF is that there is consistency and reliability between years (no sharp drops), and we do not want schools to have to defend their Tier 1 scores (Tier 1 needs to mean something).**
  - Eventually we want to get the PMF to looking at 4s; but we think that should take three to five years to complete
  - The question we have is, relatively how quickly, and through what means (floors / targets, weights)
- Question about the achievement points
  - Shifting to 93.6% (14-15 target) then to 77.9% (school proposed target), it feels weird to go back to 100%.
  - Naomi – the 100% would allow for the relatively same # of points across schools

- Levels 4+
  - The schools' proposal lowers ELA a bit, and raises math a bit
  - DC PCSB: The schools came up with a reasonable alternative
    - Easier to explain, based off of only PARCC data
- Regardless of what we do for 15-16, we will return in the winter and discuss floors / targets for 16-17 and beyond
- DC PCSB's proposal for 15-16 is to hold the floors at 0 for 15-16
- Outline of DC PCSB potential strategies from hand out
  - Not as scary as you'd think to jump during the 15-16 year
  - Option 6 – new request from the HS taskforce; no points awarded for just 5, but all points on 4+
  - Option 7 – just at the 90th percentile
- Question – all of these scenarios are based on averages scores. What happens to individual schools – do certain schools do “really well” and are there other ways we should be looking at it (is the mean skewed)
  - DC PCSB analyzed at the 10th, 25th, 50th, mean, 75th, and 90th percentiles of overall points earned
  - Task force member pointed out that the sector data is in the first few slides and on schools' FTP site from OSSE.
- Request – can we narrow to a few scenarios, and then look at the greater detail (all the data) for the few scenarios we're interested in
  - DC PCSB can send out more data on Monday with the information we have on a few scenarios
- Scott – there's support from myself and our Board Chair for continuing to keep in level 3 right now; there are a number of scenarios where there are schools earning the same rates of 4+ and 5, but which have vastly different percentages in levels 1, 2, and 3.
- Comment from Josh: we're going to have a nice increase in points this year (14-15) and then a course correction decrease in 15-16. Is there a concern in the optics of things going up this year, but then going down when we improve?
  - Naomi: we are not advocating for anything — we are fine if it stays the same as it is right now.
    - Within five years, we would like to move to looking at 4s; whether we do that incrementally, or we decide to keep this for three years and then move – that's all up in the air. The question at hand is what do we do for this year?
    - We haven't talked about not-scoring the PMF, but... [Scott] my own view is that when you look at the history of the PMF and DC CAS, there was a huge jump from year 1 to year 2. Since we're going to have new materials to work with for our students for 15-16, I'm expecting a huge increase in one year.
    - There are different messages that you as schools and us as DC PCSB are going to have to deliver. We're fine on going slowly – but we're also fine going more aggressively and making sure that there's no question that a Tier 1 school is a Tier 1 school.
- Stokes: my inclination is to set the targets where we want them to be – that way, PMF scores can reflect our improvement.
  - EK repeat back: say 3+ should be 100 and 4+ should be 75, then the points will move up.
  - Pushback – floors at percentiles work too
- Inspired Teaching: what is going to convey the message of growth long term?
- School: The idea of gradually increasing the weight on 4+ will negate the growth we'll make. Doing a straight I/O change in three years will make it so that we can blitz the change, message and be prepared, rather than have to explain yearly that scores didn't change because the floors and targets are shifting beneath us

- FOCUS - Is the data shown including closed schools
  - When we're talking floors and targets, we always remove closed schools
  - FOCUS: does it make sense to take a look at the current performance of schools with their current new load of students
    - RQ for long term – how does absorption of closed school students affect students
- Scott question -
  - How many people want to have a steady ramp (none)
  - How many people want to have the step function now (5 LEAs raised hands)
  - FOCUS: having lived through DCPS changes, I think there's something to be said to 2 year steps
  - Two Rivers: I think the suggestion not to publish this year is important to consider, especially since we're going to talk between January and March about how things will change in the future. This would allow for us to show data from 14-15, but not have any points attached to it, which would allow for a "fresh and accurate start" for the PMF
- FOCUS - offered to have FOCUS and EmpowerK12 data teams work with DC PCSB
- Yu Ying: how do we encourage and incentivize schools to move from levels 4 to level 5? Those students don't get any credits

#### Gateway

- Definitional discussion
  - Hard to say that approaching is success under gateway
  - **8<sup>th</sup> grade gateway should include all students who took tests, not just grade 8 test. DC PCSB can make that decision for the PMF, OSSE has not decided yet.**
- What is the primary purpose of the gateway —
  - In a framework like PARCC, does it make sense to do a gateway when everything is pinned to college and career success? – Future discussion, not for 2015-16. DC PCSB was strongly against changes to gateway two years ago.
- Strongly advocate for including the advanced math (Two Rivers)
- Doesn't make sense to calculate the 90th percentile without the advanced math and then include those students in the assessments
- Does anyone not want to include the advanced math students in the rates (no hands raised)

#### Weight Change for Achievement

- The votes for now:
  - Option 1: no change
  - Option 2: move some of the points from 3+ to 4+
  - Options 3 and 4 are steps – somewhat moot based on your feedback today

#### — Restatement -

- NEW OPTION from members: request DC PCSB that we request to the board an extension of the tech guide until spring, so schools can work on a plan for this year along with long term plan, shifting weights.

- Some schools very uncomfortable with not knowing targets until spring. It will not be another hold harmless year. Some schools were okay with the delay. This will be question one on the vote form. Please vote for remaining questions in case schools request to move forward with the tech guide in December.

=====

Question/Opinion: Zach – I’m fine if we want to move fast, but now’s not the time to move fast. We don’t know enough about the distribution of performance on PARCC. PARCC is a lot harder for students with disabilities than DC CAS was. I’d like to believe Scott’s perspective that we’re going to improve quickly. Beginning maybe 16-17 would be a better strategy.

Two Rivers; I’ve heard a lot of momentum toward making changes, but we can’t do it quickly (by December Board meeting). I would urge DC PCSB to allow for some delay around the 15-16 vote. I’d urge that we delay on 15-16.

- Follow up: I would agree it’s important to take the time; I do have the anxiety around this, but there’s a value to getting it right, even if we don’t know.

Request – partner with EmpowerK12 and FOCUS to look at the use the data to show us what the impact is. Also, update the calculator to be accurate and correct with the new data.

Zach – there’s more benefit to rolling out 15-16 in December, since our schools will know what their goals and targets are. We can look at 16-17, and do more analysis in January

Please send all questions regarding this meeting to Erin Kupferberg, [ekupferberg@dcpcsb.org](mailto:ekupferberg@dcpcsb.org)