

# School Accountability Performance Standard Setting for Fall 2018



## Recommendations from the Standard Setting Committee and the Interim Commissioner of Education

Report to the Kentucky Board of Education

September 5, 2018

# Background

- ▶ Kentucky is required to identify schools for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) and Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) for Fall 2018
- ▶ At least 5% of Title 1 schools must be identified for CSI
- ▶ No set amount required for TSI; TSI identification is any school with at least one student group performing at the CSI level (determining CSI therefore automatically determines TSI)



# Need

- ▶ The Kentucky Board of Education (KBE) approved in **703 KAR 5:270** the design for CSI identification, including the Indicators, design, and weights for combining performance across the Indicators
- ▶ The specific threshold cutscores for each Indicator need to be established, i.e., what combination (profile) of scores will qualify a school for CSI



# Standard Setting

- ▶ KBE approved a Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) proposal for how to establish CSI performance thresholds:
  - A standard setting committee would use a formal standard setting process to generate recommendations for the Commissioner
  - The Commissioner of Education would recommend CSI threshold cutscores to KBE
  - KBE would make a final determination of CSI threshold cutscores to adopt



# Summary of Standard Setting Committee's Workshop

- ▶ **Givens**
- ▶ **People**
- ▶ **Process**
- ▶ **Results**



# Givens for Standard Setting

- ▶ At least 5% Title 1 schools identified for CSI, by elementary, middle and high school levels
  - Kentucky will include any non-Title 1 schools as well
- ▶ Indicators will consist of KBE-approved measures available in 2017-18
- ▶ Weight ranges determined by KBE
- ▶ Use a “profile method” because SB1 does not allow an overall score that could be used to rank schools
- ▶ Standards will be reset next year for 5-star system, and CSI/TSI when additional Indicators are available



# Givens: Indicators

For Fall 2018, Indicators are:

Elementary Schools	Middle Schools	High Schools
Proficiency		Proficiency
Separate Academic Indicator		Transition Readiness
Growth		Graduation Rate





# Indicators



## Elementary and Middle Schools

Indicator	Measures	Metric
Proficiency	Reading and mathematics tests	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Index Score (0-125)</li> <li>• N=0, A=.50, P=1.0, D=1.25</li> <li>• Each score from reading &amp; mathematics weighted equally</li> </ul>
Separate Academic Indicator	Science, social studies and writing tests	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Index Score (0-125)</li> <li>• N=0, A=.50, P=1.0, D=1.25</li> <li>• Each score from science, social studies &amp; writing weighted equally</li> </ul>
Growth	Reading and mathematics tests, English Language Proficiency (ELP) tests	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Growth Score (about -150 to + 150)</li> <li>• Value table that assigns points for (projected) individual student growth</li> <li>• Each score from reading, mathematics, ELP weighted equally</li> </ul>



# Indicators



High Schools		
Indicator	Measures	Metric
Proficiency	Reading and mathematics sections from ACT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Index Score (0-125)</li> <li>• N=0, A=.50, P=1.0, D=1.25 (ACT levels)</li> <li>• Each score from reading &amp; weighted equally</li> </ul>
Transition Readiness	Academic Readiness (ACT, AP, IB, CAI, ELP) Career Readiness (Ind. Cert.; CTE EOP exam; Apprenticeship)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transition Readiness Rate (0-100)</li> <li>• Percentage of graduating cohort who have a high school diploma and also demonstrate Academic or Career Readiness</li> </ul>
Graduation Rate	4- and 5-year Graduation Rates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Percentage of 9<sup>th</sup> grade students (adjusted) who graduated in 4 or 5 years</li> <li>• Average of 4- and 5-year rates (0-100)</li> </ul>

# Givens: Weights

- ▶ Approved weight ranges in Kentucky regulation reflect relative emphasis (adjusted for three indicators)

**Weight Ranges for each Indicator, by Grade Level**

Elementary Schools	Middle Schools	High Schools
Proficiency (24-41%)	Proficiency (24-41%)	Proficiency (20-71%)
Separate Academic Indicator (24-41%)	Separate Academic Indicator (24-41%)	Transition Readiness (30-53%)
Growth (32-49%)	Growth (32-49%)	Graduation Rate (10-27%)



# People

## Representative leaders from across the state

### Members of the Accountability Performance Standard Setting Committee

**Houston Barber, Superintendent, Frankfort Independent schools**

**Travis Burton, Manager, public affairs, Kentucky Chamber of Commerce**

**Aaron Collins, Superintendent, Fulton Co. schools**

**Rhonda Colvin, Director of Special Education, Lawrence Co. schools**

**Jim Evans, Superintendent, Lee Co. schools**

**Larry Garrity, Principal, Webster Co. Area Technology Center**

**Hal Heiner, Chair, Kentucky Board of Education**

**Gary Houchens, Member, Kentucky Board of Education**

**Nancy Hutchinson, Executive Director, Kentucky Educational Development Corporation**

**Ann Elisabeth Larson, Dean, College of Education and Human Development, University of Louisville**

**Marty Pollio, Superintendent, Jefferson Co. schools**

**Amanda Reed, District Assessment Coordinator, LaRue Co. schools**

**John Scott, Parent, Covington Independent schools and member of Commissioner's Parent Advisory**

**Travis Wilder, Principal, Corbin Primary School, Corbin Independent schools**

**Wayne Young, Executive Director, Kentucky Association of School Administrators**



# Standard Setting Process - Overview



- ▶ Standard setting committee exercises expert judgment to set the accountability performance threshold cutscores
  - Not simply a statistical process because there are many possible ways to define the CSI criteria, complying with the Givens
- ▶ Systematic process known as 'standard setting' is used to to elicit standard setting committee members' judgments and make a final recommendation to KDE
  - This type of standard setting process is widely used to establish threshold criteria for assessment achievement levels (e.g., Novice (N), Apprentice (A), Proficient (P), Distinguished (D))
  - Has advantages of being systematic, public, policy-sensitive, and data-informed, and well-documented

# Standard Setting Process – Details

- ▶ Participants met Aug. 22, 2018 and were welcomed and given their charge by Dr. Wayne Lewis, Commissioner of Education
- ▶ Participants were provided essential background on Kentucky's school accountability system and training on standard-setting procedures
- ▶ Each participant independently determined the performance thresholds for identifying schools for CSI
- ▶ Data about performance thresholds were shared and discussed with the whole standard setting committee
- ▶ These steps were repeated for a second round
- ▶ Following the second round, the group discussed and made a group recommendation about the final recommended threshold cutscores
- ▶ This process was conducted three times, to establish criteria separately for elementary, middle and high schools





# Standard Setting Supports

- ▶ Because the standard setting committee members had to consider several things that interacted in complex ways, a software tool was provided to help
  - Displayed performance on each Indicator, both in percentile of performance and in the metric (e.g., Proficiency as an index score)
  - Allowed input of threshold cutscores
  - Showed impact in terms of numbers and percentages of schools identified
  - Showed weights for each Indicator





# Software Tool - Example



MS Worksheet 82118 KDE.xlsx (Read-Only)

Search in Sheet

Calibri (Body) 12

Home Layout Tables Charts SmartArt Formulas Data Review

Edit Font Alignment Number Format Cells Themes

Paste Fill Clear B I U Wrap Text Merge Conditional Formatting Styles Insert Delete Format Themes

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
1	Percentile	Proficiency	Separate	Growth Rate		Cut	Relative Weight			
2	0.01	39.4	31.0	4.3	Schools below what proficiency rate should be classified as CSI for 2017-2018?	62.0	35.0			
3	0.02	43.9	38.3	4.6	Schools below what separate academic indicator rate should be classified as CSI for 2017-2018?	55.0	28.2			
4	0.03	49.1	45.2	5.9	Schools below what growth score should be classified as CSI for 2017-2018?	9.5	36.8			
5	0.04	51.2	48.3	6.4			100			
6	0.05	52.3	49.3	6.8						
7	0.06	54.3	49.6	7.2						
8	0.07	55.6	50.5	7.4	Number of Schools Below Proficiency Criterion	41				
9	0.08	56.2	51.8	7.9	Percent of Schools Below Proficiency Criterion	0.17				
10	0.09	56.6	52.1	8.2	Number of Schools Below Separate Rate Criterion	33				
11	0.1	57.1	52.6	8.3	Percent of Schools Below Separate Rate Criterion	0.14				
12	0.11	58.2	53.4	8.4	Number of Schools Below Growth Rate Criterion	43				
13	0.12	59.1	53.9	8.5	Percent of Schools Below Growth Rate Criterion	0.18				
14	0.13	59.9	54.6	8.6	Schools Below All Criteria	12				
15	0.14	60.5	55.0	8.8	Percent of Schools Below all Criteria	0.050				
16	0.15	61.0	55.7	8.9						
17	0.16	61.4	56.1	9.2						
18	0.17	61.9	56.4	9.3						
19	0.18	62.1	56.6	9.5						
20	0.19	62.5	57.3	9.5						
21	0.2	63.0	57.5	9.6						
22	0.21	63.5	57.6	9.7						
23	0.22	64.0	58.0	9.8						
24	0.23	64.8	58.6	9.9						
25	0.24	65.1	58.8	9.9						



# Standard Setting Results – Rounds 1 & 2

## ► Rounds 1 & 2 results indicated:

- Many different recommended threshold cutscores
- More agreement in Round 2 after Round 1 discussion
- Median score a robust indicator for the “average” threshold cutscore recommendation

## ► Discussion after Round 2 indicated:

- Committee recommended adjustments to the Round 2 median scores
- High agreement by committee on final recommended threshold cutscores
  - ✓ Triangulated with evaluations after the meeting: 14 of 15 members “Agreed” or “Strongly Agreed” that the standard-setting process will help set appropriate expectations for identifying schools for CSI in fall 2018, and that the Committee’s recommendations were reasonable and appropriate; one member “Disagreed”

# Additional Recommendation

- ▶ The standard setting committee recommended that KDE investigate whether an additional set of threshold cutscores might be needed to identify schools with “jagged profiles”—very low performance on two indicators and relatively higher performance on the third (perhaps less valued) indicator, where the latter would cause the school not to be identified for CSI
- ▶ KDE’s analyses indicate very few additional schools would be identified using this additional set of threshold cutscores (1 or 2 schools per grade level; all would be identified for TSI)



# Final Recommended Threshold Cutscores to Identify Schools for CSI



Sch. Level	Indicators	Recommended threshold cutscores*	Number of CSI Schools	Percent of Title 1 Schools
Elem. Sch.	Proficiency	60.5	33	5.1
	Separate Academic Indicator	52.6		
	Growth	15.8		
Middle Sch.	Proficiency	62.0	12	5.0
	Separate Academic Indicator	55.0		
	Growth	9.5		
High Sch.	Proficiency	40.0	6	5.8
	Transition Readiness	41.0		
	Graduation Rate	85.3		

\*Recommended threshold cutscores are in the metric of each indicator (e.g., Proficiency Index)

# Commissioner's Recommendation for CSI



# Commissioner's Recommendation

- Dr. Lewis recommends, with one exception, that the KBE approve the standard setting committee's recommended cutscores to identify CSI
- The one exception is to decrease the cutscore for the graduation rate Indicator from 85.3 to 85

HIGH SCHOOL	Recommended Cutscores	Relative Weight	Number of CSI Schools	Percent of CSI Schools
Proficiency	40	40.6	5	5
Transition Readiness	41	40.6		
Graduation Rate	85	18.8		





