

**Elementary/Middle and High School PMF Task Force**  
**October 16, 2014 | 10:00am – 2:00pm | 3333 14<sup>th</sup> Street NW, Suite 210**  
**Meeting Notes**

**Meeting attendees:** Anne Herr (FOCUS), Terry Bunton (CAPCS), Irene Holtzman (KIPP DC), Rebecca Schultz (Early Childhood Academy), Pamela Faulcon (Early Childhood Academy), Jennifer Ross (National Collegiate), Diane Brown (National Collegiate), Dwan Jordan (Chavez), Demetri Tyler (Chavez), Emily Fitzpatrick (Eagle Academy), Tiffany Robinson (Eagle Academy), Alexandra Pardo (TMA), Rich Pohlman (EL Haynes), Amanda MacLellan (Mundo Verde), Hillary Dauffenbach-Tabb (DC Prep), Lauren Marar (Inspired Teaching), Zac Morford (Friendship), Jennifer Olin (Yu Ying), William West (SEED), Lori Lincoln (WMST), Julie Senerchia (EW Stokes), Ryan Benjamin (Washington Latin), Rashida Tyler (PCSB), Erin Kupferberg (PCSB), Sareeta Schmitt (PCSB), Charlie Sellew (PCSB), Naomi DeVeaux (PCSB)

**Agenda:**

- PMF Overview and Philosophy
- PARCC and the PMF
  - Floors and targets business rules
  - Publishing triggers
- High School Math Assessments

**Notes:**

PMF Overview and Philosophy

- Naomi went over the four sections of the PMF and explained that the board believes that each is vital to the whole PMF
- While the state will not set proficiency standards until fall 2015, PCSB is going to move forward with making the separate decision of what earns points on the PMF for Student Achievement
  - Task force agreed with the idea of using at least Moderate Command of the Content (PARCC levels 3, 4, and 5) to replace proficient
  - They also agreed to use College and Career Ready (PARCC levels 4 and 5) to replace advanced
- During the meeting, task force members checked with OSSE on the PARCC cut scores.
  - We have confirmation that the PARCC consortium determines the cut scores, so a 3 in Maryland is the same as a 3 in DC, for example
  - The state has the authority to set its own proficiency standards
- A task force member raised the issue of clarifying the Leading indicator business rule regarding intra-LEA transfers. Rashida noted that this should be put in the technical guide
- No questions or recommendations about the business rules discussed other than the business rule clarification above

### Floors and Targets Business Rules

- Rashida explained that we are going to work on creating business rules for transitional floors and targets, not exact floors and targets
- While we cannot know exactly what performance will look like on the PARCC, we wanted to choose a business rule that can withstand any change in performance
- Charlie shared the Impact Analysis Tool and gave an overview of how use it
- Task force members explored the tool and led the group in trying out different projections to see which business rules maintained relative consistency in tiers and scores
- The task force did not suggest any additional business rules
- The group landed on two options:
  - Scenario #4: Floor = 0%; Target = 90<sup>th</sup> percentile plus the percent gap between current 90<sup>th</sup> percentile and the current target
  - Scenario #6: Floor = 10<sup>th</sup> percentile; Target = 90<sup>th</sup> percentile

### Publishing Triggers

- The group discussed reasons why it might not be appropriate to publish a 2014-15 PMF
- Task force members agreed that if the timing of the PMF release was too close to the 2016 PARCC exam or too close to the My School DC application deadline, then PCSB should not publish
  - There was discussion about whether HS and ESMS should have different dates
  - The group agreed to having one date
  - After some discussion, the group agreed that January 19 is the latest that the PMF should be published
- The group discussed that it is important to make sure that the correlation of points earned in Student Achievement and Gateway (ESMS) from previous years to the 2014-15 is at least moderate
  - After some discussion about what is an appropriate correlation, the task force decided on 0.70
- Task force members agreed that if MGP is invalid, then PCSB should not move forward with publishing
  - The group first discussed:
    - The correlation between DC CAS and PARCC scores is less than 0.70
    - The distribution of scores is not meaningful (i.e., greater than 5% at the extremes)
    - Cohort sizes too small (as determined by the MGP vendor)
  - The task force brought up issues with the paper-based and computer-based tests
    - Naomi shared that this not an option since it would mean holding the PMF up for at least three years
    - Charlie also mentioned that since we cannot assume that the schools choosing the paper- or computer-based assessments are of similar quality, then we cannot know whether it is the assessment or some other factor causing a difference in scores

### High School Math Assessments

- The group discussed how Student Progress may be different in the HS framework from the ESMS framework because there are so many other measures that do not involve the state assessment
- After some discussion, the group generally agreed that the HS PMF should still be published even if MGP were invalid
- The group discussed the potential issues with the math MGP at length
  - There are two possible 8<sup>th</sup> grade math exams that students may take
  - There are two possible HS math exams that students may take
  - The HS MGP match rate is lower than for ESMS
- A task force member suggested that we remove the 7.5 points for math MGP
- The group decided that rather than make the ELA MGP worth 15 points, the overall score would be reduced to 92.5 points
- The task force ultimately landed on using a single business to capture possible problems with either the math or ELA MGP:
  - Overall PMF score out of 100 points if both math and ELA MGP are valid
  - Overall PMF score out of 92.5 points if only one MGP (either math or ELA) is valid
  - Overall PMF score out of 85 points if neither MGP is valid
- The group also talked about whether to combine the Geometry and Integrated Math II assessments in Student Achievement or to keep them separate
  - The group agreed that the two assessment should be combined

### **Conclusions and Next Steps**

- Members of the Task Force who were present may vote on the items discussed
- All LEAs will return the voting sheet no later than COB Wednesday, October 22