		Superintendents			SCAAC Consensus K	KDE	KBE
		Agree	Disagree	Undecided			
1	Alternative School Track Back* – Kentucky's track back system does not work well with students who enter alternative schools directly without entering an A1 school. Track back works for students who have a clear track to the A1 school that sent the student to the alternative school. However, track back does not work when a student enters an alternative school directly without entering an A1 school first. The proposed rule is as follows: Continue the track back model for any student who has a clear track to an A1 school. Students who enter directly into an alternative school without ever entering an A1 school cannot be tracked back to an appropriate A1 school; therefore, the accountability for this student would go to the district score.	44%	27%	29%	Agree	High Priority - Agree	

2	AMO Calculations* – AMO calculations on the Overall Score should be changed because the one (1) point a year improvement rate is too slow for moving forward. Suggested changes are found below:		uperintende	ents	SCAAC Consensus	KDE	KBE
		Agree	Disagree	Undecided			
	a. AMO – Set an end point date with an ultimate Overall goal for all schools to reach. The end point would be a 12-year period which equates to one generation of students. Once the end point is determined, select the appropriate Overall final score desired for all schools. To determine annual school goals, divide the difference of the school's current Overall Score and the Ultimate Goal by 12 years. (Example: Ultimate Goal of 94 in 12 Years – a score of 58 would mean a 3-point gain annually for 12 years. The AMO would be 3 points a year for this school). Note: The Ultimate Goal would be set lower than 100 because not all components have goals of 100 (i.e., Graduation rate is 98%; Growth is 60%.)	20%	67%	13%	Disagree		

		S	uperintende	ents	SCAAC Consensus	KDE	KBE
		Agree Disagree Undecided					
2	b. The Delivery AMO targets must have significant consequences and be used as real AMOs for Kentucky. Delivery targets must move from aspirational targets to real targets that are used to supply school/district labels and to provide assistance to the schools.	9%	80%	10%	Disagree		
					SCAAC		

		Superintendents		SCAAC		l	
				Recommendation	KDE	KBE	
		Agree	Disagree	Undecided			
3	College and Career Readiness - Some students who are not college ready according to the indicators of ACT/COMPASS/KYOTE are able to enroll in college remedial courses offered by the colleges. These students who successfully complete these courses are college ready as defined by the Council on Postseondary Education (CPE). Add the passing of a remedial college course as evidence of college readiness.	54%	46%	0%	Agree	High Priority - Agree	

I /I	College and Career Readiness – The Middle School College Readiness Definition does not allow students multiple attempts to show readiness and uses a cut score that does not match CPE ACT benchmarks.	Superintendents			SCAAC Consensus	KDE	KBE	
		Agree	Disagree	Undecided				
	a. *Lower the weight from 16% Middle School College Ready to something less (i.e., 8% and shift the weight to Achievement).	55%	24%	21%	Disagree			

2

		Agree	Disagree	Undecided	SCAAC Consensus	KDE	KBE
	<ul> <li>Similar to the high school, provide more opportunities for students to achieve College Readiness (more test opportunities - take EXPLORE again the in the spring, different instruments, etc).</li> </ul>	63%	26%	11%	Agree		
					SCAAC		
		Sı	uperintende	nts	Recommendation	KDE	KBE
		Agree	Disagree	Undecided			
5	College/Career Readiness - Consider adding Advanced Placement, International Baccalureate and dual credit courses to indicate college ready.	53%	47%	0%	NA		
	<u> </u>		<del>!</del>				
					SCAAC		
		Superintendents		Recommendation	KDE	KBE	
		Agree	Disagree	Undecided			
6	<b>College and Career Readiness</b> - There is anecdotal information that indicates students may be counseled toward career readiness courses instead of arts/humanties due to the bonus feature of the CCR. Remove the Bonus (.5) for students that are college and career technical ready or have policies to prevent all students from being required to choose a CTE major.	26%	74%	0%	Disagree		
	Secucion Semigrequied to encose a energy major.		l				
				SCAAC			
		Superintendents		Recommendation	KDE	KBE	
		Agree	Disagree	Undecided			
7	<b>College and Career Readiness</b> - Change the bonus to recognize excellence in either College or Career measures.	40%	60%	0%	Agree		

					SCAAC		l
		Superintendents			Recommendation	KDE	KBE
		Agree	Disagree	Undecided			
8	<b>Focus*</b> - Currently, the identification of Focus Groups using the 3rd Standard Deviation model is not working well due to its complexity and over-identification of the group titled Students with Disabilities. In order to have a more equitable and simpler method, a new set of calculations should be used. To identify Focus Schools using the performance of individual gap groups, determine the lowest five percent (5% or some appropriate percentage) for each individual gap group and prevent an over-emphasis or over-sampling of a single group.	63%	37%	0%	Agree	High Priority - Agree	

		Sı	uperintende	nts	SCAAC Consensus	KDE	KBE
		Agree	Disagree	Undecided			
9 1	Focus Schools* – Identify Focus Schools using more than one year's worth of data. There should be a two-or three-year pattern of Focus problems prior to identification.	9%	80%	10%	Agree	High Priority - Agree	

		Sı	uperintende	nts	SCAAC Consensus	KDE	KBE
		Agree	Disagree	Undecided			
10	Focus and Priority Schools – Identification of Focus and Priority Schools needs an annual update. Currently, no new Priority and very few new Focus Schools are identified because KDE cannot serve more schools than initially identified. Even if KDE cannot serve more schools, the public should know there are potential Focus and Priority Schools. Identify new Priority and Focus Schools using the definition but call those schools "Priority Schools Not Served." In other words, add some label that shows the schools are not receiving assistance from KDE but have the qualifications to be Priority or Focus Schools.	13%	72%	15%	Disagree	Agree	

		Sı	uperintende	ents	SCAAC Consensus	KDE	KBE
		Agree	Disagree	Undecided			
11	Gap Group* – The Gap Group component needs some incentives and recognition for moving a student from Novice to Apprentice. Currently, the Gap Group only receives points for proficient students. There is little incentive for moving students from Novice to Apprentice. Change the Gap Group component calculation to use the same calculations as the Achievement component. (0 points for Novice, 1/2 point for Apprentice, 1 point for Proficient and Distinguished). Using this calculation provides incentive to focus on Novice gap students and move those students to Apprentice.	89%	6%	6%	Agree	Agree	

		Superintendents			SCAAC Consensus	KDE	KBE
		Agree	Disagree	Undecided			
12	<b>Gap Group*</b> – A school with extremely high percentages of Gap Group students is at a disadvantage due to its student population. Some type of adjustment needs to be built into the system. Use a statistical method to create an adjustment to the Overall Score for schools with high percentages of poverty students.		25%	25%	Disagree	Disagree	

					SCAAC			
		Superintendents		Recommendation	KDE	KBE		
		Agree	Disagree	Undecided				
1	Gap Group*- Add a measure of enrollment and success in Advanced Placement (AP) courses to reporting or recognition in accountability system for Gap students.	41%	59%	85%	Agree			

		Superintendents			SCAAC Consensus	KDE	KBE
		Agree	Disagree	Undecided			
	<b>Graduation Rate*</b> – Currently, the Graduation Rate of 70% is used to determine if a school should be						
	identified as a new Priority School or be exited from Priority status. There are only 1 or two schools in the	37%	38%	25%	Disagree		
	state scoring below the 70th percentile rate. The Graduation Rate should be increased to a higher number						
	based on the new Cohort calculation. Example: 75% or 80% instead of 70%.						

						SCAAC	ı l	,	1
			Superintendents			Recommendation	KDE	KBE	l
			Agree	Disagree	Undecided				l
Ī		<b>Growth*</b> - Kentucky uses the Student Growth Percentile (SGP). SGP uses a normative model to determine							l
		how individuals compare against an academic peer group. It is difficult to set goals on the normative model	35%		0%	Agree	High Priority - Agree		l
	4.5	and to make estimates of progress in the year since the final score depends on how other schools		CE0/					l
15	15	performed. This problem mainly occurs in the elementary level due to the heavier weighting on Growth		65%					i
		(Achievement 30%, Gap 40%, and Growth 40%). Adjust the weight at elementary to be equal Achievement,							l
		Gap and Growth at 33.3% each.							l

6

	_						
		Superintendents			SCAAC Recommendation	KDE	KBE
		Agree	Disagree	Undecided			
16	<b>Growth*</b> - Increase the weight at elementary in Achievement to 40% and make Gap and Growth 30% each.	53%	47%	44%	Disagree		
		Agree	Disagree	Undecided			
17	Labels for Schools* – The labels of Proficient and Distinguished are confusing to the public because those labels infer that all students are proficient or distinguished. Change the School Label of Proficient/Distinguished schools to a more concrete description. Example: School in Top 30% of all schools, or School in Top 10% of all schools, or School in Top 5% of all schools.	12%	66%	22%	Disagree		
	r						
		Superintendents  Agree Disagree Undecided			SCAAC Consensus	KDE	KBE
18	<b>Labels for Schools*</b> – It is misleading to label a school Distinguished when the school has an identified problem with a gap group. Do not label a school Distinguished or Proficient (or Top 30%, Top 10%) if the school also is a Focus School.	Agree 6%	85%	9%	Disagree		
					SCAAC		
		Superintendents			Recommendation	KDE	KBE
		Agree	Disagree	Undecided			
19	<b>Program Reviews*</b> (Arts/Humanities, PL/CS, Writing, K-3, World Language) - Due to the subjective nature of program review ratings, no distinguished points were calculated into the accountability model. There is a distinguished label provided for each program review. Make available distinguished level points in accountability for Program Reviews.	48%	52%	0%	NA		

					SCAAC		
		Superintendents			Recommendation	KDE	KBE
		Agree	Disagree	Undecided			
	<b>Program Reviews*</b> (Arts/Humanities, PL/CS, Writing, K-3, World Language) - Due to the subjective nature						
20	of the program review ratings, the program reviews should have reduced weight in the accountability	48%	52%	0%	NA		
	model.						