

# PCSB Early Childhood PMF Task Force October 15, 2013 10:00am – 12:00pm Minutes

**Goal of Early Childhood PMF Taskforce:** To produce a taskforce-generated, board approved Early Childhood PMF that measures school progress towards preparing students to be successful learners in schools serving Pre-K-3 through 2nd grades\*

# **Meeting Objective:**

- a. Discuss business rules for floors and targets for student level assessments
- b. Discuss and vote on floors and targets for Teacher Interaction, Attendance, and Re-Enrollment

#### **Attending:**

**PCSB** 

**Tembo Consulting** 

AppleTree

Briya

Capital City

Cedar Tree Academy

Center City

Community Accademy

DC Bilingual

DC Prep

Eagle Academy

Early Childhood Academy

**EW Stokes** 

Excel

**FOCUS** 

**Imagine Hope** 

**Ingenuity Prep** 

**Inspired Teaching** 

KIPP DC

LAMB

Mundo Verde

The Arts & Technology

Two Rivers

Washington Yu Ying

<sup>\*</sup>For schools serving up to the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade, 3<sup>rd</sup> grade will be included.

#### **Minutes:**

- 1. Welcome
- 2. PK Assessments Establish Progress business rule to apply to all assessments:

PCSB needs to uniformly implement progress for all PK assessments. For the pilot analysis, this was not possible because all of the assessments were approved slightly different, without a uniform business rule in place.

To start the discussion, three groups of PK students were identified per students' fall scores: above developmentally appropriate, at developmentally appropriate, and below. The task force has always maintained that students in the above category should not be expected to make one year of growth because it is not developmentally appropriate. For the above category, the task force discussed three ideas to vote on: 1. Maintain score from fall to spring, 2. Maintain band from fall to spring, 3. Not count in a school's denominator or numerator. Many members voiced that the third category was not an option. Most of the discussion centered on the first two categories.

For students at the age appropriate testing point in the fall, the group discussed that these students should still be making progress. For some tests, this is already built in, for others, it was not implemented.

Students testing below their age level are still expected to make one year of progress per the publisher's progress metric.

Discuss updated data analysis

Right now, floors and targets will be delayed until possibly January for all assessments. The task force will make progress over the next few months to establish these for all student assessments. Members had the following thoughts as the group discussed this delay. 1. Can we move back to yes/ no targets for this year since the EC PMF will not be tiered this year. 2. Without an overall score, floors and targets should be delayed for one year. Over summer, the task force can set floors and targets and this year publish percent of students who made the metric.

Naomi countered that we should still move forward but that PCSB could possibly not publish points in the 2013-14 PMF for student assessments. Alternatively, the task force could vote in Jan to use the established floors and targets to implement this year. We are voting on non-assessments floors and targets today, those will be shown.

One thought was to just keep floors and targets as 60-100 for PK assessments for this year and review updated data by Jan, then the task force can vote on which set would be published. A few members voiced that they would like to not rush a

decision but spend time to develop meaningful floors and targets. With the delay, just not publish the points received from each indicator publically but publish to the schools internally.

Tembo showed Updated EC PMF Calculator – which lets school leaders change floors and targets and play with n-size and score.

### 3. Review Proposed Floors and Target:

- a. CLASS Domains When reviewing the proposed floors and targets for the CLASS domains, one member commented on how close the spread in points was. An alternate proposal was offered to vote on: When the 10<sup>th</sup> percentile is above a score of 3, then the floor remains a 3. This helps with consistency since the proposed business rule for the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile was if the score was above a 6, then the target remain at 6. For simplification, the group also proposed that the floors and targets for Instructional Support be changed to a score of 1 for the floor and a score of 4 for the target. This way the floor and target will not have to be changed next year.
- b. Attendance (both PK and K-2) PCSB proposed a second target option to vote on. Since the originally proposed floors and targets were lower than the 10<sup>th</sup> and 90<sup>th</sup> percentiles to be consistent with the ES/MS PMF, some members were concerned that no extra points would be awarded for those who do exceed the target. PCSB offered a second target to vote on that was in line with the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile.
- c. Re-Enrollment (K-2) Similar to attendance, the same second target for reenrollment was offered as a vote to be consistent with the  $90^{th}$  percentile.

#### 4. Vote – Votes are due to Erin Kupferberg by 4pm on Friday, October 18, 2013.

There is one vote per LEA. To recap, LEAs voted on the following:

- 1. PK Progress Business Rule
  - a. Students Testing Above- either maintain score, maintain band, or not be counted towards school's progress
  - b. Students Testing at age level continue to make growth as defined by publisher
  - c. Students Testing Below age level- continue to make growth as defined by the publisher
- 2. Teacher Interaction (CLASS) Floors and Targets
  - a. The following was proposed initially

<sup>\*</sup>For schools serving up to the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade, 3<sup>rd</sup> grade will be included.

Data from PILOT Scores – By Campus	PILOT Percentiles		
Domain	10 <sup>th</sup>	90 <sup>th</sup>	
<b>Emotional Support</b>	4.90	5.87	
Classroom Organization	3.99	5.63	
Instructional Support	1.27	3.81	

b. The following is the task force generated floors and targets:

Data from PILOT Scores – By Campus	PILOT Percentiles		
Domain	10 <sup>th</sup>	90 <sup>th</sup>	
<b>Emotional Support</b>	3	6	
Classroom Organization	3	6	
Instructional Support	1	4	

3. In – Seat Attendance and Re-Enrollment – circle which target or write in alternate option:

Proposed:	Floor	Target (1)	Target (2)
Re-Enrollment (K-2)*	60	90	94
In-Seat Attendance (K-2)*	82	92	95
In-Seat Attendance (PK3 – PK4)	80	90	94

# **Business Rules:**

Re-Enrollment and In-Seat Attendance:

- 90<sup>th</sup> percentile for target, 10<sup>th</sup> percentile for floor
- 3 year weighted average (same as ES/MS PMF) after 3 years
- Until then, 1 year same as ES/MS floors and targets, 2 year weighted average year two

# CLASS:

# Target:

- Use CLASS defined high score (6-7) as target of 6 if sector domain 90<sup>th</sup> percentile is above 6
- If sector domain score is below CLASS defined high score (6-7) use 90<sup>th</sup> percentile

#### Floor:

 Use 10<sup>th</sup> percentile of sector scores for floor on each domain unless the sector average is above CLASS medium score, then the floor is a 3.

<sup>\*</sup>For schools serving up to the  $3^{\rm rd}$  grade,  $3^{\rm rd}$  grade will be included.