



EC/ES/MS PMF Task Force Meeting
Vote and Comment Form
November 20, 2015

Due by December 1, 5:00 pm

LEA: _____ Name: _____

Directions: One comment form per LEA, please submit to Erin Kupferberg, ekupferberg@dcpcsb.org by 5 pm, on Tuesday, December 1.

Please indicate a vote for all items in each section.

Section 1:

1. Timing of the 2015-16 PMF Policy & Tech Guide
 - a. Move forward with timeline- schools vote now and DC PCSB staff submits 2015-16 PMF Policy & Tech Guide to DC PCSB Board in December. Schools would know floors and targets for 2015-16 in December. (original timeline)

 - b. Ask DC PCSB Board to HOLD OFF on Tech Guide Submission: Allow task force member to work on changes for the next few years to include 2015-16. 2015-16 PMF Policy & Tech Guide submitted to Board in April-May. Schools would not know the floors and targets for 2015-16 until May/June. (extended timeline)

Option A- move forward	Option B – Pause	Comments
8 LEAs	8 LEAs	50% split- Option A stands
		1. It's important that we are able to review the feedback and options that other LEAs submit to and continue the conversation around the 15-16 PMF Tech Guide and Policies so that we as a charter

		<p>community can make the most informed decisions.</p> <p>2. While the timing for knowing PARCC floors and ceilings (assuming this is just PARCC) in Dec. vs. May/June is not as much of an issue since both are before we will get scores back, we favor keeping floors/targets the same as 14-15. If keeping the same, it could be submitted in December. We feel strongly that weightings should be determined by December as well as floors/targets for non-academic components (attendance, re-enrollment).</p> <p>3. We would like to hold off on making this decision. We don't feel that we have a good enough understanding of how these shifts will affect schools with large populations of students that seem to have struggled with PARCC (e.g. SPED)</p>
--	--	--

Section 2:

1. Targets for PARCC Measures:

- a. Maintain the business rules for Achievement Targets approved for 2014-15 and 2015-16 proposed PMF Policy & Tech Guide (slide 9)

- b. Change to the business rules presented by DC PCSB in the meeting on Nov. 20, Target = 3+ = 100, 4+ = $(100-90^{\text{th}} \text{ pctl}) \times .25 + 90^{\text{th}} \text{ pctl}$ (slide 15)

Comment:

Option A – Stay Same	Option B- Move forward	Comments
6 LEAs	10 LEAs	63% for Option B -
		<p>1. move to option 7 for 2015-16 (all points on 4+)</p> <p>2. Consistency</p> <p>3. Would favor an option for raising targets to 100 for 3+ (the rationale is strong for this) while maintaining 14-15 targets for 4+. It seems to make sense to keep floors/targets the same for two years so that schools and show progress. We are in favor of changes at two-year intervals.</p> <p>4. Will there be a vote on setting the floors for PARCC achievement? Seems like that play a huge role in the average points school earn under each of the options that were presented at the meeting.</p>

2. Gateway (either vote, all 8th grade students will count, including those taking Alg 1)

- a. Maintain current gateway at Level 3+ for 2015-16
- b. Move Gateway to Level 4+ for 2015-16 with floor = zero and target = Proposed rule (slide 18)

Comment:

Option A – Maintain 3+ gateway	Option B – Move 4+ Gateway	Comments
11 LEAs	5 LEAs	69% for Option A

		<p>1. move to option 4 for 2015-16</p> <p>2. Consistency is better, we can move to 4+ but not so far</p> <p>3. Favor keeping it the same for reason stated above. Also, 3rd graders are new to this assessment and for that reason it seems like approaching might be the right target for 3rd reading especially for schools serving diverse populations. This is not to say we don't want all students to score 4+, but we don't know whether 3+ or 4+ will be indicative of success in middle school with assessment being rigorous and new. More research is needed to know whether 3+ or 4+ on PARCC is an indicator of future academic success.</p> <p>4. I believe that the 4+ metric better aligns with the purpose of the gateway metric- indicator of students on track for future success based on early milestones.</p>
--	--	---

3. Achievement Weights (Slides 23 & 24): Maintain current weights or start transition
Ratio is to show the distribution of points in the Achievement Indicator

	Points for 3+	Points for 4+
Option 1 – Maintain same as 2014-15	10 (4:1)	2.5
Option 2	7.5 (3:2)	5

Option 3	6.25 (1:1)	6.25
Option 4	5 (2:3)	7.5

Comment:

Option 1- stay same	Other	Comments
8 LEAs	8 LEAs	50% split – Stay with A
	Option 2 – 3 Option 3 – 2 Option 4 – 2 4+ - 1	
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. move all points to 4+ 2. Wee recommends that we maintain the current weights implemented for 14-15, Option 1 for 3 years. After three years the Task Force would revisit the calculation of weights and targets based on the previous 3 years of data for the sector. 3. we are in favor of a two year phase in, not five. 4. We'd like to move rapidly to 4+ being the metric on the PMF.

4. PK Attendance Proposed Business Rule (slide 31)

- a. Maintain current business rule for PK attendance (attendance is a PK-8 measure with one floor and target)
- b. Implement proposed business rule (if the 3-year calculated target is 2% or more from the K-8 target, a separate PK floor and target will be assigned)

Option A – Stay same	Option B – implement rule	Comments
1 LEA	12 LEAs	92% option B
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1015 275 1300 961">1. We proposes a third option where there is a separate attendance target for PK where the target is set at 90% versus the current 95% target with K-8. As PK attendance is not mandatory we strongly believe that their attendance should be displayed separately and not grouped with the K-8 attendance rate. <li data-bbox="1015 968 1300 1182">2. Neither A or B. PreK attendance should not be a component of the PMF until PreK is compulsory. <li data-bbox="1015 1188 1300 1358">3. Since PK is not compulsory, it makes sense that it would be broken out.

Overall Comment/Feedback:

1. PCSB should not publish points on the PMF for SY 2015-16 in order to give staff and the PMF Task Force time to create a sensible long-term plan

MEETING FEEDBACK:

On a five-point scale, where “5” is extremely satisfied and “1” is extremely dissatisfied, how satisfied are you with today’s meeting?

<i>Extremely</i>	0	0	0	0	0	<i>Extremely</i>
<i>Dissatisfied</i>	1	2	3,11,1	4,1,1,1,	5,1	<i>Satisfied</i>
				1,1,1,1,,		

On a five-point scale, where “5” is strongly agree and “1” is strongly disagree, please rate your thoughts on the following question:

Today’s meeting was a good use of time.

<i>Strongly</i>	0	0	0	0	0	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
<i>Disagree</i>	1	2	3	4,1,1,1,1,1,1,1	5,1,1,1,1	

What conversations, issues, or topics would you like to continue discussing?

1. I value PCSB’s willingness to share information and be willing to get this right!
2.
 - Continue the conversation around the 15-16 tech guide and the targets and components related to PARCC.
 - The speed and method to how we as a sector transition from looking at 3+ to having more emphasis on 4+. With the number of options that were presented but not enough time to digest the implication of one scenario over another it is imperative that we continue to keep this conversation open and moving forward so that LEAs can start to have a clearer picture of the accountability around PARCC as we move from year to year. With a bigger emphasis on having targets/weights, etc set in stone for multiple years and not adjusted every year for consistency.
3. Everything to do with 16-17 and beyond – transition schedule for weights and targets, re-considering the gateway measures, talking about difference between aspirational targets and targets based in reality, and what it means for a PMF to have both aspirational and real targets. Should we have set targets for PARCC achievement rather than having it be based on percentiles, etc etc.
4. Can the issue of having gateways (3rd reading and 8th math) at all be revisited for 2016-2017? For schools with only a few tested grades and small n size this can weight heavily and/or fluctuate from year to year. I understood the rationale in the past, but not sure how this plays out with PARCC. Also, it would make more sense to have a different measure so as not just double counting PARCC scores. Maybe 8th math should be the number of students taking/getting target score on Algebra exam—more similar to AP tests in HS.

Hopefully the 3-year hold can be discussed next time and also CLASS.

5. – We would like to continue to discuss the use of Alg ! & Geometry scores in the 7th/8th grade math calculations
6. Analysis around effect of PARCC floors, targets, and weights for schools with large SPED and ELL populations