

REIMAGINING ASSESSMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

in Service to the
Kentucky United We Learn Council's
Moonshot

Prototypes for Discussion & Consideration
Version 1.0
MAY 2024



Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Vision: Landing on the Moon	4
Prototype 1: Mirroring the Moon Landing within State Accountability	7
Essential Features	7
Assessment System	7
Reporting	8
School Support & Improvement	8
Policy & Political Considerations	8
Prototype 2: Valuing Vibrant Learning Experiences within State Accountability	9
Essential Features	9
Assessment System	9
Reporting	9
School Support & Improvement	10
Policy & Political Considerations	10
Prototype 3: New Federal Accountability Indicator of Vibrant Learning Experiences	11
Essential Features	11
Assessment System	11
Reporting	11
School Support & Improvement	12
Policy & Political Considerations	12
Prototype 4: Centering Local Innovations in State Reporting and Feedback Systems	12
Evaluation Process	12
Assessment System	12
Reporting	13
School Accountability	13
Policy Considerations	13
Appendix A: Distinguishing Features Across Prototypes	15
Appendix B: Prototypes Relative to Federal and State Law	17
Appendix C: Discussion Questions for Working Group Members	18
Landing on the Moon	18
Prototype 1	18
Prototype 2	18
Prototype 3	18
Prototype 4	19
Appendix D: Design Principles for Assessment and Accountability System Redesign	20

Introduction

During the April 2024 convening of the Kentucky United We Learn Council, the Menu of Options Workgroup was formed. This group is dedicated to enhancing education across the Commonwealth by co-creating a number of prototypes that describe how the state might revise its assessment and accountability systems to align with the council-adopted moonshot: “To build a prosperous Kentucky, we will launch an accountability system that is meaningful and useful to all our learners.”

After valuable input was collected from the members of the Menu of Options Work group in April 2024, working group facilitators developed the following vision and set of prototypes to capture the members’ desire for long-term changes to Kentucky’s assessment and accountability systems. These prototypes are preliminary versions for further discussion and serve as examples of potential approaches to assessment and accountability that better align with the Kentucky United We Learn moonshot.

The prototypes serve to communicate alternatives that education advocates will be able to evaluate and better understand each approach for the purposes of discussion and refinement. Each prototype maintains the high expectations of accountability for Kentucky’s education system. The expectation is that all students in Kentucky will participate in innovative practices and in the state’s assessment and accountability systems.

This document comprises five sections with appendices. Each section describes essential features of a unique approach to accountability and includes implications for assessment, reporting practices, school improvement and support, and policy. The first section presents an overarching vision that describes assessment and accountability in an “ideal state,” i.e., in which there are no federal or state constraints and a system can fully reflect local priorities. The Menu of Options working group spent significant time at the April Kentucky United We Learn Council convening articulating the details of this vision in what are described as the “Landing on the Moon” scenario. The subsequent four sections are prototypes that each illustrate a unique approach, but - importantly are themselves malleable and may be adjusted based on feedback during the review and revision process. For example, the feature of one prototype may be incorporated into another prototype based on feedback and discussion, or the assessment options may be included in another prototype.

Currently, assessment and accountability systems are deeply impacted by state and federal requirements for assessment and accountability. For example, both state and federal law require statewide summative testing of students in academic content areas that measures the depth and breadth of state’s adopted standards. The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) requires that

students in grades 3 through 8 and at one grade level in high school participate in assessments of reading and mathematics, and that students take a statewide science assessment once per grade span. In Kentucky, state law also requires that students be assessed in writing and social studies. Federal law also requires that students who are English learners take an English language proficiency test annually. As assessments change, Kentucky must submit them for federal approval through a peer review process.

Kentucky is also required again by state statute and federal law to develop an accountability system that comprises a number of distinct indicators that are combined to produce a summative rating of a school's performance. These requirements are satisfied by a single accountability system in Kentucky and this system including information about how the state satisfies federal assessment requirements is described in a consolidated state plan (CSP) that the Kentucky Department of Education submits to the U.S. Department of Education (USED) for review and approval. If the state wishes to make changes to its assessment or accountability system, those changes must be documented in the CSP and re-submitted to USED for review and approval. Per state law and regulation, changes must also be routed through various advisory bodies and depending on the change may necessitate legislative and/or action by the Kentucky Board of Education. It will take several years to accomplish amendments to current law, secure federal approval and fully implement revisions to the current assessment and accountability systems.

When legislative changes occur, they often have a fiscal impact. Changes within the prototypes - such as accreditation, collection of evidence and additional reporting - will impact human resources and implementation costs at the school, district and state level. Fiscal impact to legislative changes will need to be part of the ongoing discussions and advocacy.

Vision: Landing on the Moon

(vision statement, disregards policy constraints)

The Kentucky United We Learn Council envisions new systems of assessment and accountability, first articulated in the [United We Learn report](#), that prioritizes innovation, personalization, and local and student voice. These priorities are captured in design principles (see Appendix D) put forth by the Accelerating Innovation Committee. The council proposes a reimagined system for school evaluation and feedback aligned with these principles that reflects community values and supports schools in meeting their communities' needs and goals.

Assessment systems gather evidence on what students have learned and can do. Accountability systems should support improvement by cultivating relationships between the entities that have an interest in improving education. Families and caregivers, policymakers, educators and community members should have access to trustworthy information that allows them to support improvement of the student experience.

The reimagined assessment and accountability systems will emphasize transparency by providing families and communities with information on a broad set of school quality domains, which could include:

Table 1. School Quality Evaluation Framework

Academic Outcomes and Growth, + Portrait of a Learner (POL) Competencies	Vibrant Learning Experiences	Teaching and Leadership	School Culture and Student Well-being	Community Connections and Post-secondary Readiness	Locally Determined Criteria (optional)	Locally Determined Criteria (optional)	Locally Determined Criteria (optional)
State developed rubrics evaluated using a mixture of state-required and locally-specific evidence. For each indicator, some evidence would be required (e.g., growth metrics in reading and math), other evidence would be locally determined (e.g., evidence of community engagement).					Fully local criteria and evidence.		

Schools will engage in gathering evidence of school quality relative to each of the domains to share with the local board of education and an external evaluator for review and feedback. An external evaluator, the local board of education, and district and school leaders would work collaboratively to set goals based on the evidence, as well as accompanying school improvement strategies and needed state support. Schools will update their evidence of quality as it becomes available and re-submit their evidence to the external evaluator for formal evaluation at regular intervals, at least once every three years.

The accountability system would continue to include a system of student assessment. There are possible options of an assessment system that would serve different purposes and impose different constraints. Two options are presented for discussion.

Option A

The statewide system of assessment is replaced with a through-year model that captures student learning and growth within the academic year. The adaptive tests are able to meet students with outcomes above and below grade level where they are in their learning and could replace local assessments purchased by districts. This approach would prioritize math and reading in order to provide real-time information that can better support instructional decision-making while reducing the state testing footprint.

The reductions in the state assessment system create room for local assessment innovations, such as authentic demonstrations of learning across the broader set of content areas (e.g., science,

social studies, arts), and may include student capstone projects, performance assessments and student-level defenses of learning. These authentic demonstrations of learning are valued alongside the through-year growth assessment results within the first domain of the school quality evaluation framework (see Table 1).

Option B

The statewide system of assessment is replaced with a personalized, competency-based learning approach that prioritizes authentic demonstrations of knowledge and skills. Student competency on the targeted knowledge and skills across all content areas would be demonstrated through multiple sources of evidence, including curriculum-embedded performance assessments and personalized evidence drawn from authentic applications of knowledge in extended project-based learning experiences and work or service-based learning experiences.

The quality of local determinations of student competency would be supported by a comprehensive and ongoing approach to statewide professional learning and support. Local determinations of student competency will be additionally validated for comparability and technical quality through process and data audits, as well as administration of a short-form version of a standardized assessment (sampling across students and standards as is done with National Assessment of Educational Progress).

Schools and the public will have transparent access to the school evaluation data through a state-provided, but locally customized, refreshable data display. For each domain in the School Quality Evaluation Framework, the school-level goals, current evidence of quality and ratings on the statewide rubrics are provided to support community conversations and responsive accountability practices. The data displays would serve in place of the current state-issued report cards. While some metrics will allow for comparability across the state (e.g., academic growth), other evidence will allow schools and districts to lift up their unique local practices.

The Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) will continue to prioritize resources and support for schools that are low performing on the academic components of the evaluation framework, while also making available resources for all schools based on their individual needs. Schools would be required to engage their communities in conversation around the data in order to submit Continuous Improvement Plans to the state and may opt into customized state support for local improvement efforts.

The moon landing articulates the vision of the Menu of Options Work group without regard to policy constraints. The four prototypes below offer ideas for how components of the vision could be brought forth through the available policy pathways.

Each prototype presents the relationship between current legal and policy constraints and the vision. There are four high-level relationships illustrated among the proposals:

- Prototype 1. Reflect the fullness of the “Landing on the Moon” vision for assessment and accountability as an accreditation-type process through the state accountability system; reduce the federal system to the extent possible;
- Prototype 2. Update the state accountability system to include a process-based indicator of vibrant learning experiences and prioritize reporting of these results; no changes to the federal system and deprioritize federal reporting;
- Prototype 3. Update the federal system to include a menu of options indicator related to student-centered learning; and
- Prototype 4. Focus on reporting that reflects state priorities for assessment and accountability; no changes to state or federal accountability.

Appendix A provides a high-level summary of the distinguishing features across the vision statement and each of the four prototypes.

Prototype 1: Mirroring the Moon Landing within State Accountability

(mirrors vision statement within state accountability, reduces federal system to meet minimum requirements)

Essential Features

Kentucky will aim for its moonshot by fully redesigning the state accountability system to mirror the system described in the vision statement (see page 4). Education advocates will need to make the case to the Kentucky General Assembly to remove all aspects of the state’s current accountability system that are not federally required. If successful, the General Assembly will instead enact a new state accountability system that reflects the values and aspirations of the Kentucky United We Learn Council in which school quality evaluation is a collaborative process that considers state and local forms of evidence against a broad set of domains. See the description of the “Landing on the Moon” scenario for details.

The federal accountability system will be simplified and reduced to meet the minimum federal requirements to identify three categories of schools for the purpose of providing resources and support: 1) Targeted Support and Improvement/Additional Targeted Support and Improvement, 2) Comprehensive Support and Improvement, and 3) Meets Requirements. Additional simplifications to the federal accountability system include replacing the “Change” component with individual student growth.

Assessment System

The state will reduce the number and length of the assessments used to determine academic proficiency to meet the minimum federal requirements (i.e., reading, mathematics and science). Social studies and writing would be assessed using local assessments.

Reporting

Information from the reimagined state accountability system will serve as the primary means of communicating about school quality to the public through a state provided, locally customizable data display. The federal school ratings (i.e., Targeted Support and Improvement/Additional Support and Improvement, Comprehensive Support and Improvement, Meets Requirements) and indicator outcomes will be reported as required, but all other reporting components will reflect the Landing on the Moon vision (see vision statement).

School Support and Improvement

Information from the federal system will only be used to identify schools for receipt of federal school improvement funding. Receiving federal funds is associated with specific requirements and expectations. Information from the state accountability system, on the other hand, will serve as the primary means of informing state decisions about resource allocation, policies and support.

School Accountability

Federal accountability for elementary, middle and high schools would include state test results in reading and mathematics, English learner progress, quality of school climate and safety survey, individual student growth (elementary and middle only), postsecondary readiness (high only), and graduation rate (high only).

In addition to the federal indicators, state accountability for elementary, middle and high schools would 1) include an accreditation of school quality and 2) eliminate color ratings.

Policy and Political Considerations

Kentucky state statutes KRS 158.6455 (accountability) and KRS 158.6453 (assessments) would require significant changes to achieve the prototype articulated here. Notably, the state would need to replace the existing “change” indicator with individual growth throughout KRS 158.6455. The General Assembly would need to exercise its statutory authority to revise state assessments to align with federal requirements. The length of assessments could be reduced within the guardrails of the federal peer review process. The state would need to submit a modified Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) plan to the U.S. Department of Education for review and approval.

Politically, education advocates will need to lay considerable groundwork with legislators to make the case for the required statutory changes with both the legislature and Kentucky Board of Education. The groundwork must acknowledge that the legislature recently approved amendments to the state’s accountability system that created the color rating system, additional indicators of school quality and student success, and non-mandated assessments of academic achievement.

Prototype 2: Valuing Vibrant Learning Experiences within State Accountability
(adds school-level process indicator in state accountability, impacts state color rating, no changes to federal system)

Essential Features

Kentucky will value and prioritize innovative local practices by placing significant emphasis on vibrant learning practices within the state accountability system by creating a new state indicator of “Vibrant Learning Experiences.” The new state accountability system aims to support the spread of deeper and more meaningful learning experiences for all students across the state by crediting schools that are engaged in high-quality local processes and practices related to demonstrations of learning relative to the state or local portraits of a learner.

The Vibrant Learning Experiences indicator will identify where schools are along a continuum of implementation of creating vibrant learning experiences for their students. Schools will be rated on a 5-point rubric that represents a progression toward rigorous and more meaningful learning opportunities that meet grade-level standards for their students that may include, but are not limited to: student defenses of learning, digital portfolios, student capstone projects, student engagement in work- or service-based learning experiences, or other locally determined indicators.

Though there is flexibility in how schools operationalize vibrant learning for their students, all schools will be rated on the same set of rubrics that identifies the underlying high-leverage processes and practices that support quality implementation. For example, one dimension for evaluation might be community engagement processes that support reciprocity and transparency. The rubrics would be co-developed by the state with an inclusive group of education advocates and school engagement process.

School ratings on the Vibrant Learning Experiences portion of state accountability will be determined through a self-scoring process along with corroborating evidence submitted to the state. All schools will be subject to regular state audits of their local processes and practices to support the validity and consistency in the Vibrant Learning Experiences indicator.

Assessment System

No changes to the statewide assessment system.

Reporting

The Vibrant Learning Experiences indicator will be reported alongside the federally approved accountability indicators in the state report card. Schools that achieve a rating of 4 or 5 on the Vibrant Learning will move up one rating on the state color scale (i.e., Red → Orange, Orange → Yellow, Yellow → Green, Green → Blue). The shifts in the color ratings that occur as a

result of the Vibrant Learning Experiences indicator reflect the value that the state places on the significant time and resources that schools have invested in creating more vibrant learning experiences for their students.

School Support and Improvement

While the current structures and processes for state systems of support would stay the same, the system will evolve to incorporate the new emphasis on local practices to support vibrant learning experiences.

School Accountability

Federal accountability for elementary, middle and high schools would remain the same, including, Status (current year performance) and Change (current year compared to prior year performance) for state test results in reading, mathematics, science, social studies and writing (editing and mechanics and on-demand), English Learner Progress, quality of school climate and safety survey, postsecondary readiness (high only), and graduation rate (high only).

In addition to the federal indicators, state accountability for elementary, middle and high schools would include a “Vibrant Learning Experiences” indicator that could impact the school’s color rating.

Policy and Political Considerations

Kentucky state statute KRS 158.6455 (accountability) would need to be modified by adding a “vibrant learning indicator” to the state accountability system and assigning it the appropriate weight. Authority will need to be delegated to the appropriate entities (i.e., the Kentucky Board of Education, the Kentucky Department of Education) to implement the new indicator. Because this indicator would only be used at the state level, no engagement with the U.S. Department of Education would be required.

Politically, education advocates will need to lay considerable groundwork with legislators to make the case for why this particular indicator should be added to Kentucky’s accountability system. Educational advocates should acknowledge that some districts are further ahead of others in meeting the criteria for this indicator. As a consequence, some sort of allowance or grace period should be included in this proposal for those districts that have not engaged in innovative approaches in as much depth.

Prototype 3: New Federal Accountability Indicator of Vibrant Learning Experiences *(adds new federal accountability indicator that includes a menu of options)*

Essential Features

The federally approved Title 1 accountability system will include a new menu of options indicator of “Vibrant Learning Experiences.” The indicator will capture the percentage of students engaged in one or more of the following student-centered learning experiences:

- Student capstone projects
- Student-led conferences
- Service-based learning experiences
- Work-based learning experiences
- Student defenses of learning
- Personalized learning pathways (e.g., career connected learning, independent study, dual enrollment)
- Another locally-proposed, federally-approved option

This indicator is aimed at providing student-centered learning experiences for all students and valuing those experiences within the federal accountability system as an additional indicator of school quality or student success. This indicator is calculated and reported annually for all schools (i.e., elementary, middle, high school).

KDE will engage with an inclusive set of education advocates to co-design a coherent set of resources and support for schools to adopt student-centered learning practices. To support the validity of this indicator, KDE will engage deeply with education advocates to develop a set of policies and procedures that ensure equity in opportunity across the state.

This additional indicator will coincide with reductions and simplifications to the current federally-approved accountability system. These changes would include eliminating the Quality of School Climate and Safety survey and replacing the “Change” component with a metric of individual student growth.

Assessment System

No changes to the statewide assessment system.

Reporting

Overall and disaggregated scores on the “Student-Centered Learning” indicator would be added to the state accountability report cards.

School Accountability

For federal and state, elementary and middle schools would be accountable for test results in

reading, mathematics, science, social studies and writing; individual student growth, English Learner Progress and student-centered learning practices.

For federal and state, high schools would be accountable for test results in reading and mathematics, science, social studies and writing; English Learner progress, postsecondary readiness, graduation rate and the student-centered learning practices.

School Support and Improvement

While the current structures and processes for state systems of support would stay the same, the system will evolve to incorporate the new emphasis on local practices to support student-centered learning.

Policy and Political Considerations

Kentucky state statute KRS 158.6455 (accountability) would need to be modified to add a “Vibrant Learning Experiences” indicator to the federal and state accountability systems. Similar to prototype 2, the current change component would need to be replaced with growth and the current climate survey requirement would need to be struck. Authority will need to be delegated to the appropriate entities (i.e., the Kentucky Board of Education, the Kentucky Department of Education) to implement the new indicator. The state would need to submit for approval an updated ESSA plan to the U.S. Department of Education inclusive of the new indicator.

Politically, education advocates will need to lay considerable groundwork with legislators to make the case for this change. As in prototype 2, education advocates should acknowledge that some districts are further ahead of others in meeting the criteria for this indicator. As a consequence, some sort of allowance or grace period should be included in this proposal for those districts that have not engaged in innovative approaches in as much depth.

Prototype 4: Centering Local Innovations in State Reporting and Feedback Systems

(fully reporting, no changes to state or federal systems)

Essential Features

There are no changes to Kentucky’s state or federal accountability systems.

Assessment System

There are no changes to Kentucky’s system of assessments as required by state and federal requirements.

Reporting

While Kentucky's schools will still collect and report school quality data as outlined in current law, the state will value local innovation by collaborating with local schools and districts to evolve the school report card into a comprehensive data display that features locally-relevant evidence of school quality. Schools can opt-into a range of customizable display options that showcase the vibrant learning happening within the school while continuing to provide communities with access to traditional metrics outlined in state and federal requirements.

Vibrant learning evidence could include process-based information, student outcomes on local measures and even examples of authentic student work. The new data display will be co-created with the districts involved in the Local Laboratories of Learning and the Kentucky United We Learn Council to ensure the voices of students, educators, parents, and communities are represented in the design process.

In addition to improving local report cards, the Kentucky Department of Education will work to streamline and align data collection efforts across all of its programs to ensure local innovations are valued and celebrated as an important indicator of school quality. This will minimize the local reporting burden while ensuring public information better aligns to local values.

School Support and Improvement

Schools and districts will partner with their communities to analyze trends and insights on their data display and co-create strategies for improvement. While each school and district will still be required to submit an improvement plan to KDE, the integration of locally-determined measures will help KDE develop a comprehensive picture of local strengths and areas for growth. In turn, this will enable KDE to better align feedback and support to each local context.

School Accountability

There are no changes to Kentucky's accountability system as established by state and federal requirements. Signaling the importance of local accountability, state-level reporting may emphasize local vibrant learning experiences for students.

Policy and Political Considerations

The Kentucky Board of Education would need to amend regulation 703 KAR 5:140 regarding requirements for school and district report cards to enable the inclusion of local indicators of vibrant learning if a district or school chooses to opt-in. The Kentucky Board of Education could also consider whether to revise regulation 703 KAR 5:225 on continuous improvement planning for schools and districts to specify that district and school continuous improvement plans could include an emphasis on locally-determined indicators of vibrant learning in addition to academic achievement and growth if a district or school opts-in. Lastly, while not a formal policy change,

the Kentucky Department of Education would need to revise its data collection and reporting templates to comply with changes to these regulations.

Appendix A: Distinguishing Features Across Prototypes

	Federal Accountability	State Accountability	Statewide Assessment
<p>Vision: Landing on the Moon</p>	<p>Federal and state accountability are replaced by an accreditation-style system that values state and local evidence across a range of domains. Evidence of school quality is evaluated against a common set of rubrics, feedback for improvement is emphasized. Data displays share evidence of quality transparently and are locally customizable to support contextualized interpretations of school quality. The system removes all elements of ranking and sorting, and instead prioritizes resources and supports based on the unique profile of each school’s strengths and needs.</p>		<p>Two assessment options:</p> <p>A) Reduced assessment footprint with adaptive, through-year assessments in reading and math. Local, more authentic assessments across the content areas are valued in the academic learning domain of the school quality evaluation framework.</p> <p>B) Fully personalized, competency-based state assessment system that leverages authentic performance tasks across all content areas along with short and sparse standardized testing to monitor for quality.</p>
<p>Prototype 1: Mirroring the Moon Landing within State Accountability</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Replaces the “Change” component with individual student growth 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Adds an accreditation style evaluation system of evidence of school quality within the state accountability system. See vision statement for details. ● Removes color rating system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reduces number and length of assessments to meet minimum federal requirements.
<p>Prototype 2: Valuing Vibrant Learning Experiences within State</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● No changes to federal accountability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Adds a “Vibrant Learning Experiences” indicator to state accountability. ● Schools with a 4 of 5 on the process-based indicator move “up” a color rating in the state 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● No changes to the assessment system.

Accountability		color system.	
Prototype 3: New Federal Accountability Indicator of Student Centered Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Adds a menu of options indicator that reports the percentage of students who have engaged in at least one of the listed student-centered learning experiences. ● Replaces the “Change” component with individual student growth. ● Eliminates Quality of School Climate and Safety survey. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● No changes to state accountability. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● No changes to the assessment system.
Prototype 4: Centering Local Innovations in State Reporting and Feedback Systems	No changes to the formal federal or state assessment and accountability systems. Reimagines reporting in a way that lifts up and values local vibrant practices and outcomes. Vibrant learning evidence could include process-based information, student outcomes on local measures and even examples of authentic student work. The new data display will be co-created with the districts involved in the Local Laboratories of Learning and the Kentucky United We Learn Council to ensure the voices of students, educators, parents and communities are represented in the design process.		

Appendix B: Prototypes Relative to Federal and State Law

	Federal Implications	State Implications
Vision - Landing on the Moon	<i>disregards policy constraints</i>	
Prototype 1: Mirroring the Moon Landing within State Accountability	USED would need to approve a revised amendment to Kentucky’s state ESSA plan to replace school level “Change” with a growth indicator. KDE would need to submit the shorter federally-required assessments to USED to secure approval by a peer review panel.	The Kentucky General Assembly would need to adopt a new state accountability system and revise the number of required assessments to align to the minimum federal requirements.
Prototype 2: Valuing Vibrant Learning Experiences within State Accountability	No change needed to Kentucky’s federal ESSA plan.	The Kentucky General Assembly would need to amend state statute to allow the Kentucky Board of Education to operationalize a system that includes a new state indicator of Vibrant Learning Experiences.
Prototype 3: New Federal Accountability Indicator of Student Centered Learning	USED must approve a revised amendment to Kentucky’s state ESSA plan to replace school level “Change” with a growth indicator, remove the school climate indicator, and add a new Vibrant Learning Experiences learning indicator.	The Kentucky General Assembly would need to amend state statute to allow the Kentucky Board of Education to include this new federal indicator.
Prototype 4: Centering Local Innovations in State Reporting and Feedback Systems	No changes needed to Kentucky’s federal ESSA plan.	The Kentucky Board of Education (KBE) would need to amend regulations pertaining to district and local report cards. The KBE may also amend the regulation pertaining to continuous improvement planning.

Appendix C: Discussion Questions for Working Group Members

Landing on the Moon

- 1) Which assessment system proposal most resonates with the working group members?
- 2) Should it be the state agency or an external evaluator that reviews and provides ratings relative to each of the domains for the school-submitted evidence of quality? Should we consider a hybrid, similar to accreditation, where an external agency would co-create the rubrics and evaluation process with KDE?
- 3) How frequently should the formal reviews and ratings of evidence happen?
- 4) What role should the agency play in providing resources and support for improvement (e.g., opt-in vs. required in low-performing schools)?
- 5) Do the listed domains represent the intentions of the working group? Are we missing any? Should we change or remove any of the ones listed?

Prototype 1

- 1) What are the best features of this prototype?
- 2) Which features should be amended?
- 3) How does this prototype hold schools accountable?
- 4) How does this prototype improve the instructional experience of students?

Prototype 2

- 1) Should the schools/districts that shift up the color scale as a result of their evidence related to vibrant learning practices receive a special seal or designation as a “vibrant learning experience” from the state?
- 2) Should we consider collapsing the color scale down from 5 levels to 4? Perhaps suggesting we remove orange as a color in the scale?
- 3) Should schools that are designated as red be eligible for moving up a color based on their vibrant learning rating?
- 4) What are the best features of this prototype?
- 5) Which features should be amended?
- 6) How does this prototype hold schools accountable?
- 7) How does this prototype improve the instructional experience of students?

Prototype 3

- 1) What are the best features of this prototype?
- 2) Which features should be amended?
- 3) How does this prototype hold schools accountable?
- 4) How does this prototype improve the instructional experience of students?

Prototype 4

- 1) What are the best features of this prototype?
- 2) Which features should be amended?
- 3) How does this prototype hold schools accountable?
- 4) How does this prototype improve the instructional experience of students?

Appendix D: Design Principles for Assessment and Accountability System Redesign

After completing and reviewing committee members' research into innovative assessment and accountability systems within and beyond Kentucky, the Accelerating Innovation (AI) committee met in March 2023 to articulate an initial set of design principles that will guide the work on the accountability system redesign.

These design principles reflect cross-cutting themes and recommendations resulting from the committee's research, collective experience and expertise, and the aspirational themes identified in the [United We Learn](#) report. Specifically, AI members identified the following 12 design principles, which, in this document, are organized into three thematic clusters:

Theme 1: Prioritize Student Experiences and Outcomes

- Principle 1: Design to Support Vibrant Learning Experiences
- Principle 2: Design with Marginalized Students at the Center
- Principle 3: Design to Empower Students as Agents of Their Own Learning

Theme 2: Value Local Contexts and Expertise

- Principle 4: Design to Reflect Labor Market Needs in Kentucky and Beyond
- Principle 5: Design for Local Flexibility
- Principle 6: Design to Value the Professionalism of Educators
- Principle 8: Design for Transparency, Trust and Reciprocal Accountability
- Principle 12: Design to Minimize Opportunities for System Corruption

Theme 3: Continuously Improve within State Policy Context

- Principle 7: Design for Sustainability
- Principle 9: Design in Alignment with Theories of Action
- Principle 10: Design for Continuous Improvement based on Evidence
- Principle 11: Design with Policy in Mind

At this coarse-grained level, they simply represent valuable best practices for innovative system design but the way these will be put into practice in Kentucky will vary locally as it will be driven by the specific needs and characteristics in these contexts.

The principles articulate a set of priorities to be reflected in the design of any future accountability “system of systems” recommended by the Kentucky United We Learn Council (the council). That is, they act as “north stars” or guardrails for the design of local and state solutions and affect critical aspects of the design, implementation, and evaluation process for the resulting local and state systems.