

| Yes, with Proposal A for CLASS | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | None to share right now  | Yes | Yes, with Proposal A for CLASS | PCSB shared out potential focus areas for the SY 2020-21 PMF; do you have any feedback in those areas or any additional focus areas to suggest?   | Yes | On a five-point scale, where "5" is extremely satisfied and "1" is extremely dissatisfied, how satisfied are you with the meeting? | Write any additional comments or concerns regarding this Task Force Meeting below.  |
|--------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|-----|--------------------------------|---|-----|--|---|
| No                             | Yes | Yes | No  | No  | Dropping gateway overall, and re-thinking other weights. Or thinking through a non-PARCC/non-testing outcome metric to consider instead.   | Yes | No                             | I wonder if there's space for a larger growth vs achievement conversation and how we can better reflect the charter sector's values around how we reward both.  | Yes | 5  | 5 Thank!  |
| No                             | Yes | Yes | No  | No  | We'd like a longer conversation about whether to keep Gateway or whether we should get rid of it entirely. We would like to see the research that shows that 3rd grade reading and 8th grade math are more important than other grades to justify counting them twice.   | Yes | No                             | If we're moving to align the PMF with the STAR framework, at what point should we just adopt the STAR framework and get rid of PMF? If PMF is measuring something unique to the charter sector, can we be clear about what that is and where PMF will stay distinct from the STAR framework?  | Yes | 4  | 5 Thanks for listening to us. I appreciate the efforts you're putting into it - hearing the "why" behind these proposals from PCSB's perspective is helpful.  |
| No                             | Yes | Yes | No  | No  | Neither support nor vote against growth to proficiency proposal, just want more information and research. Why would Growth to Proficiency be in the Gateway domain and not the Academic Progress domain? What other measures or data points are correlated with long-term success, or high school success? High school has 9th grade on track; could there be an 8th grade on track for high school readiness composite metric? A more robust conversation about what were looking to recognize with this domain may help us as a sector to determine what measures are best here.   | Yes | No                             | Greater attention/focus on equity; not just looking at reducing correlations by tweaking metrics, but taking a step back to look more deeply at the whole tool. Having OSSE's STAR report card that overlaps with the PMF gives us the opportunity to re-envision the PMF in unique ways to align with broader sector and city goals of closing the achievement gap.  | Yes | 4  | 4   |
| No                             | Yes | Yes | No  | No  | Would we consider removing Gateway altogether? It seems unclear what purpose Gateway is serving. Hesitant to further align with OSSE's measures without a more robust conversation about the intent and outcomes of closer alignment.  | Yes | No                             | Re-examination of business rules especially given that they differ from STAR. Ensuring business rules align with what we value. Continue conversation about reducing at-risk correlation.   | Yes | 4  | 4   |
| No                             | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | I appreciate the reduction in correlation with at-risk, but I'm not sure that Growth to Proficiency is the right solution. What is the goal of this domain on the PMF today? My understanding is that Gateway measures were designed to put emphasis on key measures associated with long-term success for students. Is GIP associated with long-term success? If not, then what are we trying to do with this? Also, what do scores (and the at-risk correlation) look like without Gateway, if we determine its purpose on the PMF is no longer compelling? Maybe some other research based measure would be worth exploring: there's a white paper about how 8th grade attendance, discipline and GPA (combined into an index metrics) are correlated with secondary and post-secondary outcomes. Could we look at something like this for 8th grade? Would that reduce the correlation, and also tip the overall weight of the PMF for standalone middle schools to be not so heavily based on PARCC-derived measures?                           | Yes | No                             | Equity! How are all schools serving their at-risk students? How are schools' at-risk populations performing compared to a state/sector average? Not lowering the bar, but rather finding those places where there's a high at-risk population who are performing above state/sector average, even if overall score is Tier 2; clearly school is doing something right here. Recognizing that the populations that schools serve can be extremely different. (at-risk ranges for PK3 schools in SY1718 are 4.7% to 82.0%); schools are not on equal footing; how do we equitably recognize those differences while not lowering the bar? How do we make sure the PMF isn't just measuring at-risk? | Yes | 4  | 5   |
| No                             | Yes | Yes | No  | No  | I would like to look at other options for gateway measures where testing isn't double-counted or looking at the possibility no gateway measure and redistributing the points.  | Yes | Yes                            |   | Yes | 4  | 4   |
| No                             | Yes | Yes | No  | No  | Best of metric   | Yes | No                             |   | Yes | 4  | 4   |
| No                             | Yes | Yes | No  | No  | For PK3-3 schools, could the gateway metric be a best of the current gateway (3rd Grade PARCC ELA 4+1 and 3rd Grade ELA NWEA MG)? Since all the PK-3 schools already use NWEA, this way our gateway metric can also be a best of achievement/growth metric.  | Yes | No                             |   | Yes | 3  | 3   |
| No                             | Yes | Yes | No  | No  | We would like to propose a similar idea to your "best of notion for schools that end in 5th/8th grade. For PK-3 schools, we propose that the gateway metric be a best of the current gateway (3rd Grade PARCC ELA 4+1 and 3rd Grade ELA NWEA MG). Since all the PK-3 schools already use NWEA, this way the gateway metric from PK-3 schools can also be a best of achievement/growth metric.  | Yes | No                             | This issue needs to be addressed earlier than the 20-21SY but we want to continue to raise the issue with the PMF policy of entering zeroes for students who do not have submitted scores for assessments, specifically speaking of NWEA. We have provided practical solutions that should be reviewed with regards to this issue. It is important that the framework reflects what students are actually doing and achieving in schools and entering zeroes that were not earned by students into a schools student level data for overall metric calculations is not an equitable nor valid approach.   | Yes | 3  | 3 N/A   |
| No                             | No  | No  | No  | No  | N/A  | No  | No                             | We are not in agreement with the proposed changes. They would have great impact on our program.   | No  | 3  | We are looking forward to a follow-up meeting to discuss the results of the feedback received and concerns expressed during the meeting. 3 Thank you!   |
| No                             | Yes | Yes | No  | No  | We need to determine the purpose of Gateway in order answer this question. If intent is to track achievement against researched milestones, growth to proficiency does not accomplish this goal. We could look at other research-based milestones (attendance? truancy? discipline?), and how they relate to at-risk. Or remove gateway if not serving a purpose.  | Yes | No                             | Reducing at-risk correlations, exploring new/more ways to look at and consider equity, recognizing schools that are seeing really positive outcomes for traditionally underserved students.   | Yes | 3  | 5   |
| No                             | Yes | Yes | No  | No  | I encourage you to take the year to consider this more. While growth to proficiency is one alternative, ideally we could together explore others (though I don't know what those are)  | No  | No                             | I am strongly in favor of not having a changing goal every year and to that end - moving to set, criterion-based floors and targets across all measures. I also believe we need an alternative to the current gateway measures. However, I would like us to take time to identify additional alternatives and therefore not currently voting to adjust to Growth to Proficiency for Gateway measures.   | Yes | 3  | 3 I did not attend the meeting though I had hoped to.   |
| No                             | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | If we are looking to address at risk correlations to pmf performance it seems we need to address at risk performance differently. While we do not want to set targets for different student populations differently, could their be room to award points for those serving those students particularly well? We have schools tier 3 schools with at risk students performing better than at risk students at top tier schools. This feels discordant if our greatest goal is to educate our students equitably in DC. Another thought would be the consideration of allocating points with the focus on closing the achievement gap. There are schools where at risk students are performing at similar levels to their non-at risk peers and then schools where the gap in these scores is between 11 and 80%. No one likes the fact that our at risk students are performing far below their non-at risk peers on average so I wonder how we allow for our accountability system to reward and highlight schools and students that are successful. | Yes | No                             | I would hope the focus is on highlighting the achievement of at risk students as well as creating equity within the PMF for all schools. In order for the tool to be a meaningful way to hold schools accountable, the tool has to be equitable regardless of growth measures.  | Yes | 3  | I don't believe there is clarity amongst the task force on what the goals are on the changes that are being made. A specific example of this would be surrounding CLASS, what is the goal of moving the target? Being explicit with the problem that is causing the necessity to re-evaluate may make conversations and solutions more focused. |

| VOTE: Do you support PCSB's overall proposal for the PK-8 framework? | VOTE: Do you support PCSB's proposal to exclude outliers from target calculations for Student Achievement? | VOTE: Do you support PCSB's proposed adjustments to Student Achievement measures? | VOTE: Do you support PCSB's proposed adjustments to the floors/targets and/or weighting for CLASS Instructional Support?                                 | VOTE: Do you support PCSB's proposed adjustments to Gateway Achievement measures? | PCSB expressed concerns at the meeting about the at-risk correlations and distribution of the Gateway measures, most notably in Grade 8 Math; if Growth to Proficiency is not adopted for the PMF, what adjustment(s) or alternative(s) do you encourage PCSB to consider?   | VOTE: Do you support PCSB's proposed adjustments to Student Achievement measures? | VOTE: Do you support PCSB's overall proposal for the PK-8 framework? | PCSB shared out potential focus areas for the SY 2020-21 PMF; do you have any feedback in those areas or any additional focus areas to suggest?  | VOTE: Do you support PCSB's proposal to exclude outliers from target calculations for Student Achievement? | On a five-point scale, where "5" is extremely satisfied and "1" is extremely dissatisfied, how satisfied are you with the meeting? | On a five-point scale, where "5" is strongly agree and "1" is strongly disagree, please rate your thoughts on the following statement: The meeting was a good use of time. | Write any additional comments or concerns regarding this Task Force Meeting below.  |  |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| No   | Yes  | Yes   | Yes to Proposal B: move target for CLASS - Instructional Support to 4.5 and adjust weight among School Environment measures (see slide 16 for specifics) | No  | I think the problem is a broader one that has been brought up but remained unaddressed: Schools with different proportions of at-risk and special education students are not at an even playing field with some schools that do not include these children. This affects all grades, especially middle school as many of the more privileged parents pull their students out of DC public schools and move to VA, MD or private school. I think some of the more fundamental assumptions of the PMF (including why a gateway measure is required in the first place) are areas to re-examine instead of this one gateway measure in isolation that is the tip of the iceberg.  | Yes   | No   | Add a weight/points that take into account at risk and special ed performance compared to city averages.   | Yes  | 3  | 3  |   |  |
| Yes, with Proposal B for CLASS                                       | Yes  | Yes   | Yes to Proposal A: move floor/target for CLASS - Instructional Support from 2/4 to 2.5/5   | Yes   | Retain the current gateway measure and add the growth to proficiency measure to the "growth" category of the PMF, diluting the MCP points  | Yes   | Yes, with Proposal B for CLASS                                       |  | Yes  |  | 3  | This topic required more time for discussion. I would have loved for a follow up meeting to have been established.  |  |
| Yes, with Proposal A for CLASS                                       | Yes  | Yes   | No. Do not make any changes to CLASS weights or targets in the SY 2019-20 technical guide.   | Yes   |  | Yes   | Yes, with Proposal A for CLASS                                       |  | Yes  |  | 2  | 2   |  |
| No   | Yes  |   |  |   |  |   | No   |  | Yes  |  |  | I'd love to hear about PCSB's appeals process for specific PMF components. For example, if there are foundational problems with a metric (e.g. single administration of CLASS that yields >1SD or 2SD) variances, then there should be a process for a school to appeal them. |  |
| Yes, with Proposal B for CLASS                                       | Yes  | Yes   | Yes to Proposal B: move target for CLASS - Instructional Support to 4.5 and adjust weight among School Environment measures (see slide 16 for specifics) | Yes   | On frameworks with PARCC as MGP, there is a dramatic advantaging of low-at-risk-rate schools. On this framework 66% of the lowest 30 at-risk-rate schools are Tier 1, while only 6% of the highest 30 at-risk-rate schools are Tier 1 (just KIPP Heights & Promise). The design of the PARCC/MGP framework has a profound impact on how we think about who's doing quality educational work in this city. Right now, this framework is creating a distorted narrative that is unhelpful to families, funders, and policymakers. We think it's important for the sector that PCSB address this and, indeed, it has the capacity to do so. The measures that have been proposed thus far, while well-intentioned, overly-prioritize stability in the framework and fall short of the change needed to sufficiently rectify the institutionalized bias. If you're looking for solutions, consider placing much more weight on a measure akin to EmpowerK's Bold Performance School metric. This would NOT involve a lowering of any bar of expectations. Much like the theory of MGP, it rewards growth of progress above expectations. | Yes   | Yes, with Proposal B for CLASS                                       | We would like to suggest that PCSB separate out PreK and K+ attendance in a similar fashion to the way the STAR framework has delineated between the two. While we believe that continuing to take into account PreK attendance is important, we see a significant difference in our PreK and K+ enrollment which we think is largely due to compulsory attendance requirements. | Yes  |  |  |   |  |