



# JEFFERSON COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION

## Minutes of Special Meeting of January 29, 2024

**Special Meeting** of the Jefferson County Board of Education held at VanHoose Education Center, 3332 Newburg Road, Louisville, Kentucky, on Tuesday, January 29, 2024, at 6:00 p.m.

### **BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Chairman Corrie Shull

Mrs. Linda Duncan

Ms. Gail Logan Strange

Vice-Chairman James Craig

Dr. Chris Kolb

Mr. Joseph Marshall

All present Board members attended the meeting via videoconference.

### **BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Ms. Sarah McIntosh

### **STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Superintendent Martin A. Pollio, Ed.D.

Kevin Brown, General Counsel

Caroline Callahan, Chief of Communications and Community Relations

Dr. Katy Deferrari, Chief of Staff

Dr. Dena Dossett, Chief of Accountability, Research, and Systems Improvement

This meeting was conducted via videoconference pursuant to KRS 61.823 and KRS 61.826. The primary location for this meeting and where all members could be seen and heard by the public was the VanHoose Education Center. Members of the Board were permitted to attend in person or via video teleconference pursuant to KRS 61.826. Members of the public were permitted to attend in person or watch the live stream of the meeting.

### **SPECIAL MEETING**

The purpose of this meeting was for Board members to participate in a discussion regarding Student Outcomes Focused Governance: Goals and Guardrails.

The Council of the Great City Schools (CGCS) developed a Student Outcomes-Focused Governance (SOFG) Framework to support large urban school districts to adopt school board behaviors and practices that create the conditions necessary to improve student outcomes.

## I. Call to Order

Chair Shull called the January 29, 2024, Special Meeting of the Board of Education to order at 6:03 p.m.

## II. Student Outcomes-Focused Governance Discussion of Goals & Guardrails

Board members continued discussions of the Draft Goals and Guardrails. A.J. Crabill, Director of Governance, Council of the Great City Schools; and Leslie Grant, Student Outcomes Focused Governance Cohort Faculty; were available to help facilitate the discussion.

Chair Shull stated that the purpose of this meeting was for the Board to come to a consensus on the following two issues.

- Whether or not the metric for Goals will be the 60<sup>th</sup> percentile or growth.
- Whether or not they should add the two suggestions made by JCTA to the Guardrails.
  1. Adding *collaboration with impacted stakeholders*.
  2. Adding an additional guardrail to not require more standardized testing than necessary.

The Board had a conversation regarding the Guardrails first.

The Board reached a consensus to add *collaborating with impacted stakeholders* as a stand-alone Guardrail.

Dr. Kolb suggested combining Guardrails three and four since they are so substantially similar for ECE and ML students.

The Board reached a consensus to combine Guardrails three and four.

Chair Shull restated the revised Guardrails to ensure all Board members agreed

1. JCPS shall not allow unsafe conditions (either socially, emotionally, or physically)
2. JCPS shall not make significant decisions without first ensuring alignment with the Racial Equity Plan.
3. JCPS shall not make significant decisions without collaborating with impacted stakeholders.
4. JCPS shall not allow inequitable resource allocation for ECE students and/or ML students.

Board members reached a consensus on the first four Guardrails.

Board members then discussed adding a fifth Guardrail to ensure the District would not require more standardized testing than necessary.

Mr. Marshall expressed concern and wondered if the extra guardrail would be necessary since they added the language regarding *collaborating with impacted stakeholders*. He conceded that the rest of the Board wanted the additional Guardrail, so he agreed to go in that direction.

Chair Shull restated the fifth Guardrail to ensure consensus with the language.

5. JCPS shall not utilize more than the minimum number of district-mandated assessments to monitor student outcomes.

Once the Board had agreed on the draft Guardrails, they discussed the Goals.

Mr. Marshall stated that he was in favor of the original Option 1 Goals to include changing *percentile goals* to *growth goals*.

Dr. Pollio stated that the original Option 1 had been revised to add growth (Option 1b: Original Goals with Growth and/or Achievement). They would count growth and/or proficiency (60th percentile) toward goals four and five.

Mr. Craig stated that he had concerns. Specifically, he was concerned with including high-stakes testing and with the language in goals four and five. He said he agreed with what Dr. Kolb had previously shared regarding goals four and five and asked him to share his thoughts on those.

Dr. Kolb stated that he was in favor of the original five goals that they had previously discussed. He was concerned with using the word “proficiency”. He was in favor of combining *growth and/or achievement benchmark* measures (Option 1b). He suggested they also have the option to use some type of non-norm-based assessment benchmark in addition to a curriculum-based assessment. He hoped to ensure that they do everything they can to capture student learning that they typically fail to capture through standardized assessments.

Ms. Logan Strange also agreed with Option 1b: Original Goals with Growth and/or Achievement.

Mrs. Duncan expressed concern about having enough time to review the number of reports that would be required at meetings. She was also concerned with the community’s understanding of what the goals mean. She wanted to ensure the Goals were communicated effectively to the public. She said she would go with Option 1b.

Chair Shull stated that he preferred Option 1b including the additional language *expected growth and/or achievement benchmarks*.

Ms. Logan Strange wanted to clarify what the benchmarks would be.

Dr. Kolb said, “I’m in favor of the framework that we are discussing. I remain, as I wrote in my feedback the other day, opposed to the 60th percentile in a norm-referenced test even with the growth component. I think this fails to capture certain students who are reading very well, perfectly adequately, but may not have met a growth goal. I hear Dr. Pollio’s point about the 50th percentile being on grade-level not necessarily being a research-based determination.” He continued to say that he was in favor of Option 1b, but he would not vote in favor of anything with the 60th percentile in it.

Mrs. Duncan and Mr. Craig agreed with Dr. Kolb’s comments.

Mr. Marshall discussed the possibility of the Board defining what it means for a student to be on grade-level or proficient.

The Board discussed revising the language in goals four and five.

Mr. Craig said, “Would a motion be in order to amend the 60th percentile recommendation to 50th percentile on the draft goals [on Option 1b: Original Goals with growth and/or achievement], and if that motion would be appropriate, I’ll make it.”

Kevin Brown, general counsel, answered yes, it would be appropriate.

Chair Shull asked Mr. Craig to restate his motion.

Mr. Craig said, “I may need help with the wording of it - to bring it into this discussion, I think there is consensus here to move from 60th percentile on MAP to 50th percentile.

*4. The percentage of 3<sup>rd</sup>-grade students who met their expected growth and/or achievement benchmarks (50th percentile) will increase from % on June 2023 to % by June 2030.*

*5. The percentage of 8th-grade students who met their expected growth and/or achievement benchmarks (50th percentile) according to the Spring Map assessment will increase from % on June 2023 to % by June 2030.*

### III. Consideration of Possible Motion Related to Goals and Guardrails

**Order #2024-20 - Motion Passed:** A motion to move from 60th percentile on MAP to 50th percentile passed with a motion by Mr. James Craig and a second by Mrs. Linda Duncan.

*[The percentage of 3<sup>rd</sup>-grade students who met their expected growth and/or achievement benchmarks (50th percentile) will increase from % on June 2023 to % by June 2030.*

*The percentage of 8th-grade students who met their expected growth and/or achievement benchmarks (50th percentile) according to the Spring Map assessment will increase from % on June 2023 to % by June 2030.]*

Mr. James Craig	Yes
Mrs. Linda Duncan	Yes
Dr. Christopher Kolb	Yes
Ms. Gail Logan Strange	Yes
Mr. Joseph Marshall	Yes
Ms. Sarah McIntosh	Absent
Dr. Corrie Shull	Yes

The Board will consider the adoption of the Draft Goals and Guardrails at a future meeting. After the adoption of the draft, the Board will solicit community feedback through a variety of means before adopting final Goals and Guardrails at a later Board meeting. Once the final version is approved by the Board, District Leadership will develop Interim Goals and Guardrails to allow for effective monitoring and accountability.

#### IV. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:36 p.m.

**Order #2024-21 - Motion Passed:** A motion to adjourn the meeting of the Jefferson County Board of Education at 7:36 p.m. passed with a motion by Mrs. Linda Duncan and a second by Mr. Joseph Marshall.

Mr. James Craig	Yes
Mrs. Linda Duncan	Yes
Dr. Christopher Kolb	Yes
Ms. Gail Logan Strange	Yes
Mr. Joseph Marshall	Yes
Ms. Sarah McIntosh	Absent
Dr. Corrie Shull	Yes

---

Dr. Corrie Shull  
Chairman

---

Dr. Martin A. Pollio  
Superintendent/Secretary

**THESE ACTIONS, ALONG WITH THE AGENDA ITEMS, MAKE UP THE OFFICIAL MINUTES,  
WHICH ARE ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**