

## MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Dave Kerr at 1:30 p.m. on January 13, 1993 in Room 123-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except: Senator Tim Emert (Excused)

Committee staff present: Ben Barrett, Legislative Research Department  
Avis Swartzman, Revisor of Statutes  
LaVonne Mumert, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee:

Dr. Tom Trigg, Assistant Superintendent, Unified School District No. 231, Gardner-Edgerton-Antioch  
Sharon Buffington, Principal, Edgerton Elementary School  
Dr. Michael Pomarico, Superintendent, Unified School District No. 409, Atchison  
Dr. Perry Perkins, Assistant Superintendent, Unified School District No. 437, Auburn-Washburn, Topeka

Others attending: See attached list

Chairman Kerr announced that several school administrators would describe their involvement and experience with Quality Performance Accreditation (QPA).

Dr. Tom Trigg, Assistant Superintendent, Unified School District No. 231, Gardener-Edgerton-Antioch and Sharon Buffington, Principal of Edgerton Elementary School reviewed the QPA process in their district (Attachment 1). Dr. Trigg described the positive aspects of QPA experienced by his district:

- .It moves in the direction of school improvement
- .Motivates involvement by districts who would not voluntarily participate
- .It is data driven
- .The profile process is helpful
- .The process provides some flexibility
- .Involves parents and community as well as teachers in the process.

He also discussed some negatives associated with QPA:

- .The tremendous amount of time and energy it requires
- .The volume of paperwork
- .Too many outcomes and indicators
- .Increases the work load of administrators
- .Better communication with the public about QPA would have been helpful
- .Mid-process changes have caused difficulties
- .Some districts want to add QPA staff

Dr. Trigg talked about some of the roadblocks he sees relating to QPA:

- .The State Board of Education is understaffed
- .The program has flexibility but there is no "model" to follow
- .Some outcomes may be overly comprehensive
- .QPA requires a financial commitment
- .There is a need for alternative authentic assessment
- .There is difficulty in making transition at the same time current "operations" are ongoing.

In responding to questions from Committee members, Dr. Trigg stated that he doubts there will be many local outcomes developed because of the large number of state outcomes required. Ms. Buffington said that the district has been involved in school improvement prior to initiating the QPA process. She added that the teachers are extremely supportive of school improvement but are somewhat less positive about QPA because of changes in the QPA plan which necessitated redoing a great deal of data collection and because of the

## CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, Room 123-S Statehouse, at 1:30 p.m. on January 13, 1993.

amount of paperwork involved with QPA. Chairman Kerr suggested it might be helpful to the Committee to be provided with suggestions as to what paperwork has become obsolete and might be eliminated.

Dr. Michael Pomarico, Superintendent, Unified School District No. 409, Atchison, described his observations and involvement with QPA (Attachment 2). He listed advantages generated by QPA:

- .It has provided a statewide focus for the need for change
- .The process is data driven
- .It has provided a statewide focus on the necessary skills needed by all students
- .It creates a unity of purpose among faculty regarding student achievement
- .It increases involvement of parents and community in the educational process.

Dr. Pomarico described issues which need to be addressed:

- .Diversity among districts
- .Whether the improvement process needs to be state driven or local driven
- .Retraining and staff development
- .The need to coordinate various improvement approaches into one process so that energies and efforts are channeled in that direction.

In answering questions from Committee members, Dr. Pomarico said that the key to keeping parents and community representatives involved in the QPA process is having them participate in significant activities. His inclination is to expand the powers and duties of the site-based councils. Dr. Pomarico advised that the major costs of QPA are in two areas: staff development and retraining and the implementation of the QPA results.

Dr. Perry Perkins, Assistant Superintendent, Unified School District No. 437, Auburn-Washburn, Topeka, introduced Bruce Thezan, principal of Washburn Rural High School, and Diane DeBacker, a district instructional facilitator. Dr. Perkins said QPA is a very positive program and they are supportive of it (Attachment 3). He mentioned a concern about the QPA processing achieving a balance in being state-driven as well as local-driven and urged that the state level concentrate on student outcomes and leave the "how" to determination to the local level. He also expressed concern about the human, time and money resources needed. Dr. Perkins suggested that the present outcomes be reviewed to ensure that they all focus on student outcomes. He believes QPA has resulted in more and better communication and wants the program to become a long range commitment.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m. The next meeting of the Committee is scheduled for Thursday, January 14, 1993.

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

TIME: 1:30 PLACE: 123-S DATE: 1/13/93

GUEST LIST

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ADDRESS</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>
Tom Trigg	PO Box 97 Gardner ks 66030	USD #231
Sharon Buffington	"	USD #231
Gerry Wickman	Topeka	USD #231
Mike Bonarua	Atchison	USD 409
Jing Y. Gally	Shawnee Mission	USD 512
<del>Joe Gally</del>	<del>Topeka</del>	<del>KNEA</del>
<del>Chris Gally</del>	<del>Topeka</del>	<del>USD 501 #</del>
Craig Grant	Topeka	H-WEA
Peg Dunlap	Topeka	KNEA
Jacquie Dakes	Topeka	SQE
Dan Hermes	"	DOB
Masha Strach	Sabetha	441
Robin Nichols	Wichita	259
Mark Tallman	Topeka	KASB
Tim Nime	Topeka	ASK
Dan Biles	Doverland Park	Shel. Bd. of Ed.
Wanda Morrison	Hutchinson	S. Bd. of Ed.
Steve M. Therau	Topeka	USD 437 WRAP
Diane DeBacker	Topeka	USD 437
Perry Perkins	Topeka	USD 437
Sharon Freden	Topeka	KSBE
Kathleen White	Rawie Village	KSBE
Paul Adams	Doyle City	KSBE
Bill Mearns	Merriamville	KSBE



SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

TIME: 1<sup>30</sup> P.M. PLACE: 123-5 DATE: 1/13/93

GUEST LIST

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ADDRESS</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>
Merle Hice	Topeka	KLECC
Denise Cox	Topeka	USTA / RACC
Jeff Waggoner	Topeka	Senate Staff
Richard B. Drillon	Long Grove	St. Bd. of Ed.
CRAIG SHOVE	TOPEKA	STAFF, KSBE
EB Sonny [unclear]	Syracuse	St Bd of Ed

**Quality Performance Accreditation  
U.S.D. No. 231  
Gardner-Edgerton-Antioch**

**I. Background**

- A. Pilot School 1991-92**
- B. Year II School 1992-93**
- C. Involved in School Improvement Prior to QPA**

**II. Positive**

- A. School Improvement is needed throughout the state and nation**
- B. Motivates (requires) those who would not voluntarily be involved**
- C. Data driven - better, more accurate decisions will be made**
- D. Profile process is helpful**
- E. Some flexibility is provided**
- F. Involvement of parents and community**
- G. Involvement of teachers in the data gathering and analysis process**

## **I... Negative**

- A. Amount of time and energy required**
  - 1. Takes away from instructional time in classroom**
- B. Too much paperwork**
- C. Too many outcomes (10) - standards (21) - indicators (65+ local indicators)**
- D. Additional work load for administrators**
- E. Poor communication with the public**
- F. Lack of consistency from year to year - mid-process changes**
- G. Districts are feeling the need to add staff to coordinate Q.P.A.**

## **IV. Roadblocks**

- A. State Board of Education is understaffed**
- B. Catch 22 - Flexible for individual buildings but no "model" to pattern after**
- C. Outcomes are valuable, but may be overly comprehensive**
- D. Financial committment**
- E. Alternative authentic assessment**
- F. Attempting to accomplish the transition while all of the day to day operations are going on. It's difficult to revamp the engine of an airplane while it is flying.**

Atchison  
First Fifty Pilot District  
Q.P.A. Advocate  
What it has accomplished

Issues Which Should Be Addressed

1. QPA has provided a state wide focus on the need for change.
  2. The process is data driven, thus, leading to better decisions and accountability of results.
  3. The process provides a statewide focus on the necessary skills all Kansas students should have to function in a rapidly changing society.
  4. QPA creates a unity of purpose and ownership among faculty regarding student achievement.
  5. The process increases the involvement of parents and community in the educational process.
1. The issue of diversity among districts needs to be addressed.
  2. Can't quite decide whether the preponderance of the improvement process should be state driven or local driven.
  3. The whole issue of retraining, staff development needs to be more adequately addressed.
  4. Coordinate various approaches and put our energies into one process.

Senate Education Committee

Wednesday, January 13, 1993  
1:30 p.m., Room 123 South

Mr. Chairman and Committee Members:

Thank you for this opportunity to speak briefly to you regarding the Quality Performance Accreditation program.

I am Perry Perkins, Associate Superintendent in the Auburn Washburn School District. I also have with me today Bruce Thezan, principal of Washburn Rural High School (a QPA pilot school), and Diane DeBacker, an instructional facilitator in our district who is quite familiar with outcomes based education and the writing of student outcomes in our school district. We would welcome your questions as you deem appropriate.

In speaking about the issue of implementing the Quality Performance Accreditation program, the key word is "implementing" which is where the study and theory meets reality.

For the Auburn Washburn School District this is the reality of QPA. For three of our schools, this is the second year of implementation since they were pilot schools last year. For all remaining schools in our district, this is the first year of implementation as we wanted all other attendance centers to enter the program at the same time. By so doing, we have found that principals share ideas, problems, and concerns with each other, make some joint decisions while at the same time meeting needs of their sites, and request the same types of assistance from the district and the state which allows us to meet more needs in less time with more focus.

The Auburn Washburn District has approached the implementation of QPA in a positive and progressive manner- probably the very foundation for success in each school district and school implementing QPA. The pilot schools have completed and submitted to the state their first annual reports; they have received positive feedback from the state on these reports.

The principals of the pilot schools believe the development of a formalized school profile is essential to the QPA process and school improvement. Along with the actual School Improvement Plan, they see the school profile as the basic tool in the process.

The other principals entering QPA this year have attended several workshops, have oriented their staffs and school site councils to the program, and are in the process of determining how best to collect and use data in the development of school profiles. In my opinion, the progress is good.

Sen. Ed.  
Attachment 3  
1/13/93



This does not mean we do not have concerns about the program, however. While I have supported the need for and the concept of QPA since its conception, I am finding that I have developed some concerns, perhaps better stated as questions, as the state Board of Education and its staff continues to refine the program.

First, I hope the state will continue to pay more attention to student outcomes and holding districts accountable for meeting these outcomes and less attention to how school districts meet the outcomes. Although suggestions for models, procedures, and processes are important and appreciated, state mandates of such models are questionable. And, frankly, my general perception is that the program is moving toward telling school districts not only "the what" of the program, the student outcomes, but also "the how" of the program. If student outcomes are written in outcome form, are clear in their intent, and if appropriate assessments are developed at the state level which are congruent with the outcomes, then it seems to me that the local school districts should have the responsibility and authority to decide procedures, improvement models, and processes which best meet local needs and wants. As the state continues to develop the program, I hope the state will allow as much local control as possible in letting school districts decide how to reach the state's outcomes.

A second concern is one which comes with the territory when implementing any new program and that refers to the resources that are needed to implement the program. The QPA program requires significant time and human resources along with some financial resources at the building and district levels. We have upgraded our computer systems and will continue to do so in order to manage the data collection and analysis which will be required. We spend many hours in meetings and work sessions. While we recognize the importance of the QPA program and its outcomes, we must be cognizant of the time the day to day operations of a school requires from principals and other administrators. In addition, we need to always be alert to the fact that the top priority for all of us in the schools is the teaching/learning experience in the classroom. Teachers and principals finding enough time to address all the issues confronting them and to participate in the activities of QPA has been and will continue to be a concern.

We also recognize that the state board needs the resources to become resource driven so that the state staff can meet the needs of local school districts as we implement QPA.

In discussing time restraints and requirements, principals have voiced a concern about the time it takes to fulfill the reporting requirements of QPA to the state. They wonder what the state is going to do with all the data from all the schools in Kansas. We suggest that the state look closely at the reports needed, including whether school improvement plans

need to be approved at the state level, with the goal of keeping the state required paperwork from the site level as minimal as possible.

Depending upon local collective bargaining agreements, there may be additional expenses required to pay people for extra time spent in such activities as school site councils and school improvement team meetings.

Creating effective school profiles which must be used for decision-making is no easy task. Perhaps as we all become more familiar with the process, it will not require as much time. For right now, however, I believe that if districts are implementing QPA correctly, they are assigning significant time, staff, and money to the project.

A third concern deals with reactions from local patrons to QPA and the outcomes. Although not necessarily a major issue in my district, as we know, some outcomes have caused concern among some citizens in the state. Often times, it is the local principal, superintendent, or the local board of education who first must address these concerns. I am sure the questions being raised by some will continue to be raised. It has been suggested in our local discussions that the state should be very careful not to jeopardize all of the QPA program in order to include outcomes or indicators with which many citizens may not be comfortable. We recognize the difficulty of the task, however.

Another question concerns the outcomes document and the wording and organization of the outcomes. Could any of them be reorganized toward simplifying them? Are they all actually student outcomes or are some of them "how to" organizational outcomes?

In summary, even though we still have concerns and questions about the QPA program, we are implementing the program, we are on target in timeline projections, and we welcome the challenge. We want the program to be successful as an accreditation tool but we want it to serve local needs also. We want the flexibility and local control in deciding how we meet the outcomes, we want the QPA program to reflect effective communication up and down the line, and we want the program to become a long range commitment toward seeking and implementing "best practices" in education for all children in our state.

We sincerely appreciate this opportunity to visit with you today. Mr. Thezan and Mrs. DeBacker have worked closely with QPA and outcomes-based education in our district and we would welcome your questions.

Thank you.