

## **Kentucky Board of Education Study Session April 8, 2014**

KBE Study Session, State Board Room, 500 Mero Street, 1st Floor, CPT, Frankfort, Kentucky  
40601

### ***SUMMARY MINUTES***

The Kentucky Board of Education held a study session as part of its regular meeting on April 8, 2014, in the State Board Room, First Floor, Capital Plaza Tower, Frankfort, Kentucky. The board conducted the following business:

#### **I. Call to Order, Full Board Session - April 8, 2014, 1:00 p.m. (EDT)**

Chair Roger Marcum called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. local time. He asked everyone to either mute or turn off their cell phones, noted the meeting materials were on the board's online materials system and thanked the interpreters for their services.

#### **II. Roll Call**

Chair Marcum asked Mary Ann Miller to call the roll at 1:00 p.m. EDT.

The results of the roll call were as follows:

##### Present Board Members:

Grayson Boyd  
Leo Calderon  
Judy Gibbons  
David Kareem  
Roger Marcum  
Jonathan Parrent  
Nawanna Privett  
Brigitte Ramsey  
William Twyman  
Mary Gwen Wheeler

##### Absent Board Members:

Trevor Bonnstetter  
Robert King

### **III. Student Growth and the Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (Review Item) - Associate Commissioners Susan Allred and Ken Draut, Dr. Amanda Ellis and Dr. Bart Liguori - 2-hour presentation/discussion (Strategic Priorities: Next Generation Professionals and Next Generation Learners)**

Coming forward for this item were Associate Commissioners Susan Allred and Ken Draut, Division Director Amanda Ellis, Research Analyst Bart Liguori and Literacy Coordinator Cindy Parker.

Associate Commissioner Allred began the presentation by reminding members that they had requested a study session on how student growth is incorporated into the Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES). She emphasized that student growth is only one component of the system and noted it has two parts, a state contribution and a local one. Allred explained that the state contribution contains a student growth percentile, which is part of the state accountability system and applies to about 20 percent of teachers. She went on to say that the local contribution includes student growth goals and affects 100 percent of teachers. Allred again stressed that teacher effectiveness will be determined by multiple components of which student growth is only one of these. She then explained that in today's presentation Ken Draut will talk about the accountability definition for the student growth percentile, Bart Liguori will address how the student growth percentile will be reflected in the state accountability system for about 20 percent of teachers, Amanda Ellis will focus on the local contribution of the system including student growth goals and the resources to assist in setting these and Cindy Parker will facilitate a panel of local educators from Montgomery, Gallatin and Washington Counties who will speak on the use of student growth as they have implemented PGES. Allred summarized that a question and answer period would occur at the end and asked members to record their questions that arise during the presentation on the colored paper that was provided to them.

Next, Ken Draut used a PowerPoint presentation to address the definition of the student growth percentile. He noted the following:

- The traditional picture of growth is getting a score on a student and re-testing the student to see how he/she improved.
- Formative and interim assessments work very well with the traditional view of growth.
- Once-a-year summative assessments pose some problems with this traditional view.
- Growth models include student growth percentile, gain score, trajectory, categorical, residual gain, projection and multivariate.
- The student growth percentile measures change in an individual student's performance over time.
- Each student's rate of change is compared to other students with a similar test score history and the rate of change is expressed as a percentile.
- The student growth percentile focuses on the relative standing of a student from year to year compared to the student's academic peers.
- Students who outpaced their peer group would be in the percentile ranks of 50-99; students who underperformed their peer group would be in the percentile ranks of 1-49; the acceptable rank for growth in Kentucky is the 40th percentile; and students who score at the 40th percentile or higher are considered to have typical or higher annual growth.

- Requirements for the student growth percentile include that two test scores from two different years are needed for each student and tests must be in the same subject.
- Student growth percentile is a way to measure progress for students at all performance levels.
- The theoretical premise is that when students with "like" scores are placed in an academic peer group and then compared one year later, we assume teacher and school actions happened between the two tests to cause a student to stay even with or out-perform the academic peer group. The actions may include instruction, curriculum, on-going assessments, etc.

Bart Laguori then continued the slide presentation to explain the use of student growth percentiles to determine teacher effectiveness. He made the following points:

- Two types of student growth will factor into a teacher's overall student growth rating: local student growth goals (all teachers) and state student growth percentiles (approximately 20 percent of teachers).
- Student growth percentiles are available for teachers of students in grades 4-8 who take K-PREP in reading and/or math but are not available for grade 11 (PLAN-ACT) because there may be more than one teacher impacting that student's growth.
- For the teacher student growth percentile, median student growth percentiles are used, up to three years of data are combined, math and reading scores are combined, a minimum number of the students are required to receive a student growth percentile, attribution is determined at the local level and it is a lagging indicator.
- Teachers will receive one of three ratings on their overall student growth: Low, Expected or High.
- For research purposes, median student growth percentiles were calculated for all teachers statewide.
- Using the distribution of median student growth percentiles, cutoffs were created to indicate Low, Expected and High student growth.

Student Growth Goals was the next topic and was presented by Amanda Ellis. She emphasized the following:

- Student growth assumptions include accountability improves educator performance, growth is measured over time, and the expectation must be consistent for all teachers. Misconceptions include accountability is imposed on teachers, equity requires comparability, comparable means "the same", and We've built it...we're done!
- The foundational elements that have been essential for Kentucky's success include the Classroom Assessment for Student Learning (CASTL), Senate Bill 1 (2009), the Leadership Networks, the Math Design Collaborative/Literacy Design Collaborative and Program Reviews.
- Essential conditions for success include the Kentucky Core Academic Standards as well as a focus on the work being student growth specific.
- Think and plan guidance for developing student growth goals has been provided to educators.
- The principal as instructional leader is key to the success of the system.

The last component of the presentation consisted of local educators talking about how they have implemented student growth goals as part of PGES.

Some of the questions from state board members were then addressed and the remaining ones for which time was not available were given to department staff so that written responses could be provided.

#### **IV. High School Assessment Issues (Review Item) - Associate Commissioner Ken Draut - 2-hour presentation/discussion (Strategic Priority: Next Generation Learners)**

Associate Commissioner Ken Draut came forward for this topic. He summarized the content of the staff note dealing with high school assessment issues and said the department needs feedback on the following questions:

1. What should the Kentucky high school testing model look like? (End-of-Year or End-of-Course)
2. How should Kentucky replace the ACT EXPLORE and ACT PLAN tests?
3. What timeline should be followed for the work?

Jay Parrent responded that the change should not occur in 2014-15.

Roger Marcum stated that Option D in the staff note is the best and that the department needs to reconsider constructed responses as part of the end-of-course assessments. Brigitte Ramsey agreed with Marcum.

Mary Gwen Wheeler then asked about the status of Kentucky's participation in the work of the testing consortia.

Commissioner Holliday replied that Kentucky pulled out of this work so that when the state issues an RFP for new testing components, the consortia can participate.

Ken Draut added that if a totally new test is the vision, then it requires the RFP to be issued 18 months in advance and with an off-the-shelf test, it requires nine or ten months.

Bill Twyman commented that whatever direction is pursued, student accountability must be a part of it. He then asked if the addition of constructed responses/performance events would be cost prohibitive.

Draut replied that performance events do increase the cost.

Commissioner Holliday then clarified that the intent with constructed responses was to move this to occurring throughout the year like Smarter Balance's through-courses.

Chair Marcum indicated that the bigger conversation is to look at summative, formative and performance-based testing and try to find the right balance. He shared that the grant NASBE has awarded to the board will allow study of this issue at a more in-depth level.

Nawanna Privett stated that the input from the School Curriculum, Assessment and Accountability Council was to keep end-of-course testing and add more subjects.

Mary Gwen Wheeler then asked about the implications of changes in the system on student growth, if something could be added at grade 9 and the timeframe for this work.

Commissioner Holliday recommended that in grades 8, 9, 10 and 11 student growth should be tracked. He said that in 2014-15 there would be no changes to the current system with a new model brought forward in 2015-16. Holliday thought that a pilot project could even be done next year.

Jay Parrent then questioned whether K-PREP in grade 8 could be used as a college readiness measure.

Ken Draut responded that work has been done on this to allow it to occur through linking.

Judy Gibbons concurred that the board should continue with end-of-course assessments, keep things the same in 2014-15 and then add more in 2015-16.

At the end of the discussion, Jay Parrent asked to see information on the K-PREP 8th grade data as a predictive indicator.

## **V. Recess**

Chair Marcum then announced that the board would stand in recess until tomorrow morning when the regular meeting would continue and convene at 8:30 a.m. in the State Board Room.