



PCSB Early Childhood PMF Task Force Meeting October 7, 2014 1:00 pm – 3:00 pm Minutes

Attendees:

PCSB
Tembo Consulting
AppleTree PCS
Bridges PCS
Briya PCS
Capital City PCS
Cedar Tree PCS
Center City PCS
Community Academy PCS
Creative Minds PCS
DC Prep PCS
Early Childhood Academy PCS
EL Haynes PCS
EW Stokes PCS
Excel PCS
FOCUS
Friendship PCS
Inspired Teaching PCS
KIPP DC PCS
Meridian PCS
Potomac Prep PCS
Roots PCS
Shining Stars PCS
Two Rivers PCS
Washington Yu Ying PCS
*Eagle PCS conferenced called with PCSB to discuss the elements of the task force meeting on Oct. 9, 2014.

Minutes:

1. Review of current framework
2. Norm-referenced assessments business rule for the achievement target

- a. Show that with the equating to DC CAS, none of the data supported the business rule. The norm referenced assessments achievement targets did not increase past the implementation of the business rule.

3. Overall scores

- a. Question- Is there a differences between teacher-administered assessments and computer-based assessments. This is a question for the K-2 grade band. When we discussed this issue last spring, the group wanted to see the distribution of norm referenced versus criterion referenced assessments which is how the slides are structured.
- b. This slide makes us feel that we should all move to the GOLD and PPVT assessment if we want our kids to do well. There are problems with using the same across all of the assessments. The group discussed possibly forming an assessment sub group to continue to look at publisher guidance.
- c. The goal of choosing assessments should not be about gaining points on the PMF but fitting the structure of the program and the need of the students. Not all assessments are going to have an equal distribution. Also keep in mind these are teacher administered and teacher scored – too many variables to isolate. The task force could discuss the idea of limiting types of assessments or come up with better criteria to approve assessments, task force can implement these possibilities.
- d. When looking at the overall points, the group should also think about the construction of the entire PMF. The creation of the framework balances student assessments in addition to CLASS, re-enrollment and attendance. We are here to focus on a business rule for the floors and targets. The task force last year voted on the current floors and targets to stay steady for two years (non-leading indicators).
- e. We're confounding the whole ideas – the tension with money tied to PMF performance – not fair to say that the conversation was resolved. There's no one that feels comfortable with moving forward without mentioning that we have concerns about the framework.
- f. Tiers: Tier 1 cutoff at 80% and tier 2 cutoff at 50%. While this topic is not going to be voted on, we do want comment from the task force. The clear drops in score performance are where the working groups before looked at and where we are looking at also. For the distribution of overall scores, can we see additional information, where the schools ended in third grade land, where school choosing GOLD land, ect. We want to make sure the data makes sense and support the tiers cutoff at 80% and 50%. How do these same schools match up with their ES/MS framework? Is a high performing EC leading to a tier 3 ESMS? PCSB can send updated information. We

should be trying to figure out which are the schools that are performing below an acceptable threshold. The tier 3 cut-off should be a gut test of what is a good school – how bad is so bad that you should close for 3 and 4 year olds. Not convinced if there are enough elements in the PMF to determine that. Naomi stated that closing a school is a gut wrenching, years long process that is not only based on quantitative data. Many factors influence these decisions. For the previous PMF, there was not as much discussion about tiering. The work was not done by a large task force. We've changed the process quite a bit to include voting and more discussion. Previously a few discussions would occur than the PCSB representative would give the group the decision. Request to have more data to feel comfortable with this decisions.

- g. Please submit comments on the tier ranges to PCSB on the vote form.
- h. Floors and Targets business rules. We have two options, we can stay consistent with the ES/MS and HS frameworks and implement a three year weighted average for the 10th and 90th percentiles or we could work on what the aspirational targets and floors should be and incrementally increase both until we reach these aspirational limits.
 - i. What if we had the three year weighted average and then held it for a number of years then re-evaluated? The second option is too much like NCLB. The weighted floors and targets would give strength to the CLASS scores that are sector wide.
 - ii. Should we consider cases where the range is too narrow? Possibly for attendance we create a minimum of 10% (or 8%) between the floor and the target. This work can be done in the spring since the floors and targets are set for 2014-15. This is just us (charter schools) – if we are constantly adjusting those floors and targets the scale is very relative
 - iii. The group added to the Parking Lot a place to discuss best practices for schools who are doing well with in-seat attendance. This is a struggle for some schools.
- i. Full Academic Year Business Rule. The task force adopted the definition from OSSE but it needs clarification for EC.
 - i. Option 1: Audit data to May 1 and 85% enrolled days in between. If the student leaves after May 1 but before the testing window, they are removed from the denominator. Caveat- if the publisher has a set testing window that ends before the audit, the students enrolled on the last day of the test window in the fall count instead of the audit date.
 - ii. Option 2- Task force generated: EC FAY would be the last day of the fall testing window to the first day of the spring testing window and 85% of enrolled days in between.

- iii. Some schools wanted to consider a PK attendance measure too since PK is not compulsory and attendance is already counted. Possibly the students must be attending 50-60% of the time.
- iv. Another consideration is the 95%. If 95% or more students are reported in combination of one of the first two options, then that is fine. PCSB's concern is that schools would not report on low performers.
- v. The task force ended with the first two options for vote. PCSB asked if schools would write comments based on PK attendance inclusion and the 95%. PCSB would send out a second vote via email if the comments led to an option that needed voting on.

Propose business rule and vote

1. FAY as on slide with removal of students who withdrawal after May 1
2. Between the last date of the LEA fall window and the first date of the spring testing date and 85% of the days in between

Also comment if 95% tested is included and if PK attendance should be considered an aspect of the FAY

Need your votes by Friday at 5 pm.