



## KENTUCKY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

### Local Superintendent's Advisory Council (LSAC) SUMMARY

March 28, 2023

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chair Robbie Fletcher, Vice-Chair David Raleigh, Harry Burchett, Will Hodges, Kelley Ransdell, Kirk Biggerstaff, Sheila Mitchell, Thom Cochran and Mike Borchers.

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** David Cox and Russ Tilford

**Agenda Item:** Kentucky Minimum Bus Specifications for SY 2024

**Presenters:** Elisa Hanley, Pupil Transportation Branch Manager, and Chay Ritter, Director of Division of District Support Services

**Summary of Discussion:** The Kentucky Minimum Bus Specifications for 2024 establish the requirements for the purchase of Kentucky public school buses. A workgroup of transportation directors, transportation professionals and school district administrators annually compile the specifications pursuant to 702 KAR 5:060. The specifications are required to be approved by the Kentucky Board of Education.

**Action Taken:** The council unanimously approved the Kentucky Minimum Bus Specifications for 2024.

**Follow-up Required:** None.

**Agenda Item:** HB 678 Facility Regulation Review Update

**Presenters:** Robin Fields Kinney, Associate Commissioner, and Chay Ritter, Director of Division of District Support Services

**Summary of Discussion:** Presenters provided an update on the ongoing review of facility related statutes, regulations, policies and manuals as required by House Bill 678. The presentation included recommendations for regulatory and statutory changes to improve and streamline the oversight of school district facility planning and construction. The review will culminate in a report to the General Assembly and regulatory changes.

**Action Taken:** None.

**Follow-up Required:** No follow-up action required at this time.

**Agenda Item:** Accountability Standard Setting Overview

**Presenters:** Rhonda Sims and Jennifer Stafford, Office of Assessment and Accountability, Kentucky Department of Education, and Brian Gong and Laura Pinsonneault, Center for Assessment

**Summary of Discussion:** Rhonda Sims and Jennifer Stafford explained that although an accountability system standard setting occurred in 2022, cut scores were only established for evaluating state indicators for Status. The inclusion of the Change component for full implementation of the system necessitates another standard setting in 2023.

Laura Pinsonneault reviewed the accountability standard setting process used in September 2022 and shared lessons learned from the experience. Those considerations and advice from the Kentucky Technical Advisory Council (KTAC) informed the development of the current proposal.

Pinsonneault provided a summary of the major components in the accountability system and explained how they interact before looking ahead to the 2023 Accountability Standard Setting Plan.

To take advantage of their prior knowledge and experience, standard setting panelists who participated in the 2022 Accountability Standard Setting meeting will be invited to return for the 2023 work.

The process will be separated into two work sessions. In June, participants will develop performance level descriptors for Status, Change within each Indicator, Indicator Performance Ratings that combine Status and Change, and Overall Performance that combines all Indicators within each grade span. Participants will return in September to establish cut scores in each Indicator for Status, Change, and Indicator Performance Ratings (colors), and cut scores for school performance with Overall Performance Ratings (colors). Status cut scores from 2022 will be revisited but could remain as established.

Superintendent Mike Borchers asked for clarification about how an adjustment in Status cut scores could impact the Indicator Performance Ratings. Pinsonneault explained that an Indicator Performance Rating assigned in 2022 could have a different label (color) in 2023 for the same numerical score due to the addition of the Change component.

Borchers asked if he received a Status label of [High] in 2022 and [High] Status again in 2023, could those labels be based on different numbers. Pinsonneault explained that scenario is possible if standard setting panelists should establish different cut scores for Status in 2023. Borchers expressed concern about the desirability of generating a Change score using different status cuts from those established in 2022.

Pinsonneault clarified that even if Status cut scores change, it would not impact how a Change score is determined. An indicator's Change score is based on a numerical difference in Status scores, not in a change of Status label (e.g., High to Medium) or a movement among colors (e.g., Yellow to Green). The standard setting panelists will define the Change score numeric ranges that will characterize each Change label (e.g., Maintained, Increased).

Chair Robbie Fletcher asked about how a change in cut scores in assessment performance levels (Novice, Apprentice, Proficient, Distinguished) could impact the performance on accountability indicators.

Rhonda Sims explained that this summer, as recommended by Kentucky's Technical Advisory Committee, there will be a validation of assessment performance level cut scores established last year in all content areas except science. Changes to the assessment performance levels are not anticipated, and any suggested changes must be presented with significant justification. Sims and Jennifer Stafford also shared information about other assessment-related legislative requirements such as the revision of academic standards and assessments on a six-year cycle and the releasing of a subset of operational test items annually.

Sims and Stafford responded to several other assessment questions asked by Fletcher, Superintendent Sheila Mitchell and Superintendent Harry Burchett.

Brian Gong returned to the standard setting conversation by reviewing policy decisions already established by the Kentucky Board of Education. Key policies include weights for each indicator that contribute to a school's Overall Performance Rating and the 5 x 5 colored table template that will combine Status and Change to generate an Indicator Performance Rating. Although the placement of colors within the table will be the same for all indicators, the cut score ranges for Status and Change ratings, to be determined at standard setting, could be different for each Indicator and grade span.

Gong mentioned that one of the questions for LSAC's consideration is if they have guidance on whether to recommend that the standard setters should consider making changes to the Status cut scores previously established in 2022.

Fletcher expressed his preference for minimal or no change wherever possible to support comparison across time and stakeholder understanding. Borchers conveyed his agreement with that approach.

Gong asked LSAC's opinion about whether standard setters should set a single cut score for Change for all schools, or should they consider cut scores based on the individual school's Status (e.g., one Change cut score for a school with a high Status score, another for a school with a low Status score). He recommended setting the Change level "Maintained" at zero change, using plus or minus something to determine remaining levels (possibly from -5 to +5). Superintendent Kelley Randall expressed support for using a plus/minus range.

To allow for easier understanding of this challenge, Fletcher explained that in the past, Change (or "growth") was measured by individual student achievement on indicator measures and now Change is being measured on school performance with separate groups of students. He recommended allowing additional time to digest the information and confer with other superintendents before providing guidance at the next LSAC meeting in May.

Gong noted that the center staff have been examining Change data for 2018/2019 and 2021/2022 and will be sharing their analysis with KDE, LSAC and the standard setting committee.

Wrapping up, Gong summarized this meeting's guidance provided by LSAC:

- Keep changes in previously established assessment and accountability cut scores to a minimum to support comparison across time.
- Recognize that there may be some measurement error in using absolute scores, so use a range when defining Change cut scores in accountability.
- Whether to set different Change cut scores for different Status levels will be discussed further.

Sims encouraged superintendents to send any questions to Meredith Brewer in advance of the May meeting, if possible, to allow KDE and The Center for Assessment to come prepared with responses.

Mitchell and Fletcher attended the 2022 accountability standard setting workshop as representatives of LSAC. Fletcher invited other LSAC superintendents who might be interested in serving in their place this summer/fall to let him know and be ready to discuss in the next meeting.

David Raleigh asked for guidance on the best way to share this information and questions for consideration with other superintendents in his cooperative. The Center will work to provide a one-pager talking points tool to assist with this communication.

**Action Taken:** LSAC recommended additional time to review the accountability standard setting information before providing guidance. The topic will be included on LSAC's May 30 agenda.

**Follow-up Required:** The Center for Assessment will provide LSAC with a one-pager talking points tool to assist superintendents in discussing the accountability standard setting process with fellow superintendents.