SCAAC Meeting Minutes

(School Curriculum, Assessment, and Accountability Council)

March 9, 1999
State Board Room

SCAAC Agenda

#	Agenda Items	Presenters
1.	Meeting Minutes	Anne Keene
2.	Benchmarking	Betty Edwards/ Rhonda Sims
3.	Communications Plan	Robyn Oatley
4.	Interim Accountability Model	Scott Trimble
5.	703 KAR 5:020 Regulation	Scott Trimble
6.	Pacesetter Schools Concept	Scott Trimble
7.	Student Accountability/Motivation	Scott Trimble
Adjournment		

SCAAC Meeting Minutes
March 9, 1999

Copies of audiotapes of the meeting are available upon request.
Chairman Anne Keene called the meeting to order. The roll was called.

Members Present:

Jon Akers	Benny Lile	Bob Sexton
Jamie Bowling	Bonnie Lynch	Linda Sheffield
Kay Freeland	Gary Mielcarek	Maynard Thomas
Suzanne Guyer	Roger Pankratz	Sharon Whitworth
Anne Keene		

Eleven members were present and a quorum was present.

1. Meeting Minutes **Anne Keene**

A quorum was present. Chairperson Anne Keene summarized the agenda for today's session. Topics for discussion include the interim accountability model, the long term accountability model, scholastic audit, and student accountability.

SCAAC Motions:
Minutes for the January 6th meeting were reviewed and corrected. Roger Pankratz moved the minutes be approved as corrected; Linda Sheffield seconded the motion and the minutes were approved. The minutes for January 7th were reviewed and corrected; Maynard Thomas moved the minutes be approved as amended; Sharon Whitworth seconded the motion and the minutes were approved as corrected.

Total Meeting Time: 9 hours and 22 minutes

2. Benchmarking **Betty Edwards/ Rhonda Sims**

Betty Edwards and Rhonda Sims Kentucky Department of Education, Office of Curriculum and Professional Development) who gave a status report on the recent work with benchmarking Kentucky's Core Content against National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). Betty guided the Council through the process that was used to do the benchmarking. Clarification on the difference between alignment and benchmarking in the context of how this particular process worked was given. The process used was a four stage process: benchmarking, draft revisions, public review, and final review. The committees were comprised of teachers, facilitators outside the Department, administrators, university representatives, parents, and representatives from the business community. As a follow up to the initial process, there will be a public

review by a broad field of stakeholders. Final revisions will be concluded at the end of the process. Roger Pankratz suggested that before final revisions there be a sign-off from different interest groups such as Kentucky Science Teachers Association (KSTA), Kentucky Music Educators Association (KMEA), and Kentucky Council of Teachers of English/Language Arts (KCTE/LA) so that all those groups will be invested in the process.

Council member Maynard Thomas who participated in the benchmarking work noted that he was impressed with the hard work and diligence of the groups he observed.

Kay Freeland and Benny Lile asked if the changes/revisions made sweeping changes which would have major implications for the work schools have already done in aligning curriculum. Since revisions are only draft, there are no major changes noted at this point in the process; it was noted the changes now are mainly fine tuning and clarifications.

3. Communications Plan **Robyn Oately**

Anne Keene recognized Robyn Oatley for an update on the communications plan. She provided a paper that has been prepared to communicate basic information ("Testing in Kentucky").

Linda Sheffield asked if the department had done any publicity on the good performance on the National Assessment of Educational Progress reading test. Hunt Helm outlined the steps that had been taken to get the message out to the public.

4. Interim Accountability Model **Scott Trimble**

Scott Trimble summarized National Technical Advisory Panel for Assessment and Accountability (NTAPAA) discussions on the issues of accountability models. Scott used the handout prepared for review—a simulation chart packet—to lead the Council through the issues on accountability models.

***It is noted for the record that Bob Sexton is now present.
The Council then broke for a severe weather drill.

Scott Trimble continued his discussion on accountability models. The series of charts were simulation-- regression procedure using growth versus baseline accountability index distribution; one chart used 1 standard error below the regression line as lower bound expectation; another used growth versus baseline accountability distribution with a standard error band; a third chart showed growth versus baseline accountability with

focus on a KIRIS score of 58, and the resulting mean of growth score distribution of 60; and, the last chart showed a simple linear regression as expected performance line.

SCAAC Clarification/Discussion:
Chairperson Anne Keene asked the Council if they wished to make a statement or statements about the interim accountability model. Jon Akers asked how the charts the Council had been discussing were to be used. Robyn Oatley said that the charts were meant to demonstrate how the various models would work based on available data.

SCAAC Motion:
Linda Sheffield moved that the Council accept the regression model for the interim with the stipulation that the 1999 mid-point data for elementary, middle, and high school be analyzed to see which model would be most appropriate. The motion was seconded by Suzanne Guyer. Motion carried.

**Note for the record that Council member Jamie Bowling is now present.

---

5. 703 KAR 5:020 Regulation **Scott Trimble**

The Council began its consideration of regulation 703 KAR 5:020, the formula for determining school performance classifications and school rewards. This regulation establishes the formula beyond the interim period regulation.

SCAAC Discussion/Questions:
Some of the key questions raised were the following:

1. Should assistance line end at 1 standard error below 80?
2. Should goal line be 1 standard error below 100? Should it start 1 standard error below baseline?
3. Should progressing zone schools earn 1 share of reward? Can a school decline and still get rewards?
4. What is the recommendation for high performing schools (those above 80)?
5. What are the pacesetter school issues?

The Council recessed for lunch. Chairperson Anne Keene reconvened the meeting.

The Council resumed discussion of regulation 703 KAR 5:020 which establishes a formula for determining school performance classifications and school rewards. The discussion focused on the rationale for the assistance line and the use of standard error calculation. Linda Sheffield noted that the standard error concept was a statistical consideration.

One crucial question is whether schools who reach the 80 mark or higher should be eligible for assistance. There was discussion on the standard error bands; what they are and how many should be in the model. How high to set the mark or goal is of the greatest importance in order to assure the greatest growth and achievement.

**The record will show that John Stephens is now in attendance.

The discussion turned to the rewards section of the draft regulation. The question is whether rewards are monetary or other kinds of incentives. The second questions is how many levels of rewards should there be and at what points should schools be eligible for rewards—monetary or otherwise.

SCAAC Motion:
Gary Mielcarek moved that rewards only be allocated for those schools meeting or exceeding their goals. Motion seconded by Bob Sexton. The following rationale was given:

1. The reward would be more meaningful.
2. Past research shows that teachers are more motivated by fear of sanctions rather than by financial rewards.
3. Putting the money in a larger buffer zone dilutes the available reward funds.

The motion carried without opposition.

SCAAC Motion:
Linda Sheffield moved to change the name of the progressing zone to "no consequences zone." The motion was seconded by Suzanne Guyer. The motion carried.

Linda Sheffield moved that the assistance line begin in 2002 at baseline minus one standard error and end in 2014 at the 4th recognition point minus one standard error. Motion seconded by Benny Lile.

Roger Pankratz asked Scott Trimble what impact changing the standard error to 1 would have; Scott concluded that changing the standard error would result in more schools falling in the assistance zone.

The question was called on Linda Sheffield's motion. The motion carried.

The Chair called a recess. After the recess, Anne Keene reconvened the meeting.

Following the break, the Council reviewed data on high-performing schools to review the numbers of schools at 70 or higher indices. The question before the Council is how those high-performing schools should be treated under the new system proposed. Discussion followed about whether or not these high-performing schools should suffer any consequences if their scores slipped. There were no recommendations.

6. Pacesetter Schools Concept **Scott Trimble**

The next topic the Council discussed was the pacesetter schools concept.

SCAAC Motion:
Maynard Thomas moved that pacesetter schools be awarded a banner not monetary rewards; motion seconded by Sharon Whitworth. The motion carried. Discussion followed on defining what a pacesetter school is and how to determine the criteria awarding the banners. Four criteria for the banner were discussed:

1. Schools exceed the fourth point of recognition.
2. Schools meet the dropout requirement.
3. Schools performed in the top 5%.
4. Schools did not decline in both previous biennia.

Suzanne Guyer moved the acceptance of the four criteria for pacesetter schools; motion was seconded by Linda Sheffield. The motion carried.

The Council completed its review of regulation 703 KAR 5:020.

7. Student Accountability/Motivation **Scott Trimble**

Chairperson Anne Keene turned the Council's attention to the student accountability/motivation topic referring to the SCAAC recommendations presented in a staff note to the Kentucky Board of Education. Sue Rigney noted that the issue of inclusion of student scores on Kentucky Core Content Test (KCCT) was under review by the National Technical Panel on Assessment and Accountability. House Bill 53

requires that inclusion of any scores on transcripts have as a prerequisite the validity and reliability of the scores.

Jon Akers asked if the Council had taken any action or made any recommendation on scoring the on demand writing task from Kentucky Core Content Test (KCCT) in the schools and using those scores in some way to hold students accountable. Scoring the papers locally would allow the schools options to use the scores as part of the students' grades in language arts classes or to use the writing as a work sample. Jon expressed his belief that this option would be a key piece in student accountability efforts. Kentucky Board of Education, Chairwoman Helen Mountjoy asked for clarification on why the on demand writing prompt on Kentucky Core Content Test (KCCT) couldn't be used in the manner Jon Akers proposes. Sue Rigney answered that such a design could be developed.

SCAAC Motion:
Jon Akers moved that schools be given the option of copying the senior on demand writing portion of the Kentucky Core Content Test (KCCT) for local scoring purposes and that school will assure the security and integrity of the test and will not inappropriately influence instruction. The motion was seconded by John Stephens. The motion carried.

Adjournment

SCAAC Motion:
Roger Pankratz moved the meeting adjourn. Jon Akers seconded the motion; the Council adjourned.