

Priorities for SY 2019-20 Cycle

- Maintain reliability of PMF as accountability tool and assessment of school quality
- Maintain alignment with STAR framework unless philosophical differences
- Continue to ensure that strong PMF results can be attained across grade configurations

Summary of the SY 2019-20 Proposed Changes for PK-8 PMF Technical Guide

NOTE: All proposed options include the changes to Student Achievement and CLASS, differing only in the Gateway options for each impact analysis

Student Achievement

- Separate all current measures in this category by elementary and middle grades
 - Update target of %4+ measures using current business rule logic after removing outliers
- 95% of LEAs expressed support for this proposal from the March 2019 meeting

School Environment

- Based on LEA feedback, DC PCSB is not proposing any changes to floors and targets of CLASS – Instructional Support for SY 2019-20
- Reapportion the weight of CLASS measures so that Instructional Support counts out of three additional possible points than the other domains on all scorecards
 - Not a discussion or voting item, but feedback will be collected in follow-up survey
- The resulting possible points for School Environment will be as follows:

Measure	PK Only Schools	Schools Ending in Grades K-2	Schools Ending in Grades 3-8
Attendance	10	10	9
Re-enrollment	N/A	10	9
CLASS - Emotional Support	14	9	3
CLASS - Classroom Organization	14	9	3
CLASS - Instructional Support	17	12	6

Gateway (DISCUSSION AND VOTING ITEM)

- **Option A:** Replace Gateway with Growth to Proficiency
 For schools ending in Grades 4-8, calculate Growth to Proficiency in ELA and Math; evenly distribute 10 possible points among measures; set floor to 0, target to match STAR framework
 - **NOTE:** To help with modeling the impact of this change, Growth to Proficiency data for your LEA is now available in the Academic Data dashboard in the Hub
 - **NOTE:** No longer includes any change to scorecards for schools ending in Grade 3
- **Option B:** Remove Gateway Measures
 For schools ending in Grades 4-8, remove Grade 3 - ELA & Grade 8 - Math Gateway (scorecard out of 90 possible points); for schools ending in Grade 3, remove Grade 3 - ELA Gateway (scorecard out of 95 possible points)
 - **NOTE:** Use [PMF Calculator](#) to model this for your LEA by leaving Gateway rate(s) blank
- **Option C:** Remove Gateway Measures and Separate MGP by Grade Band
 Same change as Option B, and also separate out MGP rates into elementary (3-5) and middle (6-8) grades, with Student Progress possible points evenly distributed among measures; set target for middle school rates to 65; maintain all other Student Progress floors and targets
 - **NOTE:** Target of middle school MGP would move to 65 in a two-year progression (67.5 in SY 2019-20, then 65 in SY 2020-21)

Key Framework-Level Indicators

Consistent with our task force conversation in March 2019, here are the key indicators identified by DC PCSB as supporting our priorities for the SY 2019-20 cycle and the resulting impact of each option on those indicators (disaggregated by growth assessment).

Overall Score Impact

To maintain reliability in the PK-8 framework, DC PCSB evaluated each proposal to determine if the changes impacted scores with a range of less than 10 points and average of less than one point, compared to the SY 2017-18 PMF scores calculated with SY 2018-19 approved business rules.

Growth Assessment	# of schools	Proposed Options								
		A			B			C		
		Avg.	Min	Max	Avg.	Min	Max	Avg.	Min	Max
MGP	63	+2.1	-2.1	+6.2	+0.5	-2.1	+3.8	+1.0	-2.4	+4.6
NWEA	20	-0.7	-1.2	0.0	0.0	-1.2	+1.8	0.0	-1.2	+1.8
PK Only	7	-0.5	-1.1	+0.1	-0.5	-1.1	+0.1	-0.5	-1.1	+0.1

Median School Performance

To ensure strong PMF results can be attained across grade configurations, DC PCSB evaluated each proposal to see the extent to which each would narrow the gap in median PMF score between schools ending in grades 4 and above compared to schools ending in grade 3 & below.

Growth Assessment	# of schools	SY 2017-18 PMF	With SY 2018-19 Changes	Proposed Options		
				A	B	C
MGP	63	58.0	58.9	61.8	60.8	61.1
NWEA	20	76.2	76.2	75.5	75.5	75.5
PK Only	7	72.9	72.9	72.2	72.2	72.2

Ability to Meet Standard for Renewal

DC PCSB evaluated the ability of schools to meet the standard for renewal under the PMF as Goals policy by calculating the percentage of schools with a student population of 50% or more at-risk earning a score of 50 or above on the PK-8 PMF.

Growth Assessment	# of schools with 50%+ at-risk	SY 2017-18 PMF	With SY 2018-19 Changes	Proposed Options		
				A	B	C
MGP	33	51.5%	57.6%	66.7%	60.6%	60.6%
NWEA	15	86.7%	86.7%	86.7%	86.7%	86.7%
PK Only	2	n < 10	n < 10	n < 10	n < 10	n < 10

Subgroup Relationships

The population that a school serves should not be a strong predictor of school quality. With an increase in r-squared value in SY 2017-18 between the % of students at-risk at PK-8 schools and PMF score, DC PCSB evaluated each proposal to ensure the at-risk correlation would decrease.

Growth Assessment	# of schools	SY 2017-18 PMF	With SY 2018-19 Changes	Proposed Options		
				A	B	C
MGP	63	0.42	0.41	0.38	0.38	0.39
NWEA	20	0.07	0.08	0.09	0.09	0.09
PK Only	7	n < 10	n < 10	n < 10	n < 10	n < 10

Rationale for and Challenges Posed by Each Gateway Proposal

Option	Rationale	Challenges
Option A: Replace Gateway with Growth to Proficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited impact on overall scores Reduces subgroup correlations (replaces achievement-focused measure with growth) Matches STAR; consistent reporting Over 1/3 of respondents voted in favor; wanted to continue to offer as option 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited availability of data for modeling Growth floors and targets somewhat arbitrary
Option B: Remove Gateway Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited impact on overall scores Reduces subgroup correlations Suggested by LEAs Mitigates double counting of measures Gives more time to consider alternatives without adding a new measure such as GtP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal does not reallocate points elsewhere; relative weighting of all other measures increases Open to consider stronger Gateway measures for future years
Option C: Remove Gateway Measures and Separate MGP by Grade Band	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited impact on overall scores Reduces subgroup correlations By SY 2019-20, will be a two-year weighted average of consortium MGP rates published on STAR framework Similar logic to Student Achievement; improves validity of measure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calculation gets more nuanced; combining separate grade bands with weighted averages Smaller cohort could lead to more variability

Excerpts from LEA Feedback

Here a couple of comments that reflected consistent themes we observed in the March 2019 feedback on the Gateway category:

- “...take the year to consider this more...growth to proficiency is one alternative, ideally we could together explore others.”
- “Retain the current gateway measure and add the growth to proficiency measure to the growth category of the PMF...”
- “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.”
- “...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.”

Suggestions Not Under Consideration for SY 2019-20 Cycle

The following suggestions came up in the LEA feedback to our March 2019 meeting; DC PCSB is not open to considering these proposals in SY 2019-20 as they require further research and dialogue.

- Adding a “best of” measure to the Gateway category
- Identifying or developing a value-added or gap-closing measure to the Gateway category
- Developing of an 8th grade on track/high school readiness measure