

LOCAL SUPERINTENDENTS ADVISORY COUNCIL

Dr. Henry Webb, Chair
Mr. Buddy Berry
Mr. Tim Bobrowski
Mr. David Cox
Mr. Keith Davis

Dr. James Flynn
Mr. Jerry Green
Mr. Elmer Thomas
Mr. Russ Tilford
Dr. David Rust

July 25, 2017

Mr. Bill Twyman, Board Chair
Kentucky Board of Education
300 Sower Blvd, 5th Floor
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

Dear Mr. Twyman:

The Local Superintendents Advisory Council (LSAC) met on July 25, 2017. There were five (5) members present, but not enough members present for a quorum. Please note that LSAC has two (2) vacancies due to retirements or resignation and we are awaiting replacement appointments from the Legislative Research Commission.

While a quorum was not available, all items on the agenda were discussed, but no action was taken. While LSAC could not vote to approve the regulations due to the lack of a quorum, we note the following comments by members for each regulation presented for final reading:

702 KAR 7:065, Designation of agenda to manage middle and high school athletics and revision of bylaws - No questions/concerns noted

703 KAR 5:270, Kentucky's Accountability System

Overall, the committee was supportive of the draft regulation and accountability system. Members expressed their support for the system's inclusion of multiple measures and paths to success. There was extensive discussion on each indicator of the system. Highlights of that discussion are included below.

In relation to the new system, LSAC members asked about data modeling of the system. Associate Commissioner Sims indicated that complete modeling has not yet happened because there are new data elements in the proposed system. For example, the rich curriculum category in Opportunity and Access requires expansion of Infinite Campus and completion of the course code project.

A question was also raised about the removal of the high/low categories on the proficient performance level in the growth indicator. Many LSAC members expressed the importance to stretch students beyond the "floor" of proficiency. It was recommended that if the system does not end up reflecting this, then the data should still be categorized in this way, so that a school

can still see this type of growth (meaning the high/low categories be available for reporting at all levels – novice, apprentice, proficient and distinguished - but not calculated for points).

Discussion also occurred around the indicator of English proficiency. One LSAC member expressed concern that in the former accountability system, when English learners (EL) exited EL status, they dropped out of this student population and went into the general student population (meaning they were “lost”, with no credit in the school’s accountability for the growth and proficiency of the student in the EL disaggregation). It was suggested that the regulation somehow address this issue, so that the system can appropriately recognize the proficiency of these students.

There was also extensive discussion on the gap to group reporting related to the highest performing group. LSAC members agree with the approach proposed within the model. A question was raised about data reporting of students with a 504 plan, in addition to students with Individualized Education Plans (IEPs). KDE staff indicated that they would investigate federal guidance on this to ensure accuracy of the current proposal. Staff said that 504 students have not been included in the special education reporting since early No Child Left Behind reports.

In relation to transition readiness, some concerns were noted regarding the bonus calculation for high demand industry certifications. KDE staff explained that this requirement is explicit within Senate Bill 1 (SB 1). One LSAC member also indicated a concern over the elementary and middle school composite score for this indicator. The issue surrounded the use of data for this calculation that is reported already in the Proficiency indicator. A question was also raised surrounding the original proposal for high school transition readiness, which included college placement exams. Members expressed hope that placement exams, in addition to admission exams, would be a means of demonstrating academic readiness. KDE staff indicated that they needed clarity on this issue, in terms of the alignment to SB1. SB1 states college admission exams.

LSAC members urged KDE staff to consider business rules and operational definitions for particular measures, such as the example of career coaches. Use of the primary talent pool in the indicator of opportunity and access also seemed to present mixed emotions due to the possibility of unintended consequences. Many members expressed support for the notion of the opportunity and access indicator as a whole; however, the equity and funding issues across the state still pose some concern. LSAC members also noted the absence of a school safety measure, which is required by SB1.

780 KAR 3:072, Attendance, compensatory time, and leave for certified and equivalent service

- No questions
- All LSAC members in attendance indicated support

780 KAR 3:080, Extent and duration of school term, use of school days and extended employment

- Only question related to effective date. KDE’s Chase Bannister clarified that all changes would begin in 18-19 academic year
- All LSAC members in attendance indicated support

The members of LSAC appreciate the opportunity to participate in the discussion and provide a local perspective on issues of concern to the Kentucky Board of Education.

Sincerely,

Dr. Henry Webb
LSAC Chair

cc: Kentucky Board of Education Members