

MINUTES OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION.

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Duane Goossen at 3:30 p.m. on February 3, 1993 in Room 519-S of the Capitol.

All members were present.

Committee staff present: Ben Barrett, Legislative Research Department
Dale Dennis, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Education
Avis Swartzman, Revisor of Statutes
Joyce Harralson, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee: Dr. John Poggio, University of Kansas

Others attending: See attached list

Chairman Goossen encouraged committee members to attend the trip to the New Stanley School in Kansas City, Kansas. Sign up sheets and maps were distributed.

Dr. Poggio addressed the committee regarding the appropriateness of the tests being formulated for Kansas students. The following steps are taken in test development:

1. Eight to sixteen teachers work independently and as a group to develop each content level. Reaction is sought by public and education officials. They are also reviewed by experts from out of state. First drafts are to be ready by March 1.
2. Dr. Poggio's staff then works to clean them up - eliminate redundancies, get rid of awkwardness, work on the wording, see that there is one best answer or a multitude of answers depending upon what the particular purpose is.
3. The tests are then taken and shared with another group of Kansas educators.
4. The administrative hierarchy will work with curriculum coordinators and higher education specialists (people from the regents institutions and the private institutions) to review the emerging product.
5. It is then reviewed and audited again by Dr. Poggio's staff.
6. At this point the working draft is pilot tested in Kansas school districts with groups of 35 or 40 students to see if it is working. Students are asked to circle with red pencils anything that is not clear.
7. Dr. Poggio's staff then reviews the test again. It is then given a bias and sensitivity review by a group of historically impacted individuals.
8. The tests are then printed. This entire process takes 5 or 6 weeks.

Administration of the tests takes place between March 1 and April 15. This is determined by when state funding is available.

World class standards are the things that we want to be teaching: thinking, reasoning, problem solving, being members of a team and working as a team.

The grade or numerical place on a test is called the proficiency standard. Dr. Poggio feels we shouldn't define a single decision point. This eliminates compromise or "how low do we go" thinking. There should instead be a proficiency scale where the lower reaches of performance are labeled inadequate and a notch up from that is borderline, the next level will be adequate but not good or strong, with the next level being high and above that superior. Kansas educators will decide where these points should be, then subject them to a review by legislators, the public, professionals and those outside of the state.

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, Room 519-S Statehouse, at 3:30 p.m. on February 3, 1993.

They are developing the proficiency scale this year. No percents would be used, however scores would be kept comparing students achievement to students in each class, school and statewide. Printed forms and data disks will be sent back to schools listing all the information that has been gathered so that they may work it at their end. This will be available sometime within June or August of each year with that date being at the discretion of the State School Board. Where these reports go is up to the schools. Frequently this ends up in a file some place.

The tests do attempt to measure attitudes regarding student likes or dislikes regarding subjects. They are not intended to measure moral values.

Tests will not be sent out to the parents for security reasons, they may however, view them in the school.

The character of these tests is to offer a bonding with the instructional process, not to be something that stands apart from it, but something that can be a significant contributor to it. The process of evaluation has to be far more broadly based than the reliance on paper and pencil measurements. The professional judgements and critical appraisal of classroom teachers and the work of the portfolio of students are all critically important indicators. We can only achieve so much with paper and pencil measures. They are indirect forced activities. Working a student to his ability level is another way of evaluating a student. There should be a diversity of measurement. If we keep doing the same thing we will only see the same thing. Different perspective with different lenses will give us a better view of what's actually there.

State assessments should satisfy all the QPA standards. We have to focus on a much broader range of indicators than just tests. We should not make decisions on a person on the basis of a single test score. Grades, motivation, intent and performance on standardized measures and a students individual and career interests also are determining factors. Students must be motivated regardless of intelligence, or learning will not take place.

There is a desperate need for additional training, not only for teachers, but for administrators as well. A period of study of 6 to 8 months are required to simply understand the dynamics we are talking about. The need for retraining of staff will be a progressive developmental function. What is an outstanding initiative may potentially die of it's own weight and the indecision it places at the doorstep of administrators who are really not equipped to do it.

The floor was open for questions.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm.

The next meeting is scheduled for 3:30 pm, February 4, 1993, in Room 519-S.

GUEST LIST

COMMITTEE: House Education

DATE: 213193

[illegible]