

DC PCSB PK-8 Task Force Meeting Notes

April 11, 2019

Attendees by Phone: MM Bethune, Eagle Academy, Naomi DeVeaux (DC PCSB)

Attendees In Person: Kelly Smith (Perry Street Prep), Ed Han (KIPP DC), Kenli Okada (Empower K12), Zac Morford (Friendship), Jessica Enos (TenSquare), Dominique Coote (Capital City), Irene Holtzman (FOCUS), Pam Faulcon (ECA), Kathy Prince (ECA), Rob Murphy (Achievement Prep), Susie Cannon (Achievement Prep), Hilary Dauffenbach-Tabb (DC Prep), Laura Berger (Center City), Julia Senerchia (EW Stokes), Jodi Ihaza (Briya), Kelly Brown (Inspired Teaching), Josh Boots (EmpowerK12), Stu Smither-Wilson (EL Haynes), Erin Kupferberg (DC PCSB), Pete Petrin (DC PCSB)

Notes:

- PCSB presented proposed changes based on March 21 meeting feedback:
 - 95% of schools supported breaking out Student Achievement measures by elementary and middle grades with different 4+ targets and exclude outliers.
 - For School Environment, PCSB no longer proposing changes to floors and targets but slight adjustment to points for Instructional Support (counts three points more than other two domains).
- Gateway:
 - Option A: Replace Gateway with Growth to Proficiency (6 LEAs from previous meeting supported this option). This option no longer proposes any changes for schools ending in grade 3.
 - Option B: Remove Gateway altogether, framework would be out of few points.
 - Option C: Remove Gateway and separate MGP by elementary and middle.
 - Can PCSB consider weighted MGP by n-size instead of an even split. Only 2 grades in elementary level has MGP vs 3 in middle level.
- Request for PCSB to post the 10th, median, and 90th for consortium MGP
 - This data is available in the meeting materials folder
- Pulse check of the group to see if participants were concerned about middle school having a different (lower) target.
 - Seems like the targets should be criterion-based vs normed to allow schools to show strength.
 - MGP is stronger than GtP measure, because PARCC is not meant to be a growth metric
 - Some LEAs expressed serious concerns about adding GtP.
 - Question: What proportion of the consortium does DC make up?
 - PCSB to follow up with OSSE to see if consortium growth still includes a larger group than just DC after this year.
- What about the reliability change when we split elementary and middle with MGP-
 - We could include a business rule to support this concern.
 - If we weighted by MGP by n-size, this might help the reliability.
 - Continue to look at a business rule to support this
- If we want to change the way we measure gateway why remove it then add it back in?
 - Change in at risk correlation not much better.
- Additional metric- looking at terminal grade, students enrolled multiple years – could we display in 19-20
- None of these choices really lower the at-risk correlation, are we even meeting the goal?
 - The at-risk correlation also fluctuates

- Have we looked at what drives the fluctuating correlation, do we look at the data?
PCSB: the gateway correlation was higher, hence our proposals this cycle
- What would we lose by getting rid of Gateway?
 - Gateway was not a popular option with LEAs. There were good philosophical reasons to include it. With DC CAS, 3rd grade reading was substantially harder and such a small proportion of students had a large impact on the score.
 - Schools also have oriented to these measures, best teachers in 3rd and 8th grade.
 - Schools would like stability too.
- How did we get from 2011 to here, how has the sector changed? Should we evaluate how the PMF is being used now. What could the next version be. Group of LEAs also asked for an equity provision added to the PMF as Goals policy.
- PCSB: if you want to get rid of Gateway, put that on your feedback form. We opened up the conversation because the correlation with at-risk. If you are comfortable with where the PMF is now, we can keep it as is. We were responding to LEA feedback.
 - We did appreciate the feedback about criterion targets.
- We are not ok with the correlations but is gateway the only way to reduce correlations. Is the small proposed change in correlation worth the change in framework?
 - PCSB: we can also continue to come up with different ways that make measurable sense. If we can come up with a meaningful fix so the framework works today, great.
 - If we do remove gateway and bring another measure back, it doesn't have to be "Gateway Measure".
- Growth to Proficiency is another growth metric and schools serving a higher at-risk population do support that.
- When we look at Growth to Proficiency, the framework aligns much more with STAR. Why continue with PMF?
- Request – do not believe recommended changes to CLASS are supported by LEAs
 - PCSB: we will collect LEA feedback on this item in the follow-up survey and be clear that schools voting on the Gateway proposal

Next steps: PCSB will send out a feedback survey, due Wednesday COB

- Spring break is next week so schools may need more time; contact ppetrin@dcpcsb.org to request extension