Kentucky Technical Advisory Committee (KTAC)

Minutes of the October 15 - 16, 2024 meeting
DRAFT

Attendance

Kentucky Technical Advisory Committee (KTAC) Members: Corinne Huggins-Manley, Elena Diaz-Bilello, Pete Goldschmidt, Suzanne Lane (Absent: Leslie Keng)

Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) Staff: Commissioner of Education Dr. Robbie Fletcher (Day 1), Ben Riley, Chris Williams, David Curd, Helen Jones, Jennifer Larkins, Jennifer Stafford, John Wickizer, Kevin Hill, Kevin O'Hair, Krista Mullins, Mike Prater, Oliver Ackman, Rhonda Sims, Shara Savage, Tiffany Christopher

KDE Guests:

    Bill Auty, EdMeasure
    Gary Cook, Senior Research Fellow, WIDA
    Art Thacker, Chief Scientist, HumRRO
    Emily Dickinson, Principal Scientist, HumRRO
    Gertrudes Velasquez, Research Scientist, HumRRO
    Hillary Michaels, Director, Education Research and Evaluation, HumRRO
    Jason Way, Senior Scientist, HumRRO
    Sharon Staples, Pearson
    Scott Wilson, Pearson
    Tracy Gardner, Pearson
    Likun Hou, Pearson
    Jennifer Kash, Pearson

Facilitators: Brian Gong, Laura Pinsonneault, Center for Assessment

Summary

The Kentucky Technical Advisory Committee (KTAC) provided advice to the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) regarding the state's assessment and accountability programs. This included discussion of alternate English language proficiency assessment standard setting and concordance, English language progress measures, a proposed validity framework and site visit pilot to evaluate the state's accountability system, 2023-24 accountability results, a review of the summative item bank health, and the work of the Kentucky United We Learn (KUWL) Council.

The group additionally reviewed and recommended approval of state regulations under the purview of KDE's Office of Assessment and Accountability, approved June 12-13 meeting minutes, selected dates for future meetings, and approved recommendations from this meeting.

October 15

Agenda Item: Welcome and Introductions

Presenter: Dr. Robbie Fletcher, Commissioner, Kentucky Department of Education (KDE)

Summary

Gong opened the meeting at 8:34am and turned the floor over to Dr. Fletcher, who welcomed the group, noting that this was his first KTAC meeting. He highlighted the work of the Kentucky United We Learn (KUWL) Council to redesign the state's assessment and accountability system, providing background context and explaining his interaction with the KUWL Council, previously as a district superintendent, and his interest in an accountability system that everyone can get around and believe in. He then opened up the floor to introductions.

Gong explained that the facilitators will make sure that the KTAC meeting satisfies the requirements of an official committee per state statute. He then took roll call of KTAC members.

Agenda Item: Review Agenda and Approve Minutes from June 12 and 13 Meeting

Presenter: Brian Gong, Senior Associate, The Center for Assessment

Summary

Gong reviewed the meeting agenda for the day. He explained that KTAC will be asked to review and approve recommendations that arise during the meeting at the end of the day. There were no recommendations to change the agenda.

Gong explained that meeting minutes are produced separately from meeting recommendations and referenced the draft minutes from the June 12-13, 2024 meeting.

Action

- Lane motioned to approve.
- No suggestions or discussion.
- Diaz-Bilello seconded.
- The motion passed unanimously.

Agenda Item: Alternate ACCESS Concordance/Alternate ACCESS Standard Setting Question and Answer Session

Presenter: Gary Cook, Senior Research Fellow, WIDA

Summary

Gong invited Williams from KDE to provide background information about Alternate ACCESS in Kentucky, which has employed this assessment since 2006. Williams explained that there was a standard setting this past summer due to needed changes to the performance standards. There was discussion about the population of students who take the Alt ACCESS; there were 560 students in the Commonwealth who took Alt ACCESS in

2023-24. Cook then provided some background about the concordance process, explaining that the prior Alt ACCESS had very low level of expectations. KTAC asked about whether the construct changed and Cook replied that the content is the same, noting good correlation between 2023-2024 and 2022-2023 for the same grade levels, cross-cohort. KTAC also asked about differences across different groups of English learners, by language. Cook explained that the language identification is a challenge because it is locally reported and different states have different protocols. WIDA looks across demographic categories: disability type, IEP status, language, and gender to check for differentiating item performance.

Gong asked KDE how they employed the concordance table. Sims explained that, in consultation with program consultants, they used the concordance to go back to the prior cuts with the understanding that they would look to future cuts going forward. The group discussed state decisions about scale scores and proficiency levels given there were not exact matches. Kentucky is one of few states that include Alt ACCESS in its ESSA accountability system.

There was discussion about socializing educators to the change given the shift in the percentage of students at each performance level and the elimination of level A1, and about a cross-validation study to gather additional evidence against which standard setting cut scores may be referenced.

Cook concluded with a preview of the ACCESS for ELLs standard setting planned for 2026.

> Action: KTAC members approved these recommendations
> - Consider alternate sources beyond the performance standard setting to compile a body of evidence to cross-validate the Alternate ACCESS achievement level cut scores.
> - Quality control/forensic analysis is advised for alternate assessments, especially when local scoring – or recording of student responses– is involved. KTAC would like to see what procedures Caveon uses in its forensic analysis and information about evidence KDE gathers and uses (such as site visits) and how results are used to support the integrity of the test.
> - If possible, share the WIDA ACCESS standard setting plan with KTAC members as soon as possible so that KTAC may provide feedback to WIDA this fall.

Agenda Item: Validity Framework and Site Visit Pilot Discussion

Presenters: Art Thacker, Chief Scientist; Emily Dickinson, Principal Scientist; Gertrudes Velasquez, Research Scientist; Hillary Michaels, Director, Education Research and Evaluation; Jason Way, Senior Scientist (All presenters from HumRRO)

Summary

Dickinson shared the plan for the pilot site visit study, which is intended to gather validity evidence for each indicator of the accountability system to inform a more complete evaluation in spring 2025. The plan is to employ a combination of direct observations,

checklists by school staff, and interviews with staff. Dickinson asked if there were suggestions for adding data collection elements for any of the accountability indicators and whether KTAC felt that one day of classroom observations would provide an adequate sample of behaviors/events to inform a later evaluation.

KTAC discussed the importance of framing the purpose and research questions in order to identify the evidence necessary to support those questions. There was also discussion of the plans for scoring and evaluating how the instruments function during the pilot. This included consideration of what existing information (e.g., CSIPs, monitoring reports, extant district data) can be leveraged to address existing research questions. KTAC suggested looking at the relationship between/across the dimensions that will be assessed. KTAC noted that a similar study found it necessary to observe a classroom multiple times during a year. KTAC suggested gathering lesson plans to determine the best day to observe and recording observations if possible.

Dickinson explained next steps in preparing for the pilot, then transitioned to the validity framework topic, inviting comments from KTAC. There was discussion of pulling evidence from the technical manual into the framework to make the evidence more useful (rather than just referencing the technical manual) and about providing information regarding sufficiency of evidence (e.g., strong, sufficient, weak, etc.). HumRRO noted that there will be a shift from "instructional validity" to "instrumental validity".

KTAC discussed reporting and intended use and users, and the importance of focusing on this both for assessment and accountability measures.

> Action: KTAC members approved these recommendations
> - For the pilot study, and later for the full site visit study, identify specific research question(s) and what evidence will address the questions.
> - KTAC requests scales and scoring information within the site visit protocol and specifically the tools that were included. Indicate the rationale for combining items to produce scores and how they will be used.
> - Check for existing data sources that can serve as validity evidence that can either supplement or supplant the planned study approach.
> - Focus on how instruments function, and how easily they can be used by those intended to use them. Also consider a generalizability study to understand the reliability and consistency of results. This is in place of considering relations to outcomes at this point.
> - Consider multiple days of observations (at least two) and collect lesson plans in advance in order to identify the best day(s) to observe. Classroom video recording may also be helpful so that more nuanced scoring approaches may be used and evaluated.
> - Attend to social desirability bias.
> - It would be helpful to understand how accountability results are used at a district or school level to inform programmatic decisions and resources including next steps in terms of curriculum. In general, it is recommended HumRRO consider data they might collect in this pilot and full study that can

help with other parts of the validity arguments, such as understanding how schools inform programmatic decisions with accountability data.

- See what information from CSIPs and/or consolidated monitoring may inform both which schools to observe and to provide context about such schools. CSIPs may also provide evidence of actions districts and schools are taking account for their accountability results. There may be other information from districts or schools that provide more detailed instructional plans than CSIPs.
- KTAC suggests providing information about sufficiency of evidence in the validity framework document when it is applied to specific assessments. Such information can be organized in a chart indicating for what claims evidence is strong, sufficient, weak, etc.
- Please do not use the term 'instrument validity', instead discuss validity evidence for instruments related to their intended interpretations and uses.
- The validity framework should include test administration and score reporting.
- Consider how the framework can add claims and validity evidence for accountability in addition to each assessment.

Agenda Item: English Language Proficiency (ELP)- Consideration of EL Progress Accountability
Presenter: Brian Gong, Senior Associate, The Center for Assessment

<u>Summary</u>
Pinsonneault introduced the topic of the Progress in English Language Proficiency accountability indicator and transitioned to Gong, who provided context about recent significant growth in the English learner (EL) population in Kentucky. Gong then explained how Kentucky employs a value table approach to incorporate ACCESS for ELLs results into the accountability system. Gong offered this historical context: an advisory group established the value table approach to reflect values such as no negative points for negative growth. There was discussion about minimum n-size (30 with scores for two consecutive years) and implications for school-level inclusion.

Gong explained that this discussion was meant to focus on the implications of age and grade of EL progress toward English language proficiency; it is not an evaluation of the value table approach. He asked KTAC for advice for what KDE may consider to inform a decision, such as analyses that can help ensure the value table is achieving the policy objective, and for other approaches KDE might consider. He explained a key rationale for - and shared data relevant to - this discussion: districts have noticed that EL progress indicator scores are much higher for elementary schools compared to middle and high schools. Wickizer noted that they observe a spike in EL exits in 4th and 5th grade. KTAC noted that this pattern is similar in other states, and offered examples of states that employ incremental targets separately for elementary, middle, and high schools, and that factor in age of entry and/or initial EL proficiency level at entry.

KTAC noted that additional analyses may be informative to inform adjustments for middle and/or high school accountability for EL progress (reiterating that this is common in other states). KDE may focus on characteristics of ELs and success by time in program. KTAC

highlighted the importance of addressing this question: is the accountability system trying to detect the services provided to the student in the given year or prior services? One KTAC member recommended looking at other state approaches.

KTAC members agree that it is reasonable to condition by time in program and starting English language proficiency level.

> Action: KTAC members approved these recommendations
> - To understand the effect of instructional opportunities, first define the range of programs and services offered to ELs and clarify these across the state. Collect data/information to understand the range of programs and services offered across schools, and then consider ways to evaluate the quality of these programs and services.
> - Examine what is occurring in schools for the 22 districts that have an EL group in grades beyond elementary school compared to districts that identify an EL accountability group only in elementary schools.
> - Take program type, language development trajectories (e.g., language development for younger versus older students), time in program, and starting ELP level to help inform values captured in the value table.

Agenda Item: Office of Assessment and Accountability (OAA) Regulations for Review

Presenters: Rhonda Sims, Associate Commissioner, Kentucky Department of Education, Jenni Larkins, Policy Advisor, Office of Assessment and Accountability

Summary
Pinsonneault introduced the topic and transitioned to Larkins from KDE. Larkins explained that certain regulations are required to be reviewed by KTAC; the ones before the group have previously been reviewed by several advisory groups and the Kentucky Board of Education. Larkins first introduced and highlighted changes to 703 KAR 5:080, the administration code for Kentucky's educational assessment program, which gives guidelines for administration of the test. KTAC noted that the proposed changes improved efficiency while maintaining appropriate safeguards.

> Action
> - Huggins-Manley motioned to approve.
> - No suggestions or discussion.
> - Lane seconded.
> - The motion passed unanimously.

Larkins then introduced and highlighted changes to 703 KAR 5:240. Amendments to this regulation were necessary due to the introduction of attendance-based full-time, enrolled online, virtual and remote learning programs, as defined in 704 KAR 3:535 (not under the purview of the Office of Assessment and Accountability). Changes to 703 KAR 5:240 will define how to include these virtual programs in public reporting.

Amendments to 703 KAR 3:535 will require that students in these programs must be enrolled in an accountable school so that accountability is "assigned" to every student.

There was discussion about student assignments, trends in virtual school enrollment, assessment requirements for virtual schools. Larkins explained that, while the regulation governing full time enrolled online, virtual and remote learning programs is under the purview of the Office of Education Technology, the addition of these programs necessitated an amendment to - 703 KAR 5:240.

> Action
> - Goldschmidt motioned to approve.
> - Suggestion to amend that the recommendation to approve is contingent upon further study and monitoring regarding when these programs should be considered schools and included in ESSA accountability.
> - Diaz-Bilello seconded.
> - The motion - as amended - passed unanimously.

Agenda Item: 2023-2024 Kentucky Accountability Results

Presenters: Rhonda Sims, Associate Commissioner, Kentucky Department of Education, Jennifer Stafford, Division Director, Division of Assessment and Accountability Support, Kevin Hill, Division Director, Division of Accountability Data and Analysis

Summary

Sims introduced the topic, first noting that 2023-2024 was the first time the state had two consecutive years of the same accountability system in almost a decade. Results were released earlier than prior years, though the dashboard has not yet been updated due to a change in vendor. Stafford provided an overview of the accountability system, explaining that it currently applies for both federal and state requirements, and highlighting identification and exit rates for 2023-2024.

Sims next described trends in assessment results, noting particular attention to high school science assessment results, which have dropped. KDE is interested in a deeper dive into science results and practices to explore if there is a disconnect between science standards and instruction at the high school level. NAEP trends since 1998 were shared.

KTAC reviewed ACT results, discussing the slight decline in composite scores and the relationship both to high rates of chronic absence statewide and to teacher shortages. KTAC members discussed KDE connections with postsecondary educator preparation programs, particularly for science. Members noted that ACT science did not show the same dropoff in performance as the state test and suggested a number of analyses KDE may conduct to better understand context and inform understanding of results.

> Action: KTAC members approved these recommendations
>
> KDE and its partners should conduct analyses to better understand the recent low and declining science scores, especially in high schools. KTAC suggested several possible things to examine, including:

- Check comparability of test forms/administration over time (done by HumRRO)
- Check possible impact of pandemic on students in 2020 now grade 11 students in 2024 (but why in science and not in math/ELA);
- Consider possible impact of chronic absenteeism;
- As part of ongoing forensic investigations, examine engagement of high school students ([time spent reading before responding], time spent on items within clusters and across the entire test , completion of items by type and place in test [scores on long constructed response] - at item level starting by cluster) - this may potentially inform if a different approach will need to be taken with the test design (e.g., lighten the text heavy load, include shorter clusters);
- Do cognitive interviews to see if there are opportunity to learn issues (i.e., students have not been exposed to the content fully or recently before taking the assessment) and to explore possible issues in completing cluster-based items in ways that can demonstrate students' knowledge and skills;
- Consider conversations with teacher preparation programs regarding science education;
- Check relationships between state and national scores, such as ACT, SAT, AP (for high performing students);
- Examine course taking patterns relative to state assessment outcomes;
- Ask teachers/students via a survey or focus groups about OTL the KY standards assessed on the state assessment, as well as the timing of such OTL in relation to the test timing; alignment of high school courses vs. grade 11 tested content.
- Check in [2018] performance standard setting, were standard setters confident, etc. KDE reported this look has been completed in a validation process.

Confirmation of Recommendations

Pinsonneault asked KTAC members to review and suggest edits to the draft recommendations prior to convening the next morning.

<u>Action</u>

- Goldschmidt motioned to adjourn.
- Huggins-Manley seconded the motion.
- The motion to adjourn passed unanimously.

The group adjourned at 4:29.

AGENDA & NOTES

October 16

Attendance:

TAC Members: Suzanne Lane (until noon), Corinne Huggins-Manley, Elena Diaz-Bilello, Pete Goldschmidt, (Absent: Leslie Keng)

KDE (in-person): Rhonda Sims, Jennifer Stafford, Jennifer Larkins, Helen Jones, Kevin Hill, Mike Prater

KDE (remote): Oliver Ackerman, Tiffany Christopher, David Curd, Kevin O'Hair, John Wickizer, Chris Williams, Melissa Chandler, Krista Mullins, Kim WookJoong, Christen Roseberry, Devin Avery, Karen Dodd

Other (remote): HumRRO - Art Thacker, Gertrudes Velasquez, Emily Dickinson, Pearson - Sharon Staples, Scott Wilson, Tracy Gardner, Likun Hou, Jennifer Kash

Consultant: Bill Auty

Facilitation: Brian Gong, Laura Pinsonneault

Agenda Item: Welcome

Sims opened the meeting at 8:40, welcoming the group and thanking them for their contributions on the first day.

Agenda Item: Review Day 2 Agenda and Housekeeping

Presenter: Brian Gong, Senior Associate, The Center for Assessment

Summary

Gong suggested some adjustments to the agenda, to make time in the morning to review the recommendations and set dates for the next in-person meeting.

Action

- Lane motioned to approve recommendations from day 1.
- Diaz-Biello seconded the motion.
- The recommendations from day 1 were approved by unanimous vote.

Next, the group set upcoming meeting dates, first confirming that the meeting will be a remote convening on January 28, 2025. The group also held June 3, 2025 for a remote meeting, and October 21-22, 2025 for the next in-person meeting. Gong reminded the group that KDE may request an ad hoc meeting as needed.

Agenda Item: Kentucky Summative Assessment Item Bank Review

Presenters: Sharon Staples, Scott Wilson, Tracy Gardner, Likun Hou, Jennifer Kash (All presenters from Pearson)

Summary

Gong initiated this topic by inviting introductions from the Pearson team . Staples then provided an overview of item bank composition for all content areas including historical

context for item development and retention. There was discussion about field test history and plans for stand alone field testing in 2026. Schools in Kentucky prefer embedded field testing and all field test items are embedded for the spring 2025 administration. The group was reminded that standard setting occurred most recently in either July of 2022 (a validation of the 2018 and 2019 standard setting for science) or June of 2023 (a validation of 2022 standard setting for other content areas).

Staples described the process to gather item bank data, providing numbers of items by domain and standard. Items developed prior to standard setting were not included in counts and there was discussion about whether they could be candidate items.
Subsequent discussion focused on the implications of release requirements and how released items are used, with KTAC offering some recommendations that may bolster the usefulness of released items, such as misconception information and response time.

Staples shared Pearson's item back recommendations for all subjects and grades broadly and recommendations for each subject area by grade. KTAC discussed the possible usefulness of task models, noting the significant change management necessary for a transition to this approach. KTAC also requested an item bank health plan that is responsive to the information provided in this meeting. The plan should address three years of item development.

> Action: KTAC members approved these recommendations
> - It would be helpful to understand approaches to including different item types in field testing.
> - HumRRO may consider using data about access of released items and add a question about this use in their site visits to better understand intentional use.
> - To improve the usefulness of reports, consider including information about misconceptions with student responses and distractors. Response time may also be helpful at a student level. Another approach can be to establish protocols to allow for meaning-making in the PLC work, rather than giving every minute piece of data (and adding cost to Pearson's work).
> - Look into states that use task models (possibly even task models coming from "Evidence Centered Design- light" approach used in New York, Smarter Balanced, or the revised SAT) to generate multiple items, including prior PARCC states that use an evidence centered design approach. Be aware, if the approach is adopted, that the lift to transition to such difficult and complex work is large; it is not a simple change. Examples of task models and other specifications could also be helpful.
> - The TAC strongly recommends that Pearson should confirm that Pearson's Overview notes stating that the "current [grade/content item] bank can support OP [operational] testing for an additional 1 year" means the item bank is sufficient to produce forms for Spring 2025 and Spring 2026 that meet all the operational constraints, e.g., match the test blueprint, meet item release requirements, support the equating plan, etc.
> - The TAC strongly recommends that Pearson should supplement the item bank information provided with an item bank health plan (ideally a 3-year

plan) to share with KDE and KTAC. Include information about how to address the long-term health that mitigates risk of items shortages in the longer term.
- KDE should require assessment vendor(s) to provide item bank information on an annual basis.

Agenda Item: Kentucky United We Learn (KUWL) Council Conversations

Presenters: Jennifer Stafford, KDE, Laura Pinsonneault and Andre Rupp, The Center for Assessment, and Susan Lyons, Lyons Consulting

Summary:

Pinsonneault summarized the development timeline and process for the KUWL Council work to date, including the four memos that were written to support the current Study Phase. Stafford reviewed the KUWL Council history, which started with a 2020 listening tour conducted by prior Commissioner Jason Glass that elevated three big ideas: vibrant learning experiences for students; innovation in assessment and accountability; increase community engagement. She described efforts by 18 districts (local laboratories of learning, or L3 districts) to develop innovative practices around local accountability and the connection to a 2022 competitive grant for state assessment awarded to KDE to support this work, including establishment of the Kentucky United We Learn (KUWL) Council. The KUWL Council's goal is to impact state policy such that recommendations from the group are represented in legislative and policy changes for the State General Assembly prior to its January 2026 session. KDE has recently circulated a prototype that maps out changes to local, state, and federal accountability and assessment that align with the KUWL Council's vision. Extensive stakeholder feedback has been collected and will be reviewed by the KUWL Council in its meeting this same month. Additionally, technical consultants have drafted memos on key issues implicated by the prototype: performance assessment, balanced assessment systems, vibrant learning in accountability, and student growth models.

KTAC discussed the need to define vibrant learning clearly in order to determine how to best to measure efforts and reach, and Stafford agreed that one question the KUWL Council grapples with is whether vibrant learning should capture quality or participation in such opportunities. While practices are valued, it is not yet clear if or how they will be included in the system design.

KTAC encouraged consideration of the implications of high stakes uses of assessment and other outcome or practice data as well as consideration of how to reconcile and/or appropriately connect information across different accountability systems (federal, state, local). This may include consideration of whether local assessment measures - if more culturally sensitive, more personalized - better allow students to demonstrate what they know and can do. It will be important to think about what this might say about the state summative assessment. A theory of action will be important as the work progresses and may evolve over time.

Next, Pinsonneault provided background about the four memos produced for the study phase, noting purpose, audience, coherence with other considerations from the KUWL Council.

The group first discussed growth measures in accountability, with Stafford first providing some background about KDE's past experience with growth measures, noting that the field seems to prefer a simple approach. KTAC discussed approaches to make growth measures more accessible and transparent, noting that it will be necessary to communicate regularly about student growth regardless of the measure selected for accountability. They also discussed intended users and uses, such as parents wanting to know if their child is growing, perhaps within a school year and educators who may be interested in a content-referenced interpretation. KDE will need to define boundaries and priorities for this work in order to help narrow options.

Next, KTAC discussed balanced assessment systems, joined by Lyons, who explained that Council members have been interested in locally defined assessment systems and are turning their attention to how the state assessment system can provide actionable instructional information. Lyons explained that the memo articulates some options relative to different degrees of local autonomy so that KDE can find the right balance in this approach, and noted that, while through-year is referenced, it is not meant to be a summative approach and balanced portions would not be part of formal accountability. KTAC highlighted the value of a theory of action focused on intended use for the assessment system as a whole and for any component (summative, interim) of that system. KTAC noted the importance of clarifying the state role in relation to provision and support of summative, interim, and formative assessments and materials.

Next, KTAC discussed performance assessment, joined by Rupp, who acknowledged the connections between this topic and the topic of balanced assessment systems and the desire for clarity about different conceptualizations of performance assessment. KTAC discussed state and local roles in developing and supporting performance-based assessments and the need to understand what competencies are necessary and to be clear about the goals of the performance assessment. This discussion led to connections with design principles that can inform the argument to support validation. Broadly, KTAC acknowledged that studying this work will need to continue as the system evolves. There was some discussion about current activities in the performance assessment space, especially the L3 districts. KTAC noted the importance of guardrails, and considerations for local districts as they think about moving into the performance assessment space. The state may have an appropriate role as "main convener" and partner to support local efforts and connect promising practices across districts.

> Action: KTAC members approved these recommendations
>
> - Deciding which growth model(s) to use should include consideration of the needed communication to support all the different stakeholders that need to learn about and understand student-level growth. Recognize that continued effort will likely be needed to communicate more complex growth models.
> - In addition, with the intention of KUWL and the desire to develop a system from the ground-up, it is equally important that KDE and other Kentucky

state-level actors learn about and understand how teachers, parents, and students conceptualize student-growth to help inform measurements or approaches that can reflect that.

- Depending on stakeholder desires for student growth, it may require thinking more broadly than simply using current assessments as is: i.e. developing a grade band or over vertical scales may provide an avenue towards developing growth indicators that lead to results that may afford intended claims about students. It also may be that this type of growth can be captured through balanced assessment approaches that include what districts already use, or may be able to use, to capture longitudinal within-student growth.
- When designing reports, examine research and practice on micro credentials (being used more in higher ed and work). This use is notable in that it should have a clear benefit for the student.
- Think about considerations, guardrails, and things districts should consider and address as moving into efforts to establish vibrant learning experiences and/or create and implement performance assessment (or any other investment/development of assessments).
- Approaches to a balanced assessment system should prioritize sustainability (Design Principle #7).
- KDE and the KUWL Council should focus on appropriate use of any assessment within a balanced assessment system, and supporting effective practices around such use.
- The state should clarify its role relative to supporting performance assessment. It may be appropriate for the state to play "supporter in chief" and "master convener" around this work to establish recommendations, provide support structures, and convene states for shared learning.
- Provide a clear definition of performance assessment for KY - including consideration of what it looks like to allow for flexibility in this space - to ground local implementation work.
- It would be useful to develop specific theories of actions supporting the development and use of additional assessments as part of a balanced assessment system.

Agenda Item: Confirmation of Recommendations

Presenter: Laura Pinsonneault, Associate, The Center for Assessment

Summary

KTAC members were given time to review and suggest edits to draft recommendations from day 2 of the meeting. Edits were discussed and accepted.

Action

- Goldschmidt motioned to approve the recommendations from day 2.
- Huggins-Manley seconded the motion.
- The recommendations from day 2 were approved by unanimous vote.

Adjournment

Stafford thanked TAC members and facilitators for their support. KTAC members offered final thoughts for the meeting.

> Action
> - Huggins-Manley motioned to adjourn.
> - Goldschmidt seconded the motion.
> - The motion to adjourn passed unanimously.

The group adjourned at 2:28 pm.