

**Kentucky Board of Education Regular Meeting
August 2, 2017**

SUMMARY MINUTES

The Kentucky Board of Education (KBE) convened for its regular meeting on August 2, 2017 in the State Board Room on the fifth floor of the 300 Building, located at 300 Sower Boulevard, Frankfort, Kentucky. The board conducted the following business:

I. Call to Order

Chair Twyman called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. ET.

II. Roll Call

Chair Twyman requested that Leslie Slaughter call the roll of members and advisors. There were ten (10) voting members present and one (1) absent at the time of roll call. Board member Sam Hinkle was not present at the time of roll call; however, he joined the meeting later in the day. All four (4) board advisors were present. CPE President Bob King was absent; however, Sue Cain attended the meeting as his proxy.

Attendance taken at 9:02 a.m. ET:

Present Board Members

Mr. Grayson Boyd
Mr. Ben Cundiff
Mr. Rich Gimmel
Mr. Sam Hinkle
Mr. Gary Houchens
Ms. Alesa Johnson
Mr. Roger Marcum
Ms. Nawanna Privett
Mr. Milton Seymore
Mr. Bill Twyman
Ms. Mary Gwen Wheeler

Present Advisors

Ms. Tracey Cusick
Ms. Kathy Gornik
Mr. Wayne Lewis
Mr. Joe Papalia

Absent Board Members

President Bob King (Sue Cain in attendance as proxy)

III. 703 KAR 5:270, Kentucky's Accountability System (Action/Discussion Item: 2nd Reading) - Rhonda Sims, KDE Associate Commissioner and Brian Gong, Center for Assessment

Chair Twyman opened the floor to Commissioner Pruitt for opening remarks. Pruitt stated that he was recommending to the board that the vote on the accountability item be deferred, citing the need for additional time to discuss the finalized components of the proposed system. Pruitt noted the

significance of the vote on this agenda item and indicated that he did not want board members to feel uncomfortable or unprepared to make an informed decision. He recommended that the board vote to amend its agenda, resulting in the accountability proposal being a review item for the day. He noted that a special-called meeting could then occur within the following two to three weeks that would allow for a third and final reading of the regulation and an official vote.

Chair Twyman called for a motion to amend the day's agenda, specifically Item III (703 KAR 5:270, Kentucky's Accountability System), changing the item to a review-only item, rather than an action/discussion item. The motion was made by Ben Cundiff and seconded by Grayson Boyd. Board member Rich Gimmel asked Commissioner Pruitt to clarify what work he anticipated happening over the next two weeks that had not already occurred over the last twelve months. Commissioner Pruitt clarified that the additional time was designed to give the board an opportunity for deeper discussion and feedback. He clarified that there would be no additional committee meetings to refine the proposal and said that any additional changes that occurred from this point onward would be a direct result of the board's final input. Mary Gwen Wheeler inquired whether the board would see additional data modeling before the third reading. Commissioner Pruitt indicated that yes, this would occur where it was possible; however, he stated there were still components of the proposed system that did not have adequate data to model at this time. Ben Cundiff asked if it would be possible for the board to focus their discussions on the regulation toward the points of most controversy. Commissioner Pruitt indicated that the conversation would be focused in such a way. Chair Twyman called for any further discussion. Seeing none, Twyman called for a vote on the motion to amend the day's agenda. The motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

Prior to beginning the discussion on the proposed accountability system, Commissioner Pruitt asked to take a moment and expand on the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) plan that the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) is required to submit to the United States Department of Education by September 18, 2017. He explained that the accountability system and school improvement regulations were only one piece of the overall ESSA plan. Pruitt noted that, while the board approves those pieces of the plan through the regulatory process, the remainder of the plan is overseen by KDE through internal policy. He said the plan is designed to ensure that intentionality is given to the day-to-day operations of the state education agency and that there is a consolidated planning approach to the agency's work, as well as support to schools and districts.

Chair Twyman welcomed Rhonda Sims, KDE Associate Commissioner, and Brian Gong from the Center for Assessment, and invited them to begin their presentation. Joining Sims and Gong was Jennifer Stafford, KDE Division Director within the Office of Assessment and Accountability. Sims began by providing a summary of the work that had been completed to date to develop the proposed system. She also provided an overview of the more recent advisory meetings that have provided input from a variety of shareholders.

Stafford began walking through each section of the regulation, explaining the changes that had occurred from the first reading to the second reading. Stafford referenced the public draft of the proposed regulation, noting that the changes were reflected in red font. Ben Cundiff requested that staff share any pieces of the proposal that have involved a variation of opinion.

Board advisor Joe Papalia inquired about the five-star rating system. He asked how the metrics were nationally-normed. Specifically, Papalia asked if a five-star rating meant that a school was viewed as one of the best in the country. Sims explained that the proposed accountability system was a Kentucky-based system and is aligned to Senate Bill 1 from the 2017 Kentucky legislative session. She clarified that there are particular measures within the proposed system that have national benchmarks and can be used for state-to-state comparability, such as college entrance exams like the ACT. Sims also noted that there are no common national standards by which all states can be compared to one another. Roger Marcum said that common standards, as well as common state accountability systems, would be required in order to make such fair comparisons. Wayne Lewis indicated that, while the state must work within the boundaries of state law, he believes that the opportunity still exists to create internationally-benchmarked standards and assess those standards in a rigorous way.

Given Brian Gong's national leadership and expertise with state ESSA plans, Roger Marcum asked Brian how Kentucky's proposed system currently compared to other states. Gong noted that Kentucky had adopted very high standards, both in terms of student expectations and assessment, as well as school and district expectations. Gong said that he did not know of any other state that has proposed holding schools accountable for achievement gap closure in the ways that Kentucky has proposed. Marcum inquired specifically about Kentucky's "opportunity and access" indicator and how other states are addressing this topic. Gong indicated that most states have learned over the last twenty years that when a system focuses solely on student outcomes and assessment scores, then a school's curriculum becomes much more limited in nature. Gong commended Kentucky for attempting to address this issue through the "opportunity and access" indicator. He noted that its inclusion in the system sends a clear message that a well-rounded education and rich curriculum are important factors to student success and whole-child supports. Gong noted that accountability is and should be about more than just assessment scores.

Sims began explaining, in greater detail, the amendments that have occurred between the first and second readings of the proposed regulation. In regard to the definitions section of the regulation, she highlighted the following:

- Inclusion of a school safety measure;
- Addition of the term "career counselor";
- Defining "chronic absenteeism";
- Clarification to definition of "student group";
- Inclusion of essential skills definition and work ethic certification process;
- Clarification surrounding Individual Education Plans (IEPs); and
- Clarification on definition of a local education agency.

Discussion on this section of the regulation included specific suggestions from board members related to the proposed amendments. Specific to the definition of career counselors, Rich Gimmel suggested that the definition include the criteria of "full-time", ensuring that these individuals do not get assigned other roles and responsibilities beyond the scope of their job description. Mary Gwen Wheeler suggested that the definition of career counselors also include the responsibility of college advising.

In regard to the work ethic certification process, Ms. Wheeler expressed concern that the state had not yet defined "essential skills". Commissioner Pruitt agreed that this needed to be completed for consistency in implementation and evaluation. He noted that input from industry, the state Chamber of Commerce, and other critical shareholders would need to be collected in order to officially define these skills. Kathy Gornik inquired about the weighting of this piece within the proposed assessment and accountability system. Jennifer Stafford explained that this measurement of the system is included in the opportunity and access indicator, which is recommended to be approximately 15% of the overall rating, of which the work ethic certification would be a portion. Wayne Lewis agreed that the state needed to define these skills specifically. Gary Houchens clarified that this piece of the system still needs to be defined through additional work and internal policy. He noted that it would not be explicitly defined in the regulation. Commissioner Pruitt agreed and noted that the regulation is meant to be a framework that guides the implementation of the system, but does not necessarily include all of the "business rules".

Wayne Lewis inquired about the inclusion of the local measure in the system. He noted a concern about its compliance with the ESSA requirements, since the measures will be locally-defined and may not be uniform across the system. He indicated his desire to discuss this in greater detail later in the meeting.

Sue Cain asked why cheating and plagiarism were not included in the definition of behavior incidents. Commissioner Pruitt and Rhonda Sims explained that the state does not currently collect such data. Kathy Gornik indicated that a more appropriate place to highlight such behaviors could be in the measurement of essential skills. Gornik also asked why the transition readiness indicator did not include the work ethic certification component. Commissioner Pruitt explained that Senate Bill 1 clearly defined what transition readiness was to encompass and that KDE was informed that this measurement was not intended to be included in that indicator of the system.

Sims then moved on to the proficiency indicator of the proposed system. She highlighted the following changes to this section:

- changes to accelerated assessments for advanced learners, due to the concern of unintended consequences and ESSA limitations;
- inclusion of a "separate academic indicator" for Science and Social Studies proficiency; and
- removal of the additional weight for advanced learners.

Sims noted that the proficiency weights of novice/apprentice/proficient/distinguished are the same recommendation that had been included in the first reading, due to the concern of potential masking of lower-performing students (should higher weights be given to distinguished students). Wayne Lewis brought the conversation back to the proposed weight table and how each indicator of the system is proposed to be weighted. Lewis noted that, while he understands that the regulation would not define the percentages concretely, the board did have an opportunity to provide a policy statement on which pieces should be weighted more heavily. Commissioner Pruitt explained ESSA requires the academic indicators to have the most significant weight in the overall system. Pruitt went on to say that this requirement had served as the guardrails for the proposed range of weights.

Mary Gwen Wheeler inquired about the term "equal" in the language surrounding the separate academic indicators. Sims explained that this was meant to imply that the "separate academic indicators" of Science and Social Studies would be weighted equally to the traditional proficiency indicators of Mathematics and English/Language Arts. Sims expressed her intent to provide greater clarity to this section before the third reading of the regulation.

Much discussion occurred on the importance of a well-rounded education and the inclusion of the separate academic indicator. The discussion led to several questions and comments by board members. Mary Gwen Wheeler inquired about the state's capacity to test in these additional areas. Wheeler referenced the fact that Social Studies did not yet have revised content standards. Commissioner Pruitt indicated that the timeline for revised Social Studies standards was the 2018-2019 year, with new assessments to follow the following year.

Discussion then began on the student growth indicator of the system. Sims began by discussing the growth value tables, which highlighted the proposed points that can be earned for particular levels of student growth. Board members discussed heavily the idea of advanced points given to the growth of students from the proficient level to the distinguished level. Sims noted that most input from shareholders on this piece indicated its appropriateness, given the fact that the standards do get more rigorous at those levels. Sims also noted that the proposal included negative points for students who actually "back slide" or move backwards in their growth trajectory. Sims went on to note that there had been positive feedback received from shareholders on splitting the growth values in the novice and apprentice levels, citing that it acknowledges smaller increments of growth within each of those performance categories. Jennifer Stafford then highlighted clarifying language that had been inserted into this section of the regulation since the first reading.

Wayne Lewis inquired about individual student growth trajectories and whether those were still included. Sims indicated that yes, these were still included; however, he said there had been much confusion on this language. Brian Gong explained that the growth trajectories are meant to be student accountability and the tables being discussed at the moment were reflective of how schools would receive credit for student growth. Gong clarified that the student trajectories would still be created and would be used to calculate the points for the school's accountability. There was extensive discussion on whether the points attained by schools should be based on projections of performance or actual performance outcomes. Gary Houchens reiterated that the growth trajectories would still be based on the goal of proficiency within two years. Sims explained that this approach provides a more stable prediction for each student and encourages instructional changes, with the outcomes then becoming measured in the proficiency indicator. Gong indicated that the group could change the growth table to reflect "observed growth", rather than "projected growth" based on prior performance. Gong said that the advantage to using the projected growth data is that it ensures intentionality on the intended goal.

Milton Seymore expressed concern about waiting to measure growth and proficiency for students until the third grade. He noted concern about closing the achievement gap, should the state not place a stronger emphasis on the primary grade levels and foundational academic learning. Commissioner Pruitt agreed, but expressed concern over the funding necessary to assess in any additional grade levels, as well as the lack of research that supports the validity of standardized assessments prior to the third grade.

Kathy Gornik asked for clarification on what academic areas were included in this indicator. Sims explained that growth is based on the federally-required reading and mathematics assessments at the specified grade levels.

Alesa Johnson asked about the justification for only having split levels of growth within the novice and apprentice categories, but not the proficient and distinguished categories. Johnson expressed concern that this may overinflate the growth data. Rhonda Sims explained that the current proposal is fairer and more accurate than the former system. Sims explained that scale scores are wider for novice and apprentice and that historical data indicates there is less movement in the higher performance levels of proficient and distinguished. Sims indicated that the Consequential Review Work Group and the Local Superintendents Advisory Council (LSAC) both expressed support for split levels at all four (4) performance levels; however, she stated staff felt that the current proposal was more statistically stable.

Discussion then moved to the transition readiness indicator of the proposed system. Sims noted that a significant difference in the regulation from the first reading was the inclusion of an additional weight for the attainment of high-demand industry certifications. Sims noted that this alignment was required by Senate Bill 1. She also indicated that the change in terminology from "technical readiness" to "career readiness" was recommended by the School Curriculum, Assessment and Accountability Council (SCAAC).

Sims went on to explain that the military readiness component of this indicator contained a point of some controversy. She indicated that the controversy centered on two pieces of criteria: 1) the proposed benchmark of the Armed Forces Qualifying Test (AFQT) of the ASVAB assessment, and 2) the requirement of military enlistment. Sims expressed the importance of having additional criteria beyond the AFQT assessment score, citing concern that the assessment criteria alone may result in inappropriate testing practices and students being deemed "transition ready" for the military without any intent to pursue that postsecondary path. Ben Cundiff stated that there are just as many students turned down by the military for health-related reasons, in addition to their academic performance. Jennifer Stafford noted a concern expressed by some shareholders that military enlistment requires students to be at least eighteen years of age, so this could impact younger students and the state's early graduates. Following debate and discussion on this topic, the board requested that KDE staff explore additional options for inclusion in the military readiness category and to bring those forward for discussion at the third reading of the regulation.

Rich Gimmel inquired about the inclusion of postsecondary outcomes and cited a recommendation from the initial College and Career Readiness (CCR) Work Group to include this in the transition readiness indicator. Sims noted that this piece was proposed for inclusion as a public reporting feature of the school report card. Commissioner Pruitt cited some data limitations that were being discussed, such as students who go out-of-state for postsecondary education. Sue Cain reminded the board that the high school feedback reports developed by the Kentucky Center for Education and Workforce Statistics (KCEWS) were already capturing much of the postsecondary transition data.

Kathy Gornik stated that, by discussing academic and career readiness separately, the state may be sending a message that these transition readiness indicators are independent of one another. She stressed the importance of both paths for students. Alesa Johnson agreed and expressed the importance of Career and Technical Education (CTE). Johnson stated that the system should be clear about what being "career ready" truly means, stressing that readiness for a career may take longer and extend beyond high school.

IV. LUNCH - 12:00 p.m. ET (Provided for KBE members, invited guests and the Commissioner's Planning Committee members only)

The board recessed for lunch at 12:09 p.m. ET.

CONTINUED: 703 KAR 5:270, Kentucky's Accountability System (Action/Discussion Item: 2nd Reading) - Rhonda Sims, KDE Associate Commissioner and Brian Gong, Center for Assessment

Following the lunch break, the board continued discussing the transition readiness indicator. Rhonda Sims explained that some work groups had expressed concern that the proposal did not include a college placement exam, such as the KYOTE exam that had been offered in the past. Sue Cain noted that the KYOTE exams are accepted by all public postsecondary institutions across Kentucky. She went on to recommend that the accountability proposal include the placement scores that are included in CPE's college readiness indicators. Mary Gwen Wheeler asked for clarity as to whether these were currently included in the proposal. Sims noted that they had been recommended through committee work, but were not included in the current and final proposal. Sims also noted that some postsecondary institutions had expressed that the KYOTE was not their preferred placement exam. Wayne Lewis stated that the language of Senate Bill 1 explicitly references a "college admissions" exam. General Counsel Kevin Brown agreed to consult with legal staff at the CPE to seek clarity on this issue and alignment to Senate Bill 1.

Sue Cain referenced the current proposal requirement for academic readiness that states students must earn a "B" letter grade or higher on dual credit courses. She suggested that the board consider a letter grade of "C" or higher. Associate Commissioner Amanda Ellis spoke to the work group recommendation justifications for the recommendation of "B" or higher, citing the need for consistency and rigor among the various options for demonstrating readiness. Commissioner Pruitt noted that discussions with the university provosts had also indicated agreement on the letter grade of "B" or higher.

Discussion then began on the achievement gap closure indicator of the proposed system. Brian Gong expressed the sentiment that the gap element in Kentucky's ESSA plan and proposed accountability system was very strong. He explained there were two important pieces to the recommended gap rating:

- 1) relative performance among students groups; and
- 2) gap to proficiency, meaning the distance of a student group to the goal of proficiency.

Gong went on to describe the need for stable comparisons, which is why there is a recommendation for a minimum "n" count of students. He said that the proposal is a compromise of giving detailed information, as well as statistically-reliable data. He also stated that a unique component of the gap proposal included a "cap" on the star rating system, meaning that schools and districts with significant achievement gaps would be limited from achieving higher star ratings because of this issue. Gong said that Kentucky's definition for achievement gap closure goes far beyond the federal definition.

Jennifer Stafford then began highlighting the changes within this section of the regulation. Wayne Lewis asked for clarification on the language of the statistical test mentioned on page 15. Concerns noted by Lewis included the concept of effect size. After much discussion, KDE staff agreed that this section of the regulation needed further clarity and indicated their intent to provide attention to this area before the third reading by the board.

Stafford explained that the overall gap rating for schools and districts would be split, meaning that the gap to group performance would be weighted 33% and the gap to proficiency performance would be weighted 67%.

Board members also discussed the consolidated student group and the reasoning behind the minimum "n" count of ten (10) students. Commissioner Pruitt explained that, while many states are using a minimum "n" count of thirty (30) students, Kentucky wanted to be more transparent with the data, while still ensuring that the identification of individual students was prevented. Board Chair Twyman indicated that the proposal was reflective of the board's mission that discusses the success of "each and every child".

Board Advisor Kathy Gornik inquired about the segmenting of student groups and the justification for doing such. Commissioner Pruitt cited the federal requirement for states to do so. This led to extensive discussion by a variety of board members about the importance of shedding light on such performance data. Sims eventually noted that there had been overwhelming support for this piece of the proposed system by all shareholders.

Discussion then transitioned to the state's graduation rate proposal. Sims clarified that both the 4-year and 5-year rates will be reported and those rates will be averaged for a school's overall rating. Sue Cain asked for clarity on Kentucky's early graduates. Sims confirmed that early graduates are included in the 4-year cohort graduation rate. Alesa Johnson inquired about the state's plan for inclusion of students on the alternative assessment path. Johnson noted that these students had been labeled as dropouts in the former system. Sims explained that the state was working to include these students in the graduation data.

Joe Papalia asked about the percentage of those students who graduate in four years, versus those who graduate in five years. KDE staff indicated that the state's current four-year graduation rate was 88.6% and the five year graduation rate was 89.7%. Board members debated whether greater weight should be given to the five-year rate, in order to recognize the persistence to graduation. Rhonda Sims indicated that this was a decision left to the board's discretion. Brian Gong explained that the long-term goal for graduation was 95% for the four-year rate and 96% for the five-year rate.

Milton Seymore inquired about the state's dropout prevention legislation that had been passed several years prior and whether or not this was being enforced. Staff clarified that yes, SB 97, was being enforced and is contributing positively to the overall graduation rate for the state.

Wayne Lewis asked whether students who withdraw to home school environments were counting against the state's dropout rates. Rhonda Sims confirmed that these students are not classified as dropouts.

The board then transitioned to the indicator of "opportunity and access". Sims explained that KDE would still need to build systems or expand on current data systems to begin collecting many aspects of the measures within this piece of the proposed system. Sims said that the metrics associated with the measures were not included in the regulation and would come forward for approval as board policy, once they are defined, collected, and modeled.

Jennifer Stafford called attention to page 5 of the regulation, which is where this indicator is included. Stafford highlighted the amendments that had been made since the first reading of the regulation.

Sims noted that acceptance of the proposed opportunity and access indicators had grown significantly over time. She indicated that most shareholders had acknowledged the challenges associated with the data collection, but stated that measurement of such inputs were well worth the effort.

Board member Rich Gimmel expressed concern about applying the measures of whole child supports to all schools, regardless of their size. Gimmel noted the concern of fairness, given funding limitations, resources and local capacity. Sims clarified that the proposal provided a menu of options, only requiring a school to choose a minimum of two.

Ben Cundiff referenced a letter received by the KBE from the Kentucky Arts Council. Sims indicated that some of the recommendations from the letter were addressed in the changes, while others needed deeper discussion by the board.

Gary Houchens reminded board members that the inclusion of this indicator had some trade-offs. He said that while its inclusion is reflective of what the state has heard from shareholders, there are many details still to be developed. He noted that the regulation language was defining what to assess schools on, but language was not yet included on how the state would assess the indicators. Kathy Gornik expressed a concern that the state may be asking schools to do too much in regard to whole child supports. Gornik asked how community and parental involvement might also be reflected in the system. Commissioner Pruitt stated that, for many schools and districts, partnerships would be critical and can be captured in the system.

Wayne Lewis referenced a requirement of ESSA that mandates accountability data to be disaggregated by student groups. Lewis noted that some proposed measures of the opportunity and access indicator did not appear to be ones that could be disaggregated. Lewis asked what the board's "Plan B" was, should this piece of the indicator not get approved by the United States

Department of Education. Commissioner Pruitt stated that any indicators not approved for the rating would still be publicly reported for transparency. Pruitt went on to reflect on a legislative hearing where U.S. Senator Lamar Alexander urged Kentucky to be bold in its ESSA plan. Pruitt said that Alexander was quoted saying "If you believe in it, put it in your plan and make the feds tell you no." Board member Ben Cundiff posed the question, "Are we working for students or are we working for the United States Department of Education?" Following discussion, the board ultimately indicated consensus to move forward with the opportunity and access indicator as it had been proposed, with the understanding that feedback on the ESSA state plan may require changes at a later time.

The board then began discussing the proposed star rating for the overall system. Brian Gong stated that the discussion to this point had focused on the individual indicators of the system; however, pointed out that the discussion would now move to how those indicators combine for an overall rating for schools and districts. Gong noted that all indicators are rated from "very low" to "very high". He said that the patterns shown on the proposed table indicate the star rating, based on the levels of performance. Gong stated that the rating proposal was fundamentally different from Kentucky's former accountability system, which gave number values to each component. Gong said that the proposal includes what information goes into each measure; however, he clarified that what constitutes the performance levels of low/medium/high would be defined through a standard-setting process with statistical experts. He also reminded board members that the regulation does not specify weights for each indicator of the system, but instead provides suggested ranges of weights.

Gong drew attention to the fact that the highest possible rating for a school or district with achievement gap issues is a 3-star rating. He also noted that the state's lowest-performing schools (known as the bottom 5% required by ESSA) are reflected in the 1-star rating. Mary Gwen Wheeler inquired about how the bottom 5% is determined, asking if the standards-setting is done only once or more frequently. Rhonda Sims clarified that once cut scores are determined, they are only changed when state assessments are changed. Gary Houchens noted that the ESSA plan was required to include a description of how the state will identify schools in need of intervention and the exit criteria. Houchens inquired why this information wasn't in the current draft of the regulation. Staff indicated that this information was explicit in Senate Bill 1 and that an additional regulation would be coming forth that addresses this criteria.

In regard to long-term and interim state goals, Rhonda Sims began explaining the proposal. She stated that the proposed achievement gap closure goal is to close the gap by 50% by the year 2030. Sims indicated that data from 2012 through the current academic year was used to build the baseline for this goal. Sims asked the board to respond to this proposal. The board had deep discussion on this topic. Some members cited concern that this goal was not rigorous and urgent enough, while others cited concern about setting goals that were unattainable and unrealistic. Several board members cited the need for adequate resources and support to assist schools and districts in achieving the goals set forth for the state. Seeing that the board could not reach consensus on this issue, Chair Twyman asked that KDE staff revisit the goals and come back to the third reading with several options for board members to vote on. Board member Sam Hinkle closed out the discussion by expressing a belief that a separate and intentional focus was needed, aside from the proposed assessment and accountability system, in order to truly help the state's most

under-served students to succeed. Hinkle cited that by doing so, the board could truly focus on the support systems and strategies that were necessary in order to accomplish such goals.

Brian Gong was asked to summarize the items associated with the proposal that pose potential challenges with approval of the ESSA plan. Those items were:

- Separate Academic Indicators of Science and Social Studies
- Opportunity and access measures that are not able to be disaggregated
- Language surrounding the identification of the state's bottom 5% of schools
- Reporting proposal for English Language Learners
- Assessment of Reading/Writing versus English/Language Arts
- Comparability and rigor of measures

Gong also noted substantial strengths associated with Kentucky's accountability proposal. Those items were:

- the inclusion of the Opportunity and Access indicator;
- the transition readiness connections to postsecondary requirements;
- the merging of state and federal accountability systems;
- the systematic and extensive process for development; and
- the proposed goals.

With no further questions or concerns from the board, Chair Twyman thanked KDE staff and Brian Gong for their dedication to the development of the proposed system.

V. Administrative Regulations Related to Charter Schools

Due to time limitations, Roger Marcum recommended modifying the agenda to delay the first reading of the four (4) charter school regulations, stating that they could be heard at the board's next special-called meeting. General Counsel Kevin Brown clarified that doing so would not change the anticipated promulgation timeline. Rich Gimmel moved to defer the following regulations to the board's next special meeting (date to be determined):

- 701 KAR 8:010
- 701 KAR 8:020
- 701 KAR 8:030
- 701 KAR 8:040

The motion was seconded by Milton Seymore and passed with a unanimous voice vote.

V.A. 701 KAR 8:010, Student Application, lottery and enrollment (Review Item: 1st Reading) - Kevin Brown, KDE Associate Commissioner and General Counsel

Approved for deferral.

V.B. 701 KAR 8:020, Evaluation of authorizer performance (Review Item: First Reading) - Kevin Brown, KDE Associate Commissioner and General Counsel

Approved for deferral.

V.C. 701 KAR 8:030, Revocation and nonrenewal process for authorizers (Review Item: First Reading) - Kevin Brown, KDE Associate Commissioner and General Counsel

Approved for deferral.

V.D. 701 KAR 8:040, Conversion charter school creation and operation (Review Item: First Reading) - Kevin Brown, KDE Associate Commissioner and General Counsel

Approved for deferral.

VI. RECESS

The board recessed at 4:05 p.m. ET until the following morning.