

VOTE: Which of the following proposed pathways do you support for the Gateway category?	Write any additional comments or concerns regarding this Task Force Meeting below.
Option C: Remove Gateway Measures and Separate MGP by Grade Band Option C: Remove Gateway Measures and Separate MGP by Grade Band Option B: Remove Gateway Measures	There are other key reasons to drop the gateway measures that I didn't raise during the meeting - there is a severe jump in difficulty in the common core reading standards going from 2nd to 3rd ... which is fine, and it's a good thing, it's just that we don't also need the added pressure from the accountability framework when it's already included in the all student PARCC outcomes metric.
Do not make any changes to Gateway Measures in the SY 2019-20 technical guide Option C: Remove Gateway Measures and Separate MGP by Grade Band Option C: Remove Gateway Measures and Separate MGP by Grade Band	Please stop with the marginal changes. CLASS should remain the same until there is a need to change it. This feels like too much tinkering! Same goes with gateway. Let's keep it the same for 19-20 and come up with a new model (or remove it entirely) once we are ready. We need the next 6 months to work through the gateway options.
Option C: Remove Gateway Measures and Separate MGP by Grade Band	We strongly oppose the reweighting of CLASS to allocate more points to the instructional domain. Research does not show that higher CLASS Instructional Support scores has any long-term impact on individual student outcomes; what then is the rationale to support shifting the structure of this measure towards a heavier weighting of instructional support if research and data do not support this? Based on conversation from the Task Force, it sounds like it is even developmentally appropriate to weigh instructional support more than emotional support and classroom organization for very young children. We all want our students to be set up for success from day one, but the weighting CLASS instructional support more heavily than the other CLASS domains is not the appropriate tool to incentivize this work. We also believe a more robust conversation about the unacceptable at-risk correlation is necessary. The proposals put forward attempt to mitigate the correlation by tweaking how measures are calculated, but do not get further into what drives this correlation (and how the correlation has varied over the years; why is this past year so much higher?). We think it is appropriate at this point in time to step back and discuss the goals of the PMF, how the sector has changed over time, how changes in the sector have impacted the way the PMF functions, how we meaningfully adapt the PMF to address the at-risk correlation, and how we ensure that PMF is really measuring a school's program and not it's population.
Option C: Remove Gateway Measures and Separate MGP by Grade Band	We oppose the shift in CLASS weights to weighing instruction more heavily, especially for schools that also offer grades assessed on PARCC where more reliable student level academic data are available. Currently, CLASS is part of the Environment domain, not the academic performance or growth domain. It isn't logical to weigh the instructional component of CLASS more heavily under the Environment domain; that isn't the goal of this domain. Additionally, there has been a lot of discussion about flaws in the current CLASS observation process; shifts in weighting given those issues is especially problematic. We recommend maintaining the current CLASS weighting (distribute CLASS points equally across all 3 CLASS domains). Also concerned about using Growth to Proficiency given that we only have one year of data in DC; would like to see more substantive long-term conversation about goal/intent of gateway going forward before committing to a new metric for it.
Option C: Remove Gateway Measures and Separate MGP by Grade Band Option A: Replace Gateway with Growth to Proficiency Option C: Remove Gateway Measures and Separate MGP by Grade Band	Still unclear about the purpose/rationale of using Growth to Proficiency for Gateway, especially given conversation since the last meeting about intent/purpose of Gateway now and going forward (other than reducing at-risk correlation driven by current Gateway). Until we have a clear vision for what we're trying to accomplish with Gateway, would prefer to just push pause rather than substitute in a metric that's only had one year of analysis in DC. More broadly, while we appreciate that these proposals work to reduce the correlation between at-risk population and overall PMF score, they only reduce it by at most .04; these correlations are still too high. We would like to see a much deeper, robust, and longer-term discussion about the goal of the PMF, especially now that STAR is the public-facing report card for all schools. What is the Board's vision? What do we value as a sector? How do we keep expectations high while accounting for different challenges? What are we attempting to measure with the PMF in a post-STAR environment, and does the PMF measure that? How do we know?
Option B: Remove Gateway Measures	If the charter sector seeks as a mission to close the achievement gaps we see in public education AND a goal of adjustment
Option A: Replace Gateway with Growth to Proficiency	Early Childhood Academy PCS does not agree with the reapportioning of the weight of CLASS measures so that Instructional Support counts three additional possible points than the other domains on all scorecards.
Option A: Replace Gateway with Growth to Proficiency	The instructional support domain of CLASS should not be weighted more than classroom organization or emotional support. If PCSB is unwilling to weight all domains equally, they should at least be weighted similarly across frameworks. 3/3/6 vs 9/9/12 vs 14/14/17 are too different. Instructional support should not be weighted twice as much as both Emotional Support and Classroom Organization, and sends the wrong message to stakeholders given that these metrics are under "School Environment". What about 4/4/5 with attendance and re-enrollment being both 10? Or weighting the points 30%/30%/40% even if it means they're not all whole numbers?
Option A: Replace Gateway with Growth to Proficiency Option B: Remove Gateway Measures	Regarding the proposal to redistribute weights for CLASS domains in PK only scorecards, the minor points changes that would result may not adequately address this goal of ensuring strong PMF results across grade configurations. I'm not convinced that changing weights across domains would be a wise use of the tool and would recommend leaving as is for the time being.