2023 Kentucky School Accountability System Performance Standard Setting Summary Report

February 7, 2024
Center for Assessment

Introduction

The Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) is charged with evaluating and reporting school performance according to prescribed performance levels for *Status*, *Change*, and for *Indicator* and *Overall* performance ratings.

- Status refers to how schools performed in the most recent year and is described by performance levels: Very Low, Low, Medium, High, and Very High. It is one of two Indicator components.
- Change refers to how schools' performance changed from the previous year compared to the most recent year and is described by performance levels: Declined Significantly, Declined, Maintained, Increased, and Increased Significantly. It is one of two Indicator components.
- Indicators are components of the accountability system and are composed of Status and Change outcomes. Combined Status and Change Scores result in the Indicator Score. Combined Status and Change Levels result in an Indicator Performance Rating, which are reported as one of five colors: Red, Orange, Yellow, Green, and Blue.
- Overall refers to the schools' combined performance on all Indicators. Indicator Scores are weighted and added together to produce an Overall Score. Overall Performance Ratings are reported as one of five colors: Red, Orange, Yellow, Green, and Blue.

This requirement necessitates descriptions of performance at each level or rating, and criteria that define the accepted range of outcomes for one level or rating contrasted with another level or rating. These descriptions and criteria - or cut scores - are established through a standard setting process.

This report recounts how the descriptions and criteria for evaluating school performance were established for Kentucky's school accountability system for 2023. It starts with background information including context for system requirements. It then describes the accountability standard setting process. Finally, it presents the final cut scores approved by the KDE and Local Superintendents Advisory Council (LSAC) as required in state statute. The appendices provide information about standard setting panelists and results of the meeting evaluations.

Background

Several aspects of Kentucky's school accountability system were established by the General Assembly and the Kentucky State Board of Education.

The Kentucky General Assembly passed SB 158 in 2020, establishing parameters for a school accountability system substantially different from the one in place in 2019. Such changes, in conjunction with changes in the assessment system, necessitated a performance standard setting process. The law required that the cut scores be reported as percentiles when they are established, and that KDE and the Local Superintendents Advisory Committee (LSAC) approve final cut scores.

KRS 158.6455 requires that these six Indicators exclusively comprise Kentucky's school accountability system: State Assessment Results in Reading and Mathematics; State Assessment Results in Science, Social Studies, and Writing; English Learner Progress; Quality of School Climate and Safety; Postsecondary Readiness (for high schools only); and Graduation Rate (for high schools only). Each of these Indicators has two components: *Status* is a measure of performance in the current year, and *Change* measures how performance differs from the prior year to the current year.

KRS 158.6455 also establishes the levels and ratings that comprise the system. There are five Status Levels: Very Low, Low, Medium, High, and Very High. There are also five Change Levels: Declined Significantly, Declined, Maintained, Increased, and Increased Significantly. Status Levels and Change Levels are associated with a reported color: Red, Orange, Yellow, Green, or Blue, respectively. Indicator Performance Ratings are reported as one of the five colors; they do not have a level. Finally, Overall Performance Ratings are also reported as one of the five colors.

The Kentucky Board of Education (KBE) established the relative weights for each of the indicators in determining the Overall Score for elementary, middle, and high schools in regulation in 2021 (703 KAR 5:270). These weights are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Relative Indicator Weights for Overall Scores

	State Assessment Results in Reading and Mathematics	State Assessment Results in Science, Social Studies, and Writing	English Learner Progress	Quality of School Climate and Safety	Postsecondary Readiness	Graduation Rate
Elementary	51	40	5	4		
Middle	46	45	5	4		

	State Assessment Results in Reading and Mathematics	State Assessment Results in Science, Social Studies, and Writing	English Learner Progress	Quality of School Climate and Safety	Postsecondary Readiness	Graduation Rate
High	45	20	5	4	20	6

KBE also established the table below, which determines Indicator Performance Ratings based on Status and Change Levels in the current year. This is shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Indicator Ratings based on combined Status and Change Levels for All Indicators and Grade Spans

	Change Declined Significantly	Change Declined	Change Maintained	Change Increased	Change Increased Significantly
Very High Status in current year	Yellow	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue
High Status in current year	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Green	Blue
Medium Status in current year	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green
Low Status in current year	Red	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Yellow
Very Low Status in current year	Red	Red	Red	Orange	Yellow

This table presents the Indicator Performance Ratings that result from each combination of current year Status and Change Levels. For example, a school with Status Level of Medium and a Change Level of Increased would have a resulting Indicator Performance Rating of Green. This table applies to all Indicators across all grade spans. It does not apply to Overall Performance Ratings.

The requirements in KRS 158.6455 and the policies enacted by the Kentucky Board of Education delineate aspects of the accountability standard setting process by impacting which components of the accountability system need cut score recommendations by the standard setting panelists. Specifically, panelists recommend performance descriptors for Status Levels, Change Levels, Indicator Performance Ratings (based on the table adopted by KBE), and Overall Performance

Ratings. They also recommend cut scores that distinguish the different Status Levels and Change Levels and Overall Performance Ratings. Because the Indicator Performance Rating table stipulates which combinations of Status and Change Levels result in different Indicator Performance Ratings, no cut scores need to be established for Indicator Performance Ratings.

The requirement to include both Status and Change components necessitated two separate standard setting events. Due to interruptions to state academic testing, it was not possible to measure change in the 2021-2022 accountability cycle. As such, the first year of the accountability system (2021-2022) reflected only Status, i.e., the Indicator Score was the same as the Status Score. In 2022-2023 the accountability system would incorporate both Status and Change. Hence, there was an accountability performance standard setting process in 2022 that dealt only with Status in generating Indicator (Status only) and Overall Performance Ratings. The process and results from that process are documented in a separate report. This document describes the accountability performance standard setting process that took place in 2023, which included both Status and Change components of the system.

Accountability Standard Setting

KDE contracted with the Center for Assessment (the Center) to design and conduct an accountability standard setting workshop. The process used was based on similar procedures the Center for Assessment has implemented in other states, and that was employed for the 2022 process in Kentucky, with customizations appropriate for Kentucky's unique needs and context.

Panel

The KDE established a panel of 27 members who were broadly representative of persons and organizations, including teachers, knowledgeable and involved with Kentucky school performance quality from elementary through high school as indicated by Kentucky's school accountability system. The panel included school, district, and regional (from education cooperatives) staff, members of the Kentucky Board of Education, parents, and a student representative from the Commissioner's Student Advisory Council. The panelists representing schools and districts had experience working with diverse populations of students (e.g., English learners, students with disabilities, and students from different racial and ethnic backgrounds) and in a variety of roles (e.g., a principal of a high school focused on career and technical education, an elementary classroom teacher). In addition, the panelists represented schools and districts of varying performance.

A full list of panel members and their affiliations is provided in Appendix A.

Process

The accountability standard setting process was implemented across two different events totalling five days, held in person at the Kentucky Department of Education in Frankfort. On June 22-23, 2023, the panel convened to review and discuss performance descriptors for Status Levels, Change Levels, Indicator Performance Ratings, and Overall Performance Ratings. On September 13-15, 2023, the panel convened to recommend cut scores that differentiate the five Status Levels, Change Levels, and Overall Performance Ratings. Performance descriptors and cut scores were established separately for elementary, middle, and high school grade spans.

KDE and the Center worked closely with LSAC and the Kentucky Technical Advisory Council in advance of the workshops. The Local Superintendents Advisory Council (LSAC) is a statutorily mandated advisory group comprising 11 members appointed by the Legislative Research Commission; seven members represent each of the state Supreme Court districts and four members serve the state at-large.

The Kentucky Technical Advisory Council (KTAC) is an advisory group established by the Kentucky Department of Education whose purpose is to provide advice and recommendations relating to the development and modification of the state's assessment and accountability system, development of administrative regulations governing the assessment and accountability system, and setting of standards used in assessment and accountability.

LSAC and KTAC have specific roles in relation to the standard setting process because 703 KAR 5:270 requires that the accountability standard setting process be advised by the Kentucky Department of Education Technical Advisory Council (KTAC), the School Curriculum, Assessment and Accountability Council (SCAAC), the Local Superintendent Advisory Council (LSAC), and the Office of Education Accountability (OEA). The department sought the advice of these advisory groups regarding the standard setting process in the meetings below and via supplemental email correspondence, and received feedback from each group prior to implementation.

> KTAC: February 14, 2023
> SCAAC: March 21, 2023
> LSAC: March 28 and May 30, 2023
> OEA: May 31, 2023

Pre-Workshop Preparations

Coordination with key partners: LSAC and KTAC

KDE and Center staff met with LSAC two times prior to the June workshop via webinar. The intent of these meetings was to consult with LSAC about system priorities and the standard setting plan.

At the March 28, 2023, LSAC meeting, KDE and Center staff provided information about the accountability system, focusing on the incorporation in 2023 of the Change component; reviewed the proposed three-part approach and timeline for the standard setting process, and; introduced policy questions for LSAC's consideration and guidance.

In order to inform LSAC's further contributions regarding the policy guidance, the questions were distributed to LSAC members via survey following the March meeting. Summarized responses were shared with KDE and the Center to inform planning and future conversations.

At the May 30, 2023, LSAC meeting, KDE and Center staff provided further accountability system details and reviewed the responses received from the policy questions introduced at the March meeting. LSAC members had an opportunity to refine or add to the summary guidance at this time. LSAC then voted to approve the standard setting plan for 2023 and designated two members to participate in the standard setting process. These were the same members who served on the standard setting panel in 2022.

The accountability standard setting plans were discussed at the February 14 and June 13, 2023 meetings of the Kentucky Technical Advisory Committee (KTAC). KTAC provided advice concerning validity evidence, recruiting representative panelists, incorporating Change, making the cognitive demand on panelists manageable, and other aspects of the standard setting workshop plan.

Development of workshop tools

A variety of tools and materials were necessary to facilitate the performance level descriptor (PLD) and standard setting workshops. Some resources were developed and distributed in advance of the meetings. Others were prepared in advance for use in the meeting.

Prior to the June PLD workshop, panelists received the agenda and a brief overview video describing the standard setting process and what to expect in the June and September workshops. Prior to the September standard setting workshop, panelists received the agenda and a video that described what to expect at the workshop and provided a summary of the accountability system components, weights, and combining rules.

Panelists were able to access relevant materials for each workshop from a website developed for the standard setting process. For the PLD workshop, these materials included a detailed agenda, slide deck, draft PLDs, and documents to capture table discussion notes. For the standard setting workshop, the website provided a central point of access to a detailed agenda, meeting slide decks for each day, updated PLDs, forms for panelists to submit and edit their recommendations, profile sheets to inform Overall Performance Rating cut score recommendations, and an online data tool panelists could use to explore impact data for different Status, Change, and Overall cut scores.

Panelists also had meeting folders for each event. At the June PLD workshop, folders included a summary agenda, draft performance level descriptors, a list of panelists, and an "at a glance" document describing Kentucky's accountability system. At the September standard setting folders included a summary agenda, draft performance level descriptors updated following the June meeting, a list of panelists, and the Kentucky Accountability System at a glance document.

June Workshop: Performance Level Descriptors (PLDs)

Draft performance level descriptors for Status Levels, Change Levels, and Overall Performance Ratings were the focus of the June PLD workshop. To inform their work, panelists had draft PLDs prepared by the Center with KDE prior to the June workshop. The drafts incorporated feedback from the 2022 accountability standard setting as a starting point. The PLDs employ both normative and criterion-referenced information, which are described in the introduction to each accountability system component.

In the workshop, KDE staff provided an overview of the accountability system, accounting for the addition in 2023 of a Change component for each Indicator. Center staff then provided a brief overview of each Indicator's Status component and the respective draft PLDs. Status data from 2022 were shared as 2023 data were not yet available. Panelists had time to review the draft PLDs individually before engaging in table discussion to share their reactions to the drafts and learn from their peers. Panelists were encouraged to use the data as one factor combined with their individual expertise, experience, and judgment to shape their recommendations. Following small group discussions, panelists shared their perspectives as a full group. The facilitators recorded the collective feedback, focusing on areas of agreement, to inform revisions to the draft Status Level descriptors.

Center staff then facilitated the same process - individual, table, and full group review and discussion - for the Change component of each Indicator. For Change, panelists reviewed the draft PLDs without data because 2023 results were not yet available. Panelists were then provided an opportunity to review and ask clarifying questions about the draft Indicator Performance Rating Descriptors that describe the Indicator Performance Rating table established by KBE.

Lastly, Center staff provided an overview of Overall Performance Ratings, noting the importance of understanding Indicator weights. Panelists again had time for individual review, table discussion, and full group discussion.

Group feedback on PLDs

For Status Level descriptors, panelists liked that the drafts reflected a consistency of language throughout, and pushed for confirmation that agreed-upon terms were being applied consistently throughout all PLDs. They noted that describing performance for a "minority" of students, on

average, could be confused as a reference to minoritized populations of students. Finally, they requested clarification in the overview of the English Learner Progress Indicator PLD.

For Change Level descriptors, panelists voiced a preference to simplify the descriptors and apply the descriptions for each Change Level across for all Indicators and grade spans. They preferred a focus on whether change is positive or negative and how the amount of change compared in the distribution of Change Scores for schools in the same grade span.

Panelists agreed that the format for the Indicator Performance Ratings sufficiently described the Indicator Performance Rating table established by KBE.

For Overall Performance Rating descriptors, panelists confirmed the importance of clear introductory language that references 2023 as the baseline year throughout and that explains that outcomes for all Indicators contribute to Overall Scores. They also requested that some language that had originally been included in the descriptors for Orange and Red ratings be removed.

Center staff updated PLDs based on panelist feedback after the first day of the workshop. On the second day of the workshop, Center staff shared summarized feedback and highlighted what changes were made in the PLDs. If a requested change was not made, a rationale was provided. The final PLDs used by panelists when making their judgments about cut scores are available on [this page](#).

Meeting Evaluation

Before adjourning, facilitators described next steps in the process, explaining that updated performance level descriptors and 2023 data would be available during the September workshop to inform panelist recommendations for cut scores. Panelists were also asked to complete a meeting evaluation.

Results of the evaluation for the June workshop are provided in [Appendix B](#).

September Workshop: Cut Scores

In the September workshop, panelists provided cut score recommendations for Status Levels, Change Levels, and Overall Performance Ratings. The workshop started with an accountability system overview that oriented panelists to the Status, Change, Indicator, and Overall score calculations.

The process was designed to produce recommendations for four cut scores each for Status Levels, Change Levels, and Overall Performance Ratings at elementary, middle, and high school grade spans. The four cut scores differentiate
- Five Status Levels: Very Low, Low, Medium, High, Very High

8

- Five Change Levels: Declined Significantly, Declined, Maintained, Increased, Increased Significantly
- Five Overall Performance Ratings: Red, Orange, Yellow, Green, Blue

Status and Change Level Cut Scores

Each Indicator component (Status and Change) comprised a five-step process facilitated by Center for Assessment staff:
1. Review applicable PLDs and data:
    a. This included an opportunity to raise any questions about how to use PLDs to help recommend cut scores.
    b. Center staff introduced available 2023 data using the data tool.
2. Individual recommendations - *round one*
3. Table discussion and full-group discussion (review median recommendations and rationales)
4. Individual recommendations - *round two*
5. Full-group discussion with opportunity to recommend adjustments to median cut score recommendations. Adjustments were applied if two-thirds of the group approved by vote.

Prior to round one individual review, facilitators explained to panelists that the PLDs should not unduly constrain individual judgment. Their purpose is to help clarify the perspectives on the panel and to inform the rating recommendations.

Round One
Panelists were first asked to make individual ratings based on their own judgments using the Status and Change Level Descriptors and available data as resources. Status and Change data were provided in an online tool that allowed panelists to see 2023 distributions and impact data resulting from the cut scores they entered into the tool.

Panelists submitted their recommendations using an online Google form and results were summarized and shared by Center staff. Summary results - including individual recommended cut score distributions, and minimum, maximum, and median cut score recommendations - were displayed, as were impact data showing the number and percent of schools that would have ratings in the different categories based on the initial median ratings for each Indicator for Status and Change Levels.

Next, participants engaged in table discussion focusing on ratings with the most variability (i.e., less agreement). The purpose of the table discussions was for members to share and learn from one another and build agreement where possible or recognize and understand divergent views.

Finally, Center staff facilitated a full group discussion so that panelists could hear main points from other table discussions.

Round Two

The second round of the rating process again involved panelists individually submitting their recommended cut scores using the online form. In this round their prior responses were available so panelists only needed to make what they thought were necessary changes. Updated summary data were shared with the group and discussion was invited. Facilitators informed the panel that median ratings from round two were considered the candidate cut scores and opened the floor for any proposals to make changes, noting that any proposal with support of at least two-thirds of panelists would be recorded as the revised panel recommendations.

No recommendations were made for adjustments to Status Level cut scores.

Two recommendations were made and passed by two-thirds vote in favor of these Change Level cut scores. (Abstentions were counted as 'no' votes.)

Table 3. Adopted modifications to round two median Change Level cut scores

High School Indicator	Cut	Round Two Median	Adopted Modification
Postsecondary Readiness	Declined Significantly/Declined	-3	-5
Postsecondary Readiness	Declined/Maintained	-1	-2
Graduation Rate	Declined Significantly/Declined	-3	-5
Graduation Rate	Declined/Maintained	-1	-2

The cut scores and 2023 percentiles in Table 4 below reflect the final Status Level cut score recommendations of the accountability performance standard setting panel. The cut scores and 2023 percentiles in Table 5 below reflect the final Change Level cut score recommendations of the accountability performance standard setting panel.

Overall Performance Rating Cut Scores

The process to elicit recommendations for Overall Performance Rating cut scores was similar to the method for Status and Change Levels. In addition to the Overall Performance Rating Descriptors, panelists were provided school profiles to inform their judgment. The profiles were designed as a representative sample of the 719 elementary schools, 318 middle schools, and 228 high schools in the state. Participants rated a list of 59 elementary schools, 53 middle schools, and 40 high schools. Each list contained these performance data: Overall Score, Overall Score

percentile, applicable Indicator Scores, and - for each Indicator - Status Level, Change Level, and Indicator Performance Ratings. The profile schools were selected using the following process:

1. the overall accountability performance score was generated for each school;
2. a likely score range was identified as encompassing the four cuts, based on prior accountability system percentiles;
3. two schools were identified for each whole accountability scale score point in the range (e.g., 75.0-75.9): one school was identified from near the midpoint (e.g., 75.5) that had data for all the indicators; a second school was also identified as near the midpoint as possible, and was missing data for at most one indicator (often EL Progress, since only 15% of schools had this indicator).

Four cut scores were set for each Overall Performance Rating at elementary, middle, and high school grade spans. The four cut scores differentiate five color-coded rating categories: Red/Orange, Orange/Yellow, Yellow/Green, and Green/Blue.

The recommendations were elicited through a multi-step process facilitated by Center for Assessment staff.

1. Review Overall Performance Rating descriptors and Overall Score data:
   a. Center staff provided an opportunity to raise any questions about how to use PLDs to help recommend cut scores.
   b. Center staff introduced 2023 Overall Score data using the data tool and provided an overview of the profile sheets for each grade span.
2. Individual recommendations - *round one*
3. Table discussion and full-group discussion (review median recommendations)
4. Individual recommendations - *round two*
5. Full-group discussion with opportunity to recommend adjustments to median cut score recommendations. Adjustments were applied if two-thirds of the group approved by vote.

Round One
Panelists were first asked to submit individual recommendations, using an online form, based on their own judgments using the Overall Performance Rating descriptors and the data provided as resources. After all individual recommendations were submitted by panelists, summary results were shared with the full group. Results focused on median cut score recommendations and variation in recommendations across the group, and included impact data of how many schools at each grade span (elementary, middle, high school) would fall into each category with the proposed median cut (noting the preliminary nature of results). As a full group, panelists were asked to share their rationale and learning, focusing on areas of greatest variation (i.e., less agreement), considering whether and where adjustments to cut scores were warranted.

Round Two

In this round, panelists were invited to make any adjustments they felt necessary to the cut scores they initially proposed. They were able to use their same online form to update recommendations based on their judgment and learning from round one. Updated summary data were shared with the group and discussion was invited. Facilitators informed the panel that median ratings from round two were considered the candidate overall school cut scores and opened the floor for any proposals to make changes, noting that any proposal with support of at least two-thirds of panelists would be recorded as the revised panel recommendations.

There was discussion about the relationship of Status and Change Scores and Levels to Indicator Performance Ratings, the profiles of school performance that were reviewed to set the school cuts, the PLDs, and the distributions of school performance in the five rating categories. No modification proposals were offered to the median scores following the second round.

The cut scores and 2023 percentiles in Table 6 below reflect the final Overall Performance Rating cut score recommendations of the accountability performance standard setting panel.

To conclude the standard setting process, a motion to adopt the proposed recommendations for Status Level, Change Level, and Overall Performance Rating cut scores was introduced and seconded. Panelists were asked to register their vote on the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Standard Setting Meeting Evaluation

Before adjourning, facilitators described next steps in the process, explaining that recommended performance level descriptors and cut scores would be presented (per statute) both to the Interim Commissioner of Education for review and approval and to LSAC for that group's review and approval. They also explained that approved cut scores would be applied to accountability results produced in fall 2023, for 2022-2023 accountability.

Finally, panelists were asked to complete a meeting evaluation. Results of the September meeting evaluation are provided in Appendix B.

Results

On the following pages, Table 4 shows the panel's recommended cut scores for each Indicator Status Level by grade span. Table 5 shows the panel's recommended cut scores for each Indicator Change Level by grade span. Table 6 shows the panel's recommended cut scores for each color-coded Overall Performance Rating by grade span. Percentiles represent the percentage of schools *at or below* the given cut score and are not the same as the percentage of schools with scores in the given category.

Table 4. Status Level Cut Score Recommendations (2023 percentiles)

Elementary School Indicator (row)/Status Level (column)	Very Low/Low	Low/ Med	Medium/ High	High/Very High
State Assessment Results in Reading and Math (percentile)	32 (3.2)	54 (30.2)	70 (67.7)	81 (87.8)
State Assessment Results in Science, Social Studies, and Writing (percentile)	34 (3.9)	50 (23.6)	67 (62.7)	76 (84.1)
English Learner Progress (percentile)	34 (1.1)	48 (2.7)	58 (19.2)	65 (46.2)
School Climate and Safety (percentile)	67 (1.3)	74 (24.6)	77 (53.4)	82 (86.4)
Middle School Indicator (row)/Status Level (column)	Very Low/Low	Low/ Med	Medium/ High	High/Very High
State Assessment Results in Reading and Mathematics (percentile)	36 (5.7)	55 (38.4)	65 (71.4)	73 (86.8)
State Assessment Results in Science, Social Studies, and Writing (percentile)	33 (5.1)	48 (31.4)	59 (64.7)	69 (88.8)
English Learner Progress (percentile)	16 (16.0)	24 (52.0)	31 (76.0)	45 (100)
Quality of School Climate and Safety (percentile)	59 (4.4)	64 (34.6)	68 (63.5)	75 (94.3)

High School Indicator (row)/Status Level (column)	Very Low/Low	Low/Med	Medium/High	High/Very High
State Assessment Results in Reading and Mathematics (percentile)	39 (7.5)	53 (33.3)	65 (72.4)	77 (93.9)
State Assessment Results in Science, Social Studies, and Writing (percentile)	32 (5.8)	47 (36.9)	55 (66.7)	63 (90.2)
English Learner Progress (percentile)	10 (0.0)	40.0)	31 (75.6)	45 (100)
Quality of School Climate and Safety (percentile)	54 (0.9)	59 (24.1)	64 (69.7)	68 (89.9)
Postsecondary Readiness (percentile)	59 (2.7)	76 (12.8)	88 (44.2)	95 (70.4)
Graduation Rate (percentile)	86 (4.8)	92 (26.3)	95 (54.8)	98 (88.6)

Table 5. Change Level Cut Score Recommendations (2023 percentiles)

Elementary School Indicator (row)/Change Level (column)	Declined Significantly/ Declined	Declined/ Maintained	Maintained/ Increased	Increased/ Increased Significantly
State Assessment Results in Reading and Math (percentile)	-6 (5.6)	-2 (17.7)	0.1 (27.2)	7 (76.4)
State Assessment Results in Science, Social Studies, and Writing (percentile)	-7 (4.8)	-2 (20.1)	0.1 (31.0)	9 (76.0)
English Learner Progress (percentile)	-7 (5.7)	-1 (11.4)	0.1 (12.7)	23 (75.3)
Quality of School Climate and Safety (percentile)	-5 (3.8)	-2 (22.5)	0.1 (51.7)	3.8 (89.3)
Middle School Indicator (row)/ Change Level (column)	**Declined Significantly/ Declined**	**Declined/ Maintained**	**Maintained/ Increased**	**Increased/ Increased Significantly**
State Assessment Results in Reading and Mathematics (percentile)	-7 (4.1)	-2 (20.8)	0.1 (38.8)	6.3 (84.2)
State Assessment Results in Science, Social Studies, and	-7 (4.9)	-2 (25.1)	0.1 (38.1)	6 (78.8)

Writing (percentile)				
English Learner Progress (percentile)	-15 (10.5)	-5 (36.8)	0.1 (50.0)	8 (78.9)
Quality of School Climate and Safety (percentile)	-5 (4.7)	-2 (27.1)	0.1 (63.1)	4 (90.9)

Table 5 continues on the next page.

Table 5, continued. Change Level Cut Score Recommendations (2023 percentiles)

High School Indicator (row)/Change Level (column)	Declined Significantly/ Declined	Declined/ Maintained	Maintained/ Increased	Increased/ Increased Significantly
State Assessment Results in Reading and Mathematics (percentile)	-12 (5.3)	-5 (28.5)	0.1 (51.8)	6.3 (78.9)
State Assessment Results in Science, Social Studies, and Writing (percentile)	-11 (5.3)	-3.5 (24.4)	0.1 (40.9)	7 (78.2)
English Learner Progress (percentile)	-13 (8.1)	-4 (35.1)	0.1 (54.1)	9.6 (78.4)
Quality of School Climate and Safety (percentile)	-4 (5.3)	-2 (16.3)	0.1 (46.3)	4 (90.3)
Postsecondary Readiness (percentile)	-5 (1.8)	-2 (8.4)	0.1 (17.3)	12 (74.3)
Graduation Rate (percentile)	-5 (1.8)	-2 (8.3)	0.1 (44.7)	3 (89.9)

Table 6. Overall Performance Rating Cut Score Recommendations (2023 percentiles)

Row indicates grade span; column indicates Overall Performance Rating cut scores	Red/ Orange	Orange/ Yellow	Yellow/ Green	Green/ Blue
Elementary Schools (percentile)	38 (4.6)	55 (25.9)	70 (56.3)	83 (82.8)
Middle Schools (percentile)	36 (7.9)	51 (32.4)	64 (64.2)	77 (90.3)
High Schools (percentile)	49 (6.6)	60 (23.2)	71 (61.8)	81 (89.9)

Approval of Final Cut Score Recommendations

KRS 158.6453 requires that both the Kentucky Commissioner of Education and LSAC approve cut score recommendations made by the accountability performance standard setting panel. In accordance with these requirements, KDE and Center staff shared recommended results with the Interim Commissioner.

In order to review and consider the recommended cut scores, LSAC held a special meeting on October 10, 2023. The recommendations, documented in a memo and slide deck, were provided to LSAC members in advance of this meeting, on Tuesday, September 26, 2023. The special LSAC meeting was attended by KDE staff, including a representative for the Commissioner, and Center staff, who shared the recommended results and responded to questions from LSAC members. After discussion, LSAC voted to approve the recommended accountability Status Level, Change Level, and Overall Performance Rating cut scores. Interim Commissioner of Education Robin Fields Kinney also approved the cut scores.

Appendix A: 2023 Standard Setting Panel

The accountability standard setting panelists below were chosen to represent a wide range of experience and viewpoints from across Kentucky. The 27 panelists represent parent and community organizations, students, teachers, principals, superintendents, and other district personnel including district assessment coordinators. Additionally, specializations were represented in special populations, including students with disabilities, English learners, and homeless/migrant students. The panelists represented each of Kentucky's congressional districts, which include urban, suburban, and rural environments and all socio-economic ranges. Nineteen of the 27 panelists (70%) participated in the 2022 standard setting activities.

Importantly, panelists represented a broad range of school performance from lowest- to highest-performing schools. Note that panelists might represent more than one segment (e.g., a superintendent whose schools are low- and high-performing).

Panelist	Role	Location
Artavia Acklin	Elementary School Principal and School Curriculum, Assessment and Accountability Council (SCAAC) member	Shelby County Public Schools
Carrie Ballinger	Superintendent	Rockcastle County Schools
Dionne Bates	Implementation and Improvement Lead	Kentucky Valley Educational Cooperative (KVEC)
Eddie Campbell	President, Kentucky Education Association	Statewide
Penny Christian	Parent	Statewide
Skip Cleavinger	DEIB/EL Consultant	Green River Regional Educational Cooperative (GRREC)
Dena Dossett	Chief of Accountability, Research and Systems Improvement	Jefferson County Public Schools
Jared Fields	High School Teacher	Laurel County Schools
Robbie Fletcher	Superintendent and LSAC member	Lawrence County Public Schools
Jim Flynn	Executive Director, Kentucky Association for School Superintendents (KASS)	Statewide
JanaBeth Francis	District Assessment Coordinator and SCAAC member	Daviess County Public Schools

Panelist	Role	Location
Alvin Garrison	Superintendent	Covington Independent Schools
Nicholas Hazelett	High School Student and Commissioner's Student Advisory Council member	Paintsville Independent Schools
Amy Leasgang	Middle School Teacher	Bullitt County Public Schools
Christi Lefevers	Middle School Principal	Corbin Independent Schools
Patrice McCrary	Kentucky Board of Education member (former teacher)	Supreme Court District 2
Sheila Mitchell	Superintendent and LSAC member	Anderson County Public Schools
Amanda Reed	District Assessment Coordinator	Larue County Public Schools
Danielle Rice	Director of Special Education	Kenton County Schools
Lynn Schentrup	Career and Technical Education Teacher	Fayette County Public Schools
Kathy Smiley	President, Kentucky Parent Teacher Association	Statewide
Brooke Stinson	District Assessment Coordinator	Fayette County Public Schools
Steve Trimble	Kentucky Board of Education member (former superintendent)	Supreme Court District 7
Gretchen Wetzel	Executive Director	Western Kentucky Educational Cooperative (WKEC)
Lenny Whalen	Superintendent	Dawson Springs Independent Schools
Laura Williams	Career and Technical Education Principal	Boone County ATC
Stephanie Winkler	Elementary School Teacher	Madison County Schools

Appendix B: Summary of Meeting Evaluations

Performance Standard Setting Workshop Evaluation Responses (September 15, 2023)

Item/Percent in response category	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree
The meeting was well organized.	96.2	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
I understood my role at this meeting.	96.2	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
I had adequate opportunities to express my views and opinions at this meeting.	92.3	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
I feel the recommendations for Status Level cut scores (i.e., Very Low to Very High) were appropriate and reasonable.	61.5	38.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
I feel the recommendations for Change Level cut scores (i.e., Declined Significantly to Increased Significantly) were appropriate and reasonable.	57.7	42.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
I feel the recommendations regarding Overall Performance Ratings (i.e., color ratings) for elementary schools were appropriate and reasonable.	57.7	46.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
I feel the recommendations regarding Overall Performance Ratings (i.e., color ratings) for middle schools were appropriate and reasonable.	46.2	50	0.0	0.0	3.8
I feel the recommendations regardingOverall Performance Ratings (i.e., color ratings) for high schools were appropriate and reasonable.	53.8	42.3	0.0	0.0	3.8

Open Response Feedback

- Thank you for the opportunity to serve. Well done!
- This cohort is superintendent heavy; it adversely impacts discussion and outcomes
- Thank you for the expertise and experience that the facilitators brought to the meeting. The meeting was well organized and productive. Great job
- Thank you for the opportunity to be apart [sic] of this group. I enjoyed the collaboration and the work that was accomplished over the past three days.
- EVERY voice was heard during this process. Thank you for the opportunity to have that voice.
- Great job!!
- Thank you for keeping us on pace. I really appreciated the app. This made going through multiple sets of data easier. I also like the responsiveness of the Center staff. There were constant check ins and I felt as if every voice was honored.
- Again, KDE OAA did an outstanding job with the logistics.
- None
- It was a great meeting. Thanks for including me; it was an honor.
- NA
- Including the data tool was a game changer!
- Thank you for such a wonderful and meaningful process!
- I appreciate being included in this group. Everyone from KDE and The Center is very helpful and thorough in explanations and professional in processing the group's feedback, communicating it back to the group and moving forward. I enjoyed the insight of my colleagues and they were very helpful
- While I may not fully agree with the cut scores at the RED level at middle and high school. I do feel that I must honor the work of the committee and the process.
- Thank you to all involved. It has been an honor to serve with each involved.
- The app was extremely helpful
- I appreciate the information, organization and support that the Center and KDE provided throughout the 2.5 days. I also appreciate the thoughtfulness and seriousness of the entire committee. Well done!
- Thank you for listening to our feedback from last year and allowing us more time this year, and also breaking it into June and Sept sessions. It was so helpful to have that time and break in between this year. I also think it was very helpful that the vast majority of participants this year were the same as last year. Having that familiarity with the process and conversation from 2022 helped greatly in this year's process with the addition of the change factor into the system. Lily was a great addition to the team as well. Love the data tools!! THANK YOU to KDE and to the Center for Assessment!!

Number of responses: 26 total
(Some panelists did not respond to all questions.)

Performance Level Descriptor Workshop Evaluation Responses (June 23, 2023)

Item/Percent in response category	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree
The meeting was well organized.	92.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
I understood my role at this meeting.	84.0	16.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
I had adequate opportunities to express my views at this meeting.	88.0	12.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
I feel the indicator performance descriptors for status (i.e., very low to very high) are appropriate and reasonable.	44.0	52.0	4.0	0.0	0.0
I feel the indicator performance descriptors for change (i.e., declined significantly to increased significantly) are appropriate and reasonable.	32.0	64.0	0.0	0.0	4.0
I feel the overall performance level descriptors (i.e., color ratings from red to blue) are appropriate and reasonable	48.0	44.0	0.0	4.0	4.0

Open Response Feedback
- I am a new panelist. Thank you for this opportunity! The last two days went very well and I feel fortunate to be apart [sic] of this work. It was well organized and the pace of the two days were GREAT!
- Great discussions over the last 2 days.
- Thank you for the opportunity to spend quality time in discussion and the flexibility around schedule.
- The structure of the meeting provided ample time to review individually as well as have group conversations and listen to other perspectives. I appreciate that the group considered feedback from last year in making changes to this year's meeting.
- Well organized meeting. Center for Assessment Team and KDE were very responsive to questions and provided ongoing guidance and support.

- Thank you for having this meeting ahead of time. It helped us discuss some significant issues. I understand the change can't be as flexible as we had hoped. I'm glad that we can make sure all increase change schools are treated as increased.
- I appreciate the materials ahead of time. I hope we also get the PLDs ahead of the next meeting as well.
- The Center did a wonderful job with all of our questions. KDE was highly supportive. Thanks for organizing an amazing meeting.
- Meeting was ran very well and our time was valued.
- It was very thought provoking and informative. I appreciate having the opportunity to participate.
- Thank you for the time to talk about the PLDs' independent of the data.
- Thank you for planning more time this year to fully develop and discuss ideas. I also think it was very helpful to have so many of last year's members back again this year. Looking forward to our continued work in September.
- I appreciate the attention to detail down to our seating arrangement. I'm more quiet because I'm generally a slow processor. I was placed with table leaders that made me feel comfortable expressing my views. And channeled all views into a table presentation.
- Well organized. I appreciate how the flow of the meeting went and how the input was taken. These two days were very well done. I'm grateful for the opportunity to serve and be a part of this process. Well done on all aspects; thank you for your leadership, time and knowledge as we work together to the best we can for our students and staff.
- I appreciate having this most important work split up in order to process and discuss. Could we include more student voice next year? I think the addition of another student would be very valuable so it's clearly understood that they had input and understanding of the assessment process.

Number of responses: 25 total