



Growth Indicator Work Group Recommendation and Amendments to 703 KAR 5:270

Kentucky Board of Education Meeting

December 5, 2018

Rhonda Sims, Associate Commissioner

Jennifer Stafford, Division Director



Growth Indicator

Background and Process

- During development of the accountability system, “individual student growth” was consistently valued
- For 2018, the growth model defined growth in relation to Proficiency
- Were students “on track” to be proficient using a projection of student data two years into the future



Background and Process

After 2018 reporting, multiple comments on growth were received:

- ▶ The growth model is difficult to understand and explain, especially “projected growth.”
- ▶ The projected growth sometimes does not fit the observed performance of students; occasionally the mismatch is severe.
- ▶ Educators feel schools should be accountable for the results of students while in their schools, not performance that might happen in the future.
- ▶ The growth model is too tied to Proficiency, and somewhat duplicative of the Proficiency Indicator.



Background and Process

- Schools received credit, both moving up and down



Projected	Novice	Novice	Apprentice	Apprentice	Proficient	Distinguished
Current	Low	High	Low	High		
Distinguished	-1.50 (L)	-1.25 (L)	-1.00 (L)	-0.75 (L)	0.00 (K)	0.25 (K)
Proficient	-1.00 (L)	-0.75 (L)	-0.50 (L)	-0.25 (L)	0.25 (K)	0.50 (M)
Apprentice High	-0.75 (L)	-0.50 (L)	-0.25 (L)	0 (L)	0.25 (C)	0.75 (M)
Apprentice Low	-0.50 (L)	-0.25 (L)	0 (L)	0.25 (L)	0.50 (C)	1.00 (M)
Novice High	-0.25 (L)	0 (L)	0.25 (L)	0.50 (C)	0.75 (C)	1.25 (M)
Novice Low	0 (L)	0.25 (L)	0.50 (C)	0.75 (C)	1.00 (C)	1.50 (M)

Growth Indicator Work Group

- Commissioner Lewis authorized establishment of a Growth Indicator Work Group with the charge to consider options for defining and measuring growth
- Met in a public meeting on October 24 and November 9, 2018
- Brian Gong with the Center for Assessment facilitated the discussion on the Growth Indicator



Growth Indicator Work Group Participants

#	Name	Role	Location
1	Mike Lafavers	Superintendent	Boyle County
2	Rob Fletcher	Superintendent	Lawrence County
3	Jerry Green	Superintendent	Pikeville Independent
4	Travis Hamby	Superintendent	Trigg County
5	Mike Borchers	Superintendent	Ludlow Independent
6	Jana Beth Francis	District Assessment Coordinator	Daviess County
7	Teresa Nicholas	District Assessment Coordinator	Pulaski County
8	Patrice Thompson	District Assessment Coordinator	Paris Independent
9	David Meinschein	District Assessment Coordinator	Ballard County
10	Jeff Stamper	District Assessment Coordinator	Wolfe County
11	Florence Chang/Joe Prather	Data Management Specialist	Jefferson County
12	Twanjua Jones	Principal, Yates Elementary	Fayette County
13	Lorri Stivers	Principal, Shelby County West Middle	Shelby County
14	Nyree Clayton-Taylor	Teacher, Elementary (Wheatley)	Jefferson County
15	Barry Baird	Teacher, Middle (Whitley Co. Middle)	Whitley County

Growth Indicator Desired Characteristics	
SHOULD BE	SHOULD NOT BE
<p>Fair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Every school should have a chance to do well on growth • Growth should reflect what did happen, not what might happen • Equitable <p>Actionable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concrete goal known ahead of time for school improvement • Interpretable • Improved growth scores reflect “my kids and my school system” <p>Different information than provided by other indicators in the assessment and accountability systems</p> <p>Predictive</p> <p>Simple</p> <p>Understandable, Explainable</p> <p>Usable/user friendly</p> <p>Reliable, consistent</p> <p>Accurate</p> <p>Non-gameable</p> <p>Leverage point</p> <p>Reasonable</p>	<p>Complicated</p> <p>Black box</p> <p>Projected</p> <p>Confusing</p> <p>Duplicated</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EL students in accountability for both ELP and ELA



Growth Indicator Recommended Principles

1. Growth indicator should provide substantially different information than that provided by other indicators in the assessment and accountability systems
2. Growth should be based on observed (measured) student performance over time
3. No matter where student starts, comparable positive growth earns comparable credit
4. More positive change earns more positive credit
5. Learning more challenging content in a subsequent grade should be recognized as positive change, although the label may be the same (e.g., Apprentice in grade 3, Apprentice in grade 4; or 50th percentile in grade 3, 50th percentile in grade 4)
6. The growth system should focus on positive growth; all “negative growth” should be treated the same, regardless of whether a student declined more or less
7. Growth at extremely high and extremely low performances should be treated the same as other growth to the extent technically feasible



8. All students should be included in growth to the extent technically feasible, within the constraints of the law, including students with severe cognitive disabilities and English Learner students
 - a. The growth credit should be as comparable across the different assessments as possible, e.g., maximum credit should be the same
 - b. English Learner students should be included once, not twice, for growth in the accountability system
9. The system should be sensitive to growth, but the accountability results should be adequately reliable and resistant to being “gamed”
10. The system should be understandable, useful, and credible, especially with those who receive reports and who use the results to inform educational and/or policy actions
 - a. The reporting scale should be clear (e.g., avoid negative numbers)
11. Growth should be included as an indicator in determining school accountability ratings; other aspects of growth performance might be useful to report as well
12. The growth model for Kentucky school accountability should be based on Kentucky achievement levels
 - a. The Kentucky Department of Education should investigate the feasibility and desirability of using scale scores, particularly a vertical scale



Growth Indicator Value Table:

Points for student performance in Year 2, given performance in Year 1

		Year 2 Student Performance					
		NL	NH	AL	AH	P	D
Year 1 Student Performance	D	0	0	0	0	0	50
	P	0	0	0	0	50	100
	AH	0	0	0	50	100	150
	AL	0	0	50	100	150	200
	NH	0	50	100	150	200	250
	NL	0	100	150	200	250	300

NL=Novice Low; NH=Novice High; AL= Apprentice Low; AH=Apprentice High;
P=Proficient; D=Distinguished

How to use the value table to generate a school's growth score: For each student for whom the school is accountable for growth, use the table to find the number of points assigned for that student's growth. Sum the numbers and divide the total by the number of accountable students. Round to one decimal point for reporting.



KDE Tasks Following Meeting

► Analysis

- Compliance of the Value Table with the Principles
- Interpretability of School Growth Scores
- Reliability and Sensitivity
- Interaction with Other Accountability Elements

► Research

- Inclusion of English Learners for growth based on acquisition of English language only





Proposed Amendments to Kentucky's Accountability System Regulation

703 KAR 5:270

Dual Credit Amendment

- October KBE meeting introduced in first reading
- FROM “completing six or more hours of KDE-approved dual credit and receiving a grade of B or higher in each course”
- TO “completing six hours of KDE-approved dual credit and receiving a grade of C or higher in each course.”



Why Change?

- A “C” is an appropriate expectation for a minimum standard for students to meet under transition readiness.
- The letter grade “C” is an acceptable postsecondary standard and is transferable between Kentucky postsecondary institutions.



Growth Indicator (Elementary/Middle)

- Implement new value tables based on principles and recommendations from work group
- Edit calculation to use previous year to current student performance
- Eliminate projection of student data



First Year Implementation of Accountability Indicators

- ▶ KDE staff has continued to review and discuss all indicators of the accountability model
- ▶ Based on comments received and review of federal and state law, additional regulatory changes are proposed to simplify the accountability system and to continue complying with legal requirements



Transition Readiness at Elementary and Middle School

- ▶ A composite scores combining all content areas is scheduled to enter accountability in 2018-2019
- ▶ The indicator uses the same student performance data as Proficiency and Separate Academic Indicator
- ▶ Recommend removing the indicator for accountability



Achievement Gap Closure Indicator (all levels)

- ▶ Simplify the calculation by including only reading and mathematics



Opportunity and Access (all levels)

- ▶ Based on concerns with data collection, replace Opportunity and Access language in current regulation with requirement in Kentucky statute–Quality of School Climate and Safety
- ▶ Staff will develop metrics for Quality of School Climate and Safety for the KBE to consider and approve



703 KAR 5:270 Amendment

Tentative Timeline

- **October – KBE First Read**
- **December – KBE Second Read**
- **January – Public Comment Period (written and oral)**
- **February – KBE Statement of Consideration**
- **Spring – Legislative Committees**
- **Expected to be effective for 2018-2019 reporting**





Questions and Answers

