

KENTUCKY



Several features of Kentucky’s accountability system encourage high schools to pay attention to high-achieving students. Rewarding schools where students earn college credit via AP, IB, or dual enrollment programs would further improve the system.

THE PURPOSE OF THIS ANALYSIS

The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) grants states more authority over their school accountability systems than did its predecessor, No Child Left Behind (NCLB). Consequently, states now have an opportunity to design school rating systems that improve upon the NCLB model, especially when it comes to high achievers.

NCLB meant well (as did many state accountability systems that preceded it), but it had a pernicious flaw: it strongly incentivized schools to focus exclusively on low-performing students’ “proficiency” and high school graduation rates, ignoring the educational needs of high achievers, who were likely to pass state reading and math tests and earn a diploma regardless of what happened in the classroom. This may be why the United States has seen significant achievement growth and much higher graduation rates for its lowest-performing students over the last twenty years but smaller gains for its top students.

Starting in 2011, former secretary of education Arne Duncan offered waivers to states that wanted the flexibility to redesign their accountability systems. In particular, states were allowed to incorporate the use of real student growth measures into their school determinations. This was a much fairer way of evaluating schools’ impact on student achievement than looking only at proficiency rates, which are strongly correlated with student demographics, family circumstance, and prior achievement. And, just as significantly, well-designed growth measures can eliminate the temptation for schools to ignore their high achievers.

In 2015, Congress replaced NCLB and its waivers with the ESSA, which maintains NCLB’s requirement that states assess students annually in grades 3–8 and once in high school. Under ESSA, states must now use four types of indicators to rate high schools: academic achievement (which can include student growth); graduation rates; growth toward English proficiency for English language learners; and at least one other valid, reliable indicator of school quality or student success. Furthermore, each of the academic indicators (1–3) must carry “substantial” weight and, in the aggregate, must count “much more” than the fourth.

To help states make the most of the ESSA opportunity, we have reviewed how well their present, intended, or most recently employed accountability systems serve high achievers. If a state's system doesn't do a satisfactory job of incentivizing schools to focus on high achievers, we believe that strengthens the case for changing it materially.

States may think we're being premature in evaluating their systems during this time of massive change. Please understand that our primary objective is to identify the design features of an accountability system that works for all students—which we hope will become the prevailing model now that ESEA is reauthorized and states' testing regimes are becoming stable once again.

Here we examine Kentucky's system for rating high school performance during the 2014–15 school year—the most recent year for which information is available. We do not examine the quality of the state's standards, tests, or sanctions for low performance.

Part I of this report, released in August 2016, examined Kentucky's rating systems for elementary and middle schools.¹

HOW STATES CAN PRIORITIZE HIGH ACHIEVERS IN THEIR HIGH SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEMS

In our view, states can and should take four steps to ensure that the needs of high achievers are prioritized under ESSA.

1. **For the first academic indicator required by ESSA (academic achievement), give high schools incentives for getting more students to an advanced level.** Under ESSA, states will continue to track the percentage of students who attain proficiency on state tests. They should also give high schools incentives for getting students to an advanced level (such as level four on Smarter Balanced or level five on PARCC). For example, they might create an achievement index that gives schools partial credit for getting students to a basic level, full credit for getting students to a proficient level, and additional credit for getting students to an advanced level. (It's not entirely clear from the Department of Education's proposed regulations whether this will be allowed, though we don't see anything in the law prohibiting it.)
2. **Use the flexibility provided by ESSA to rate high schools using a true growth model—that is, one that includes the progress of individual students at all achievement levels and not just those who are low-performing or below the "proficient" line.** Regrettably, some states still don't consider individual student growth, don't use it at the high school level, or use a growth-to-proficiency system that continues to encourage schools to ignore the needs of students above (or far above) the proficient level. Using true growth models—such as those that estimate a school's value added or median growth percentile—is preferable.
3. **When determining summative high school ratings, make growth—across the achievement spectrum—count at least as much as achievement.** The Department of Education's proposed regulations under ESSA require states to combine multiple factors into summative school ratings, probably through an index. Each of the first three indicators (achievement, graduation rate, and progress toward English proficiency) must carry "substantial" weight. In our view, states should (and, under ESSA, are free to) make growth count at least as much as achievement does. Otherwise, schools will continue to face an incentive to ignore their high performers. (States that don't yet roll their indicators up to a summative rating for the school receive a "not applicable" designation here.)

4. **Include an indicator that gives high schools an incentive to help able students earn college credit before they graduate.** One “indicator of school quality or student success” should be the percentage of students who earn college credit via AP, IB, and/or dual-enrollment programs, which are among the best ways to challenge high performers. It’s important that states focus on actual attainment of college credit or the equivalent, not just participation in these programs, lest the incentives encourage the wrong behavior by schools: shoving students into AP, IB, and/or dual enrollment even if they are not prepared to succeed, leading to frustration on their part and potentially harming the experience of their higher-achieving peers. Let us also acknowledge the questionable value of many of today’s dual-enrollment programs. Students are often taught not by college professors but by high school teachers, and the “college credit” earned doesn’t always transfer to bona fide colleges. States should therefore encourage more high schools to offer AP and IB courses because those come with external exams, which ensure program quality and rigor.

DOES KENTUCKY’S HIGH SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM PRIORITIZE HIGH ACHIEVERS?





INDICATOR	RATINGS	NOTES
1. Does the state rate high schools’ academic achievement using a model that gives additional credit for students achieving at an advanced level?		Kentucky gives additional credit for students achieving at a “distinguished” level. ²
2. Does the state rate high schools’ growth using a model that includes the progress of all individual students, not just those below the “proficient” line?		Kentucky uses a student growth percentile model. ³ A student growth percentile model compares students to peers with similar achievement in the previous school year by ranking them based on their year-to-year growth.
3. When calculating summative high school ratings, does the state assign at least as much weight to “growth for all students” as it does to achievement?		At the high school level, “growth for all students” and achievement each count for 20 percent of a school’s summative rating. (See Exhibit A.)
4. Does the state rate high schools’ success in helping students earn college credit before graduating via AP, IB, and/or dual-enrollment programs?		Kentucky does not rate high schools’ success in helping students earn college credit before graduating, though it does report school level data on AP performance. ⁴ (See Exhibit B.)

EXHIBIT A⁵**How will student performance be used for accountability?**

Next-Generation Learners is the main component of Unbridled Learning and is based on many measures of student performance on various tests. Points will be awarded based on how well a school performs on each measure.

- **Achievement** – Just as in the past, elementary and middle school students' scores will be labeled as novice, apprentice, proficient or distinguished. Kentucky's goal is 100 percent proficiency for all students. At high school, achievement is based on end-of-course exams and an on-demand writing test.
- **Gap** – Schools will compare test results for African-American, Hispanic, Native American, special education, low income and limited English proficiency students, combined into one gap group, to results for other students who aren't in those categories.
- **Growth** – A statistical program will measure how much students' scores are improving from one year to the next.
- **College/Career Readiness** – Schools and districts will provide information about how many students are ready for college and/or careers, based on test scores and certifications earned.
- **Graduation Rate** – Schools and districts will report how many students graduate within four years of high school.

Calculating Next-Generation Learner Score

	Elementary	Middle	High
Achievement	30%	28%	20%
Gap	30%	28%	20%
Growth	40%	28%	20%
Readiness for College/Career	n/a	16%	20%
Graduation Rate	n/a	n/a	20%

EXHIBIT B⁶

Advanced Placement (AP)

*These are tests that can be taken upon completion of Advanced Placement (AP) courses. Students earning a score of three or above may qualify for college credit. **The number of students listed in the Assessment results reflects students tested at a school.***

Advanced Placement - Performance and Participation															
Group	Number of Test Takers			Percent of Total Test Takers			Number of Exams Taken			Number of Exams with Scores 3-5			Percent of Exams with Scores 3-5		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
All Students	17	17	31,772	100.0	100.0	100.0	28	28	50,912	3	3	24,437	10.7	10.7	48.0
Male	***	***	13,138			41.4			21,817			11,234			51.5
Female	***	***	17,782			56.0			27,910			12,678			45.4
White (Non-Hispanic)	***	***	26,524			83.5			42,556			20,713			48.7
African American			1,750			5.5			2,489			690			27.7
Hispanic			1,001			3.2			1,573			644			40.9
Asian			1,028			3.2			2,180			1,487			68.2
American Indian or Alaska Native			39			0.1			50			21			42.0
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander			27			0.1			37			15			40.5
Two or more races			551			1.7			842			342			40.6
Migrant			23			0.1			33			8			24.2
Free/Reduced-Price Meals	***	***	8,756			27.6			13,056			4,122			31.6
Disability-With IEP (Total)			154			0.5			191			61			31.9
Gap Group (non-duplicated)	***	***	9,942			31.3			14,858			4,919			33.1
Limited English Proficiency			41			0.1			46			20			43.5

Note: Percentages may not sum to 100% due to rounding. School results are based on the grades in the school.

*** Using guidance from the U.S. Department of Education, counts must be displayed for all groups. In order to protect student identification required by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), performance results are suppressed.

ENDNOTES

1. Michael J. Petrilli, et al., *High Stakes for High Achievers: State Accountability in the Age of ESSA*, pages 116–121, (District of Columbia: Thomas B. Fordham Institute, 2016), <https://edexcellence.net/publications/high-stakes-for-high-achievers>.
2. “Unbridled learning accountability model,” Kentucky Department of Education, page 5, accessed July 20, 2016, <http://education.ky.gov/comm/ul/documents/white%20paper%20062612%20final.pdf>.
3. “PGES Student Growth,” Kentucky Department of Education, accessed May 31, 2016, <http://education.ky.gov/teachers/pges/tpges/pages/tpges-student-growth-page.aspx>.
4. “Unbridled learning accountability model,” page 8.
5. “A Parent’s Guide to School Accountability in Kentucky,” Kentucky Department of Education, accessed May 31, 2016, <http://education.ky.gov/comm/UL/Documents/Parents%20Guide%20Accountability%20082812.pdf>.
6. “Kentucky School Report Card – Bellevue High School,” Kentucky Department of Education, accessed July 20, 2016, <https://applications.education.ky.gov/src/Assessment.aspx>.