Approved January 31, 1984
Date

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION.

The meeting was called to order by CHAIRMAN JOSEPH C. HARDER at
Chairperson

1:30 a.m./p.m. on TUESDAY, JANUARY 24, 1984 in room 254-E of the Capitol.

All members were present except:

Committee staff present:

Mr. Ben Barrett, Legislative Research Department
Ms. Carolyn Rampey, Legislative Research Department
Ms. Avis Swartzman, Legislative Revisor's Office
Mrs. Millie Randell, Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee:

SB 473 - Schools, minimum competency assessment of basic skills of pupils, Re Proposal No. 14 (Spec. Committee on Education)

Proponents:
Mr. Robert Wootton, Governor's office
Ms. Nancy Lindberg, President, Kansas-National Education Association
Mr. Bob Clemons, Member, State Board of Education
Dr. Owen M. Henson, Associate Superintendent for Education, USD 501; Chairman, Task Force, United School Administrators

SB 502 - School districts, school bus use for adult education participants (Montgomery)

After Chairman Joseph C. Harder called the meeting to order, he recognized Mr. Jerry Slaughter, Executive Director of Travel Industry Association of Kansas. Mr. Slaughter requested that the Committee introduce a bill mandating that all Kansas schools begin classes after Labor Day. (Attachment 1) The Chairman said that Committee discussion and consideration of this request would be at a later date.

SB 473 - Chairman Harder then recognized Mr. Robert Wootton from the Governor's office, who testified as a proponent for SB 473. Mr. Wootton offered some slight additions and/or modifications of the bill, and his testimony is found in Attachment 2.

Ms. Nancy Lindberg, K-NEA president, testified in support of SB 473 but offered suggestions for modification as indicated in her testimony, Attachment 3.

Dr. Owen M. Henson, testifying for SB 473 on behalf of United School Administrators, offered several recommendations for amending the bill, and these are found in his testimony, Attachment 4.

Dr. Henson testified that USD 501 supports SB 473 but recommended that local boards be given the option to design their own tests. He continued by saying that USD 501 also recommends that the eleventh grade tests be shifted to tenth grade, since students should have completed their life skills preparation by this time.

Mr. Bob Clemons of the State Board of Education urged the Committee to recommend SB 473 favorably for passage, and his testimony is found in Attachment 5.

SB 502 - The Chairman recognized Senator Don Montgomery, author of SB 502, who explained the background for his bill. Senator Montgomery introduced supporters of his bill from Wabaunsee County who were in attendance at today's meeting: Alan Gnadt, President, Wabaunsee County Young Farmers; Duane Hund, Secretary-Treasurer, Wabaunsee County Young Farmers; John Hund, member, Wabaunsee County Young Farmers; Jeannie Stuewe and Diane Hoobler, members, Wabaunsee County Young Farm Wives; and Mr. Bill Woods, Wabaunsee County agricultural agent. Mr. Les Olson, Program Specialist, Department of

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION,

room 254-E, Statehouse, at 1:30 ~~a.m.~~/p.m. on TUESDAY, JANUARY 24, 1984

Education, was also introduced by Senator Montgomery. The Chairman indicated that Committee action on SB 502 would be delayed until a later date.

The Chairman announced that the hearing on SB 473 would continue on the next meeting day, January 26, due to lack of time today.

Copies of "An Assessment of the Impact of Minimum Competency Testing in Kansas", Attachment 6, prepared by faculty members of the School of Education at the University of Kansas, were distributed to Committee members for their perusal.

The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 2:30 p.m.

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

TIME: 1:30 p.m. PLACE: 254-E DATE: Tuesday, January 24, 1984

GUEST LIST

NAME	ADDRESS	ORGANIZATION
Merle Hee	Topeka	KACC
Owen Vernon	"	USA
[illegible]	Topeka	USD 501
Nancy Lindberg	Topeka	K-NEA
Mary Ellen Limp	Topeka	Ks. Co. of Classroom Teachers
Harold Blackburn	~~KSR~~ Topeka,	KSDG
Bob Clemons	Independence	Ks. St. Bd. of Ed.
Bill Foster	KSDE	KSDE Topeka
Dan Farrell	Topeka	USD
Sen. Bob Ha[illegible]	Topeka	Law Office
Sharon Green	Topeka	Senator Daniels
Bill Curtis	Topeka	KASB
James Hays	Topeka	Div. of the Budget
Les Olson	Topeka	Dept of Educ

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

TIME: 1:30 p.m. PLACE: 254-E DATE: Tuesday, January 24, 1984

GUEST LIST

NAME	ADDRESS	ORGANIZATION
Diane Hoobler	RR3 Manhattan	Wab. Co. Chapter of Kansas Young Farmers
Joannie Stugme	RR1 Paxico	"
John Hund	RR 1 Paxico	" "
Dwane Hund	Box 73A Paxico	Same "
Alan Grodt	RR 2 Alma	" "
Dale Cleanlindorg	1700 College	Washburn Univ.
Ellen Zimbrano	5436 SW Wanamaker	Kansas Action for Children
Chris Graves	1700 College Topeka	ASK
Jesse Goodman	1700 College	Washburn Univ.
Diane Prentice	2516 Seabrook	Gov. Office
Harold C. Pitts	2606 Chelsea DR	Self
Jim Yonally	Shawnee Mission	USD #512
Mark E. Tallman	Topeka	ASK
Chris Edwards	Lawrence	Univ. of KS / ASK
Rob McNeely	RR Lawrence	KIN
Mike Turner	Manhattan	Collegian
Jacque Oakes	Yates Center	KASB
Don C Laurer	Sabetha	USD #441
Bob Porter	Topeka	KSN

Travel
Industry
Association of
Kansas

200 Jayhawk Tower, 700 Jackson
Topeka, Kansas 66603 913/233-9465

January 24, 1984

TO: Senate Education Committee

FROM: Jerry Slaughter
Executive Director

SUBJECT: Post-Labor Day School Openings

We appreciate the opportunity to appear today. Our purpose is to ask this committee to introduce a bill relating to school openings.

The proposed bill is being worked on right now by the Revisor's office, consequently I do not have a copy for you to review. It would mandate that all schools open after Labor Day in Kansas.

This subject has drawn quite a bit of attention nationally, as Missouri and Arkansas became the first states to enact such laws. At least three Kansas school districts have recently set their openings after Labor Day, including Topeka's USD 501.

We realize the bill will be controversial, but would ask your help in seeing that the issue is debated this year. There are good arguments for the change, including the beneficial effect it will have on our tourism industry.

We appreciate your consideration of this request.

Attachment 1

Testimony to Senate Education Committee
by
Robert Wootton
January 24, 1984

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee,

Thank you for allowing me, as the Governor's representative, to present to you today the Administration's recommendations regarding Competency Based Testing. As this Committee begins its review of Senate Bill 473, the bill submitted by the Interim Education Committee, the Governor would like to request that you consider some recommendations that he outlined in his Legislative Message. The following items represent only slight additions and/or modifications to Senate Bill 473:

1) that the Legislature re-enact Competency Based Testing, with no "sunset" of its provisions;

2) that the grade levels tested be 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10. The Governor is recommending the change from grade 11 to grade 10 so that remediation efforts for those needing them prior to graduation can begin earlier; and

3) that the Department of Education be permitted to contract for testing services with a vendor for a period not to exceed five years. This will provide the needed stability for this program and will permit local districts to plan accordingly.

Thank you, again, on behalf of the Governor for allowing the opportunity to address the Committee.

Attachment 2

KANSAS-NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION / 715 W. 10TH STREET / TOPEKA, KANSAS 66612

Nancy Lindberg Testimony Before
Senate Education Committee
January 24, 1984

Thank you Mr. Chairman. Members of the committee, my name is Nancy Lindberg, President of Kansas-NEA. I appreciate the opportunity to address SB 473, the competency testing bill.

K-NEA is not opposed to continuing the practice of testing the students in Kansas; however, we feel that there are important aspects of this bill which should be stressed. The purpose of this, or any other testing program, should be to find ways to improve the curriculum and instruction for the students in this state. Using test scores to compare school districts or buildings or even teachers, as has been done in this state and others, is not proper utilization of the results.

It is this thought which brings us to a change in the bill. We would request that the tests be administered to tenth graders rather than eleventh graders. The tests are taken in fall, results provided around second semester, which allows only three semesters to develop and implement plans of remediation for students who do not score well on the examination. If the test were given earlier, educators would have a longer time to work with such students in high schools in order to improve their skills.

Another concern which teachers have expressed to me is the problem with such early testing in the 2nd grade. Teachers have explained that many students have become frustrated--even to the point of tears--when taking the exam. K-NEA hopes that you will study this further to see if a statewide test at the second grade is really necessary.

Kansas-NEA believes that testing, properly administered and utilized, can be one of many tools for teachers to analyze and change the instructional environment for individual students. With the change and the concerns expressed above, K-NEA supports SB 473.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, for listening to the concerns of teachers.

Attachment 3

Telephone: (913) 232-8271

UNITED SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS
OF KANSAS

1906 EAST 29TH TOPEKA, KANSAS 66605 913-267-1471

JERRY O. SCHREINER
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

M.D. "MAC" McKENNEY
ASSOCIATE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

TO: Senate Education Committee

FROM: Owen Henson, Chairman, Task Force

DATE: January 24, 1984

SUBJECT: SB 473

The United School Administrators recommends that SB 473 be amended to provide the option for school districts to develop local competency testing programs which meet predetermined criteria established by the State Board of Education.

We believe that most school districts in the State of Kansas are capable of handling their own competency based criterion referenced testing program within their own school district. Such a program would no doubt require technical assistance from the State Department of Education and guidelines for the school districts to follow.

In the absence of the program described above, USA has no strong objections to a statewide minimum competency assessment program for the public schools of Kansas. We do believe that it is important for the State Legislature, if action is taken upon this matter, to give the districts some guarantees that the program will be in place for a period of at least five years. Those districts which have tried to design their own criterion referenced testing program have had considerable difficulty in knowing how to proceed with their own program since the state has been somewhat uncertain as to the legislation which will ultimately be passed. USA recommends that the instructional areas to be tested remain reading and math.

USA further recommends that the eleventh grade tests be shifted to grade ten and that the other testing levels remain at grades two, four, six, and eight. The rationale for shifting the eleventh grade tests to grade ten is as follows:

1. Since a very large majority of the students in grade ten are presently enrolled in required English and/or reading classes as well as classes in mathematics, the instructional objectives of the state test can be better addressed by the classroom teacher.

Attachment 4

2. By giving the test at grade ten, the school districts will have a full two years to remediate any problems among the students who might show deficiencies.

In the final analysis, any testing program administered by either the state or local districts should be prescriptive, diagnostic, and helpful to students.

USA Task Force Members

Owen Henson, Associate Superintendent, Topeka (Chairman)
Perry Perkins, Principal, Chanute High School
Ken Brown, Principal, Abilene High School
Bill Todd, Principal, Washington High School, Kansas City
Ed Pettit, Principal, Shawnee Heights Elementary
Michael Culp, Principal, Elmont Elementary, Seaman

Kansas State Board of Education

Kansas State Education Building

120 East 10th Street Topeka, Kansas 66612

Kay M. Groneman
District 1

Kathleen White
District 2

Dale Louis Carey
District 3

Alicia L. Salisbury
District 4

Ann L. Keener
District 5

Marilyn Harwood
District 6

Theodore R. Von Fange
District 7

Evelyn Whitcomb
District 8

Robert J. Clemons
District 9

Gordon Schultz
District 10

January 24, 1984

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, my name is Bob Clemons. I am a member of the State Board of Education, and I am here today to urge you to recommend Senate Bill 473 for passage.

The State Board of Education has discussed this legislation at length and has taken action as a Board to support the testing of students in the schools of Kansas. We believe that this is one positive step that can be taken to improve the educational program of many of the local school districts.

The testing program provides the schools information about what is important in education and what the students of Kansas should be taught. It then goes further by determining how well students of Kansas are being taught and if they need more help in areas in which they are not succeeding. The test allows local schools to determine if there are areas of the curriculum that need to be improved and if there are areas of teaching that need to be improved.

These tests are an annual report to the patrons of a school district as to how well the local schools are doing. Local boards of education can have test

Attachment 5

information before them when they make the important decisions about the schools under their control. Parents can have the same information as they determine the educational progress of their children. You as legislative leaders can have the information available as you make legislative decisions about the education of the students of Kansas. Members of the State Board of Education have the same information available as they make policy decisions about the educational progress of Kansas students.

One important part of the proposed legislation is that the testing program would be in place for a minimum of five years. Members of the State Board feel this is a crucial aspect of the bill. It gives us year-to-year data which we can compare and obtain a picture of the education in Kansas.

I have tried to keep my remarks brief, but I hope you do not interpret this as a lack of interest on this subject by the State Board. Indeed, the State Board feels this is one of the important pieces of legislation to be considered this legislative session. We urge you to strongly recommend passage of Senate Bill 473.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to speak today and I would be pleased to try to answer any questions.

Kansas State Department of Education
Kansas State Education Building
120 East 10th Street Topeka, Kansas 66612

January 17, 1984

TO: Chief School Administrators
Guidance Counselors
Elementary School Principals

FROM: Willard Foster, Education Program Specialist, Kansas Minimum Competency Testing Program

RE: Kansas Minimum Competency Research

A continuing research effort associated with the Kansas Minimum Competency Testing (KMCT) program has produced another paper, "An Assessment of the Impact of Minimum Competency Testing in Kansas." The attached paper is recommended for ideas how school districts are working to impact changes in test scores. Due to the length of this paper you might choose to review Summary and Conclusions, pages 34-36, before study of the entire text.

Additional copies are available upon request.

trc

Attachment

Attachment 6

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPACT OF MINIMUM COMPETENCY TESTING IN KANSAS

Prepared by:
John P. Poggio and Douglas R. Glasnapp
Department of Educational Psychology and Research
School of Education
University of Kansas

December, 1983

Concurrent with student testing in both 1982 and 1983 personnel in districts were surveyed in an effort to examine the curricular impact of minimum competency testing. The personnel surveyed included district superintendents, school board members, building principals and teachers. In 1982, 230 districts volunteered to participate in the various research and evaluation activities associated with minimum competency testing. For 1983, 187 districts agreed to participate in these research/evaluation ventures. It was personnel from these districts in each year who have provided the data for the reporting and analyses that follow.

The surveys were developed with specific intent. Minimum competency testing for the entire state had first taken place in Spring 1980. Testing cycles in April 1982 and 1983 were occurring under new legislation. Education was, again, undergoing the occurrence of public scrutiny in the form of mandated testing. Experiences following the 1980 testing made it clear that how a district and the state were "measuring up" would quickly be on display in the public record. If motivation was not keyed to this form of accountability, then the simple act of student testing and the reporting of results to districts on the objective-referenced basis of the state tests could potentially result in changes to the local education process. The surveys were designed to ascertain the impact of this form of testing on education and select educational practices in the state.

The questionnaires for the four surveyed groups (superintendent, board members, principals and teachers) in each year were prepared to solicit information, actions or reactions in the following areas: descriptive information about the individual responding (e.g., years in that position,

other jobs held, etc.); the receipt, examination and distribution of the previous year's test results; reactions and concerns of the respondent and other colleagues to the district's test results; detailing of specific actions taken as a result of the prior year's testing; an evaluation if actions taken were in direct response to testing and test results; and, a characterization of actions being taken in preparation for that year's testing. For each of these categories a series of questions were posed to the respondent designed to detail carefully occurrences and actions at the local level. Survey questions were written to be parallel across each respondent as appropriate, and then the same surveys were used in 1982 and 1983. Thus, a common set of questions for different groups over time was employed. From the data gathered, it becomes possible to address questions of impact of mandated minimum competency testing.

As mentioned, at the time of the April 1982 testing 230 districts had agreed to participate in those research and evaluation activities being carried out in association with student testing. For the 1983 testing cycle 187 districts indicated a willingness to be participants in research associated with the testing program. Because of the attrition in the participant group by comparison to 1982 it was decided to send the board member, superintendent and principal questionnaires to all Kansas districts. Each individual surveyed was asked to complete the questionnaire they had been sent. Thus, the sampling plans varied between the two years. Differences in the sampling plans used in each year could result in differences in responses to the survey items over time. How sampling was carried out is considered next.

In 1982 only persons in volunteering districts were contacted. This included the district superintendent, all elected board members, and all

district building principals. To sample teachers from volunteering districts in 1982 the following method was used. The test contractors sampled up to five buildings in each cooperating district. When a building sampled was at the elementary level, all teachers in that building were contacted and asked to complete a survey. When a junior or senior high school was sampled, then two reading teachers and two mathematics teachers were contacted. At these levels four teachers besides those chosen due to teaching assignment were also sampled.

Survey data gathering in 1983 was as follows. All superintendents, board members and building principals of accreditated Kansas schools were contacted and asked to complete the appropriate survey. To obtain data from teachers, 84 of the original 187 volunteering districts were selected randomly. In these districts up to three buildings were then randomly selected. Within these buildings, then all teachers with instructional responsibility in Reading or Mathematics were contacted and requested to complete the survey questionnaire.

In each year surveys were sent to a district along with their testing materials. Questionnaires were distributed to the intended individual by the district test coordinator. Along with the questionnaire the respondent was given an envelope for use when returning the survey and thereby protecting the confidentiality of each person's response. Questionnaires were distributed, responded to and returned to the contractors during April and May of each year. The table on the following page details the amount of questionnaire data assembled for the years 1982 and 1983.

TABLE 1

SOURCE OF DATA FOR IMPACT STUDIES

Group	1982 # Districts Sampled (%)	1982 # Districts Represented in Surveys Returned (%)	1982 # Surveys Returned (%)	1983 # Districts Sampled (%)	1983 # Districts Represented in Surveys Returned (%)	1983 # Surveys Returned (%
Board Members	-No data available-			325 (100%)	122 (38%)	449 (20%)
Superintendents	230 (71%)	155 (67%)	155 (67%)	325 (100%)	198 (61%)	198 (61%)
Building Principals	230 (71%)	191 (83%)	843 (62%)	325 (100%)	243 (75%)	1015 (52%)
Teachers	115 (35%)	93 (81%)	1358 (38%)	84 (26%)	70 (83%)	816 (41%)

With the exception of school board members, return rates, based on a single contact and request, were found to be quite high (60-80%). Although the sampling plans for the two years differed, the rates of return, insofar as sampling was from similar populations, offers confidence in the representativeness of data from the state as a whole.

In the sections that follow findings are reported for each of the groups surveyed.

SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

The 449 School Board member respondents in 1983 represented 122 different school districts. The entire Board of 7 members responded from 8 districts while 15 districts of the 122 had only 1 Board member respond. The median and modal average response rates across districts was completion of the questionnaire by 3 School Board members. The median number of years the 449 School Board members had served on the School Board was 4.47 years and the modal number of years served was 4 (a frequency of 108). The median number of years the Board member respondents had lived in the school district was 23.67 with a range of from 1 to 77 years.

Responses from the 449 School Board members to the 1983 questionnaire items are summarized in Table 2. The indices reported are percentages of the School Board members who answered an item by checking a specific response category. For Yes-No response items, only the percent responding to the Yes category is reported. The data reported in Table 2 can be briefly summarized by the following statements.

a) Of the respondents, 88% indicated that they were satisfied or extremely satisfied with their district's emphasis on basic skills instruction while only 12% expressed some degree of dissatisfaction.

b) Approximately 95% of the Board members indicated that a report was made to the School Board of the district's performance on the 1982 Kansas Minimum Competency Tests.

c) Most reported examining summary district performance data (84%) with less examining building performance data (66%) and fewer examining individual student test results (20%).

d) Reading performance level in 1982 was an area of concern expressed by 39% of the Board members. This expressed concern in reading can be broken down by grade level results.

Results at Grade Level	Percent Expressing Concern
2	10.5%
4	15.8%
6	17.7%
8	19.6%
11	18.9%

e) The 1982 performance level in mathematics was an expressed area of concern by 53% of the School Board members. Concern expressed over individual grade level results is as follows.

Results at Grade Level	Percent Expressing Concern
2	11.3%
4	16.9%
6	23.1%
8	28.0%
11	33.3%

f) Less than 8% of the School Board members perceived the general reactions of other groups as entirely dissatisfied with 1982 student performance, Similarly, very few described group reactions as very satisfied with student performance levels in general (4% or less).

g) Less than 50% of the Board members reported taking any of the actions listed in response to the availability of 1982 test results. The greatest response frequency was to items 9(e) on making remedial opportunities available (45%) and 9(c) placing more emphasis on State competency objectives (43%). However, all individual actions listed were reported to have been taken by at least some School Boards

in the State. Hiring new staff and using test results to evaluate teachers were the less frequent actions taken (9%).

h) The Minimum Competency Testing Program was viewed as having accelerated decisions on curricular change by 37% of the Board members.

i) Only 10% of the Board members recalled any board action taken in 1983 because of the existence of 1983 competency testing.

TABLE 2

SCHOOL BOARD QUESTIONNAIRE

1. How satisfied are you with your district's emphasis on basic skills instruction?

	1983
extremely satisfied	11.8
satisfied	76.6
dissatisfied	11.6
extremely dissatisfied	-

The remaining questions ask for information about minimum competency testing as it has been implemented in Kansas. In the Spring of 1982, Kansas students in grades 2, 4, 6, 8, and 11 were tested in reading and mathematics due to state mandated minimum competency testing legislation. Results of this testing were returned to districts in August 1982. The following questions reference the 1982 test administration and reporting.

	1983 YES
2. Was there a reporting to the School Board of the district's performance on the 1982 Kansas Minimum Competency Tests?	94.5
3. Did you examine any of the following information?	
a. summary building performance data	65.9
b. summary district performance data	84.3
c. test results for individual students	20.1
4. Based on students' level of performance, were you particularly concerned about student performance	
in Reading?	38.9
in Mathematics?	53.4

5. How would you describe the reactions of the following groups/individuals to student performance on the 1982 Kansas Minimum Competency Tests?

		Satisfied	Mixed	Dissatisfied	Indifferent	Don't Know
a. other school board members	'83:	40.5	42.8	7.6	0.9	8.2
b. central administrators	'83:	56.0	27.3	7.5	0.9	8.2
c. principals	'83:	53.4	26.0	6.6	0.5	13.5
d. parents	'83:	24.0	25.8	6.1	5.4	38.7
e. teachers	'83:	36.4	26.7	4.3	0.7	31.9
f. your reaction	'83:	47.4	31.2	17.7	0.7	3.0

6. Which of the following actions were initiated by the School Board as as a result of the availability of the 1982 Kansas Minimum Competency Test performance information?

	1983 YES
a. Formation of committee(s) to study district performance levels and make recommendations.	17.3
b. A course (courses) was (were) added to the curriculum.	24.9
c. Increasing the emphasis in the existing curriculum on the state minimum competency objectives.	43.0
d. Altering student core requirements	
in Reading.	17.9
in Mathematics.	32.0
e. Requiring a demonstrated level of proficiency prior to high school graduation or grade promotion	
in Reading.	15.6
in Mathematics.	20.3
f. Changed focus of the existing district testing program toward an objectives-referenced testing or reporting format.	12.7
g. Use of test results to evaluate teacher performance.	9.2
h. Requested a supplemental analysis looking at district results in consideration of student characteristics, etc.	9.5
i. Directing that remedial opportunities be available for students whose performance was poor.	44.9
j. Creating new staff positions to work	
in Reading.	8.1
in Mathematics.	9.4
k. Requested a study of the tests to assess their match with district instructional objectives.	17.2

7. Do you believe that your board would have taken any of these actions if the state legislature had terminated the minimum competency testing mandate last year? 68.4

8. Has the Minimum Competency Testing Program served to accelerate decisions on curricular change? 36.8

The following questions reference the current year's (1983) state mandated minimum competency testing program.

	1983 YES
9. Did you receive a copy of the 1983 minimum competency objectives?	27.9
10. Has there been any school board action taken this year because of the existence of the 1983 Kansas Minimum Competency Testing Program?	10.2

11. How would you appraise the following school personnel/patron reactions to the activity of state mandated minimum competency testing?

	Supportive	Evenly Mixed	Opposed	Indifferent	No Basis for Judgment
a. the school board	60.5	20.3	10.4	4.2	4.6
b. district patrons	34.7	22.9	4.4	11.1	26.9
c. central administration	60.8	14.5	15.2	1.6	7.9
d. principals	57.2	17.6	11.8	2.3	11.1
e. teachers	39.4	25.2	15.2	1.2	18.9

Superintendents

Responses to the Superintendents' Questionnaire were received by 155 and 198 superintendents in 1982 and 1983, respectively. Of the 155 respondents in 1982, 125 were repeat respondents in 1983. These response rates represented 48% and 61% of the districts (public and private) tested in 1982 and 1983, respectively. For the respondents in each year, the median number of years reported as superintendent of the current district was approximately 5 years and the median total number of years as a superintendent was approximately 11 years.

Table 3 provides a summary of the response frequencies to items on the Superintendents' Questionnaire for 1982 and 1983. The indices reported are percentages of the respondents for a given year. The following statements provide brief summaries of the data in Table 3. Apparent differences in 1982 and 1983 response patterns are noted specifically.

a) Little dissatisfaction with the districts' emphasis on basic skill instruction was noted.

b) Test results from both 1980 and 1982 were reported to have been shared with a variety of groups, particularly School Board members and Building Principals.

c) Concern over the level of student performance in reading was indicated by 33% of the superintendents in 1982 and 43% in 1983. The response patterns indicating concern about student performance at specific grade levels are as follows for 1982 and 1983.

Results at Grade Level	Percent Expressing Concern 1982	1983
2	12.3	13.4
4	8.4	21.5
6	11.6	20.4
8	14.2	17.7
11	16.1	21.5

As indicated, a slightly greater proportion of superintendents were expressing concern about reading performance based on 1982 data than performance based on 1980 test data.

d) In mathematics, 56% of the superintendents expressed concern over students' performance levels based on 1980 test results and 61% expressed concern over 1982 student performance levels. Concern at specific grade level performance in mathematics are summarized as follows.

Results at Grade Level	Percent Expressing Concern 1982	1983
2	9.0	10.1
4	11.0	19.2
6	12.9	25.3
8	14.8	30.8
11	40.6	34.8

The response pattern indicating concern at specific grade levels is consistent with the student performance pattern. Mathematics performance at the 11th grade level in 1980 was poorest and the expression of concern by superintendents reflects this relatively poor performance. Based on 1982 test results, concern with 11th

grade performance was down slightly, but concern with performance at other grade levels, especially 6th and 8th, showed an increase.

e) Perceived reactions of different groups to district students' performance was consistent across 1982 and 1983 responses. Approximately 40-50% in each group were viewed as satisfied, 30-40% were perceived as having mixed reactions and 0-10% were judged to be dissatisfied.

f) Based on the availability of minimum competency test results, several actions were reported as having been taken (Item 6). In general 75 % of the superintendents reported having taken at least 3 of the actions listed. Distribution of information to buildings was the most frequent action taken, but the next most frequently taken actions were curricular/instructional focused, i.e., actions 6c, 6e, 6n and 6p. Responses to 6e and 6c particularly are indicators of change. Increased emphasis in the existing curriculum on state minimum competency objectives was reported by 51.5% of the superintendents in 1982 and by 64.6% in 1983. Curricular scope and sequence revisions also were reported with a greater frequency (10-15%) reporting revisions in mathematics than in reading. Two other points should be noted in the data for item 6. First, policy decisions altering student core requirements or hiring new staff were reported to have been made by some districts (items 6f, 6g, and 6o). Second, few superintendents report using test results as the basis for evaluating teacher performance (item 6k).

g) Responses to the remaining items are supportive indicators that curricular and/or instruction changes are reported to have occurred relative to the state minimum competency objectives in 25-50%

of the districts. While a greater proportion of superintendents in 1983 than 1982 reported that steps were being taken to insure that state minimum competency objectives were taught (47.7% versus 30.9%), the data indicates that over half the districts in the response sample are not specifically attending to the state competencies.

TABLE 3

SUPERINTENDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. How satisfied are you with your district's emphasis on basic skill instruction?

	1982	1983
extremely satisfied	19.9	10.2
satisfied	75.5	83.2
dissatisfied	4.6	6.6
extremely dissatisfied	0	0

The remaining questions ask for information about minimum competency testing as it has been implemented in the state of Kansas. In the Spring of 1982, Kansas students in grades 2, 4, 6, 8 and 11 were tested under the mandated minimum competency testing legislation. Results were returned to districts in August 1982. The following questions reference the 1982 test administration and reporting.

2. Were district performance results shared with:	1982 YES	1983 YES
a. the School District Board of Education members	95.6	98.0
b. local media (newspaper, radio, etc.)	70.5	78.0
c. parent organizations	46.7	53.8
d. local Chamber of Commerce	15.0	12.7
e. other community groups	33.3	33.1
f. building principals	97.0	99.0

3. Did you examine any of the following information?	1982 YES	1983 YES
a. summary building performance data	96.2	94.8
b. summary district performance data	99.2	98.5
c. test results of students	79.4	88.8

4. Based on students' level of performance, were you particularly concerned about student performance

	1982 YES	1983 YES
in Reading?	33.1	43.1
in Mathematics?	56.1	61.3

5. How would you describe the reactions of the following groups/individuals to student performance in your district on the 1982 Kansas Minimum Competency Tests?

		Satisfied	Mixed	Dissatisfied	Indifferent	Don't Know
a. school board members	'82:	50.7	36.4	3.0	4.5	5.3
	'83:	50.0	39.4	4.2	3.2	3.2
b. building principals	'82:	53.4	32.3	11.3	1.5	1.5
	'83:	48.9	37.9	10.0	2.1	1.1
c. teachers	'82:	45.8	36.6	6.9	3.8	6.9
	'83:	46.3	38.8	4.2	3.2	7.4
d. parents	'82:	39.6	24.6	3.2	2.4	30.2
	'83:	43.5	30.1	.5	6.5	19.4
e. your reaction	'82:	51.5	31.1	14.4	3.0	0
	'83:	45.5	36.5	15.3	2.6	0

6. Which of the following actions resulted from the availability of the 1982 district test performance information?

	1982 YES	1983 YES
a. Distribution of student performance records to appropriate buildings.	93.0	93.8
b. Formation of committee(s) to study district performance levels and make recommendations.	23.8	26.4
c. Revision of the curricular scope and sequence		
in Reading.	26.6	27.4
in Mathematics.	42.5	36.7
d. A course (courses) was (were) added to the curriculum.	24.4	25.0
e. Increased emphasis in the existing curriculum on the state minimum competency objectives.	51.5	64.6
f. Alteration of student core requirements		
in Reading.	9.1	8.3
in Mathematics	24.8	21.2
g. Instituted a requirement of a demonstrated level of proficiency prior to high school graduation or grade promotion.	8.5	10.4
h. Conducted district inservice on the use of test results.	31.5	33.0
i. Changed focus of the existing district testing program toward an objectives reference testing or reporting format.	12.1	15.9
j. District directive to share individual student performance results		
with students.	35.4	30.5
with parents.	37.0	34.8
k. Use of test results to evaluate teacher performance.	3.1	4.1
l. Comparison of building to building performance rates.	17.7	20.1
m. Supplemental analysis looking at district results in consideration of student characteristics, etc.	38.8	39.1
n. Offering remedial opportunities for students whose performance was poor.	48.1	55.6
o. Hiring of additional staff to work		
in Reading.	3.1	6.9
in Mathematics.	5.3	3.3
p. A study of the tests to assess their match to district instructional objectives.	51.1	52.2

7. Would you have taken any of these actions if the state legislature had terminated the minimum competency testing mandate last year?

1982 YES 89.4 1983 YES 78.5

8. Has the Minimum Competency Testing Program served to accelerate decisions on curricular change?

1982 YES 22.4 1983 YES 40.2

The following questions reference the current year's (1983) state mandated minimum competency testing program.

	1982 YES	1983 YES
9. Were state minimum competency objectives distributed to		
building principals?	92.9	96.9
curriculum coordinators?	60.0	65.4
counselors?	83.2	86.2
regular classroom teachers?	83.7	90.4
school board members?	41.4	47.8
special services personnel?	50.0	57.8
10. Was there a study and analysis to determine the fit of the 1983 state minimum competency objectives to the district's scope and sequence		
in Reading?	31.2	38.0
in Mathematics?	33.8	42.7
11. Were steps taken to insure that the state minimum competency objectives were taught?	30.9	47.7
12. Have the state minimum competency objectives affected a change in your district's curricular scope and sequence?	29.6	31.8
13. Was your teaching staff directed to emphasize the state minimum competency objectives in their instruction?	22.9	37.0
14. Has the district focused its instructional effort toward maximizing student performance on the 1983 Kansas minimum competency tests?	18.3	24.2
15. Are there indications that due to the minimum competency testing program the school curriculum is being narrowed?	9.2	10.8
16. Has the presence of minimum competency testing led to such activities as drills, coaching, practice of test items, etc.?	14.9	20.1

Building Principals

During the time of the April 1982 testing usable Principal Questionnaires were returned by 843 individuals. This group represented 83% of those districts agreeing to participate in evaluation activities associated with minimum competency testing. As a group they had served as principals an average of 10.5 years, and on the average had been principal of the building in which they were then serving for 4.5 years. When Principal Questionnaires were distributed in April 1983, 1015 usable questionnaries were returned. This sample of respondents was drawn from across the entire state and represents 52% of the surveys distributed. In all, returns represent response from 75% of those districts in which 1983 testing was occurring. The 1983 principals averaged 12.6 years as principals and had been serving in their present position an average of 4.7 years. The table below reports the percent of principals by the grade levels contained in their buildings in the 1982 and 1983 samples.

	Sample	
	1982	1983
Elementary, includes K-3, K-6, K-8 configurations	49	44
Junior High, includes 6-9 7-9, 7-8 configurations	10	11
Senior High, includes 9-12 and 10-12 configurations	18	14
Other	23	31

A consideration of the principal demographics suggests that although each year's group had been sampled using different approaches, the groups appear rather comparable.

Table 4 which follows reports for the 1982 and 1983 samples of principals their response to questionnaire items. Values reported are percents. When reviewing these data the following items are noteworthy.

(1) In the vast majority of occasions building principals report being satisfied with their districts' emphasis on basic skill instruction. In 1982, the small percentage identified as dissatisfied was made up almost entirely of high school principals. In 1983, dissatisfaction was comparable over different building levels.

(2) Beginning with item 2 as can be seen in related items 3, 4 and 5 the reporting and accessibility to competency testing information is high although by no means absolute. Across the years it is clear that more and more of the principals are gaining access to test results and they report, in greater numbers, examining the various information they are receiving.

(3) Item 6 from the table asked if the respondent had concerns about students' levels of performance on the minimum competency tests. In 1982, 36% said Yes to Reading performance, while 44% indicated concern over Mathematics performance. For the 1983 sample of principals, 38 and 53% reported concern about Reading and Mathematics performance, respectively. These data from both years were more precisely examined in terms of the grades of specific concern. Results from this analysis are reported below. The values reported

Grade	Area	1982	1983
2	Reading	14	13
2	Math	15	15
4	Reading	16	15
4	Math	20	18
6	Reading	17	16
6	Math	19	20
8	Reading	10	9
8	Math	14	16
11	Reading	9	7
11	Math	18	13

are the percent of the principals who voiced a specific concern about pupil performance at a particular grade level in an area tested. The pattern of these are data mostly stable between years. When a shift is noted, e.g., Grade 11 Mathematics, the shift parallels upward trends in student performance noted statewide.

(4) Principals' perceptions of the reactions of other groups to student performance evidences some slight movement toward sentiments of greater satisfaction. Noteworthy in these data is that a plurality of the principals reported being unaware of the reactions of board members and parents, and they place their own level of dissatisfaction above that of all other groups. When this latter factor was further studied, it was observed that high school principals reported a significantly higher rate of personal dissatisfaction with student performance. This pattern was observed for both the 1982 and 1983 samples.

(5) Based on availability of minimum competency test results, item 8 surveyed those actions that resulted. From the possible actions that could have resulted, 57% of the principals in 1982 and 71% of the 1983 sample of principals reported taking at least 3 of the actions listed. Clearly, action is resulting from availability of test results and actions would seem to be increasing with the passage of time. Of the possible actions to be taken the most frequently cited include: distribution of test results to teachers for use, increased curricular emphasis on minimum competency objectives, providing remedial opportunities for students, and analysis of objectives to identify location in local curriculum. It should be noted that as well as being the most frequently mentioned actions,

they are also actions with the greatest increase between the years 1982 and 1983.

When the data were examined in terms of the grade levels in the principals' building the following were noted. For item 8, parts a, b, e, h, j (parents), k, m and o occur far more frequently in elementary (K-8) buildings. This pattern was sustained in both years. For item 8, parts d, f, g, j (students) and n (mathematics), these actions were reported as occurring more frequently in junior and senior high school buildings. Again, the pattern was consistent over the years. In summary, principals report taking action and the specific action taken is often related to the grade level of instruction in the building. In the main availability of past years' results, results in more action from elementary levels of instruction. This item is clear in providing evidence of the specific form of impact the state testing program is engendering as reported by building principals.

(6) Item 9 asked principals how teachers in their building were using the test results. For the most part principals report 30 to 40% of their teachers using performance reports over the categories provided. With the exception of three items (c--evaluating adequacy of instructional methods, e--diagnosing learning difficulties, and i--determining if performance expectations were being met), patterns of response were very similar from 1982 to 1983. For the items noted, however, large increases were observed between the years. Finally, further analyses of these data found that elementary level teachers are more likely to use the test results when reporting to parents and for evaluating their instructional methods, whereas high schools found test results useful when

working with various support personnel.

(7) Items 11 through 19 ask principals to detail actions underway in preparation for that year's testing. Reviewing these data reveals two interesting occurrences. First, attention to minimum competency testing and preparation for it is, relatively speaking, high, and the amount and type of attention it is receiving is seen to increase from 1982 to 1983. Related to this, additional analysis clearly revealed that elementary school principals tended as a group to respond "Yes" far more frequently to all these items than their junior and senior high counterparts. In short, a fair amount of attention is being paid to readiness for the testing program. Item 20, pressure to do well, reflects these behaviors and, like the other items, is more intense for elementary personnel.

TABLE 4

PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE

1. How satisfied are you with your district's emphasis on basic skill instruction?

	1982	1983
extremely satisfied	29	25
satisfied	65	71
dissatisfied	5	4
extremely dissatisfied	1	0

The remaining questions ask for information about minimum competency testing as it has been implemented in the state of Kansas. In the Spring of 1982, Kansas students in grades 2, 4, 6, 8 and 11 were tested under the mandated minimum competency testing legislation. Results were returned to districts in August 1982. The following questions reference the 1982 test administration and reporting.

	1982 YES	1983 YES
2. Was there a reporting to the building principals of the district's performance on the 1982 Kansas Minimum Competency Tests?	92	96
3. Did you receive your building summary and individual student performance results for the 1982 testing?	86	96
4. Did you examine any of the following information?		
a. summary building performance data	90	96
b. summary district performance data	85	88
c. test results for individual students	77	88
5. Was the test result Interpretation Manual available for your use when reviewing performance data?	65	78

6. Based on students' levels of performance, were you particularly concerned about student performance

	1982 YES	1983 YES
in Reading?	36	38
in Mathematics?	44	53

7. How would you describe the reactions of the following groups/individuals to student performance in your building on the 1982 Kansas Minimum Competency Tests?

		Satisfied	Mixed	Dissatisfied	Indifferent	Don't Know
a. school board members	'82:	41	25	6	3	26
	'83:	45	28	5	3	19
b. central administrators	'82:	49	26	10	2	14
	'83:	47	32	10	2	9
c. teachers	'82:	42	40	8	3	8
	'83:	45	42	7	3	3

(continued)

		Satisfied	Mixed	Dissatisfied	Indifferent	Don't Know
d. parents	'82:	38	22	2	6	32
	'83:	40	21	2	9	38
e. your reaction	'82:	40	32	14	2	3
	'83:	45	38	14	2	1

8. Which of the following actions resulted from the availability of your 1982 building test performance information?

	1982 YES	1983 YES
a. Distribution of student performance to appropriate teachers.	71	83
b. Formation of committee(s) to study building performance levels and make recommendations.	18	21
c. Revision of the curricular scope and sequence		
in Reading.	19	19
in Mathematics.	24	26
d. A course (courses) was (were) added to the curriculum.	12	11
e. Increased emphasis in the existing curriculum on the state minimum competency objectives.	49	60
f. Alteration of student core requirements		
in Reading.	9	7
in Mathematics.	12	11
g. Instituted a requirement of a demonstrated level of proficiency prior to high school graduation or grade promotion in your building		
in Reading.	6	6
in Mathematics.	8	8
h. Conducted building inservice on the use of test results.	33	36
i. Changed focus of the existing testing program toward an objectives-referenced testing or reporting format.	12	13
j. Building directive to share individual student performance results		
with students.	27	28
with parents.	31	32
k. Use of test results to evaluate teacher performance.	3	3
l. Supplemental analyses looking at building results in consideration of student characteristics, etc.	30	33
m. Offering remedial opportunities for students whose performance was poor.	44	46
n. Hiring of additional staff to work		
in Reading.	5	4
in Mathematics.	5	4
o. A study of the tests to assess their match to district instructional objectives.	37	46

9. Did teachers in your building use the individual student performance information for the following?

		1982 YES	1983 YES
a.	to inform students of their status	23	26
b.	to make reports to parents	30	39
c.	to evaluate the adequacy of instructional methods in basic skill areas	56	68
d.	to group pupils for instruction	14	19
e.	to diagnose individual pupils' learning difficulties	41	48
f.	to motivate pupils to study	31	34
g.	to assess teaching effectiveness	31	35
h.	to determine each pupil's instructional level	26	28
i.	to assess whether students were meeting district performance expectations	42	50
j.	to match instructional methods to individual performance levels	30	30
k.	to assign students to remedial instruction	22	23
l.	to work with counselors or school psychologists in decision-making about individual students	25	29
m.	to increase your understanding about a student	56	63

10. Has the Minimum Competency Testing Program served to accelerate decisions on curricular change?

1982 YES 23 1983 YES 28

The following questions reference the current year's (1983) state mandated minimum competency testing program.

		1982 YES	1983 YES
11.	Were 1982-83 state minimum competency objectives distributed to:		
	building principals?	86	89
	teachers?	75	83
	special services personnel?	49	53
12.	Was there a study and analysis to determine the fit of the 1983 state minimum competency objectives to the district's scope and sequence		
	in Reading?	30	30
	in Mathematics?	30	33
13.	Were steps taken to insure that the state minimum competency objectives were taught?	44	55
14.	Are the state minimum competency objectives effecting a change in your district's curricular scope and sequence?	24	30

		1982 YES	1983 YES
15.	Has your teaching staff been directed to emphasize the state minimum competency objectives in their instruction?	34	45
16.	Has the district focused its instructional effort toward maximizing student performance on the 1983 Kansas minimum competency tests?	26	33
17.	Has your building focused its instructional effort toward maximizing student performance on the 1983 Kansas minimum competency tests?	30	39
18.	Are there indications that due to the minimum competency testing program the school curriculum is being narrowed?	9	13
19.	Has the presence of minimum competency testing led to such activities as drills, coaching, practice on test items, etc.?	13	22

20. How much pressure for a high level of performance on the 1983 Kansas minimum competency tests has there been

a. on you as the building principal?

	1982	1983
A great deal	6	7
Moderate	21	32
Slight	25	25
None	48	36

b. on the teachers in your building?

	1982	1983
A great deal	4	6
Moderate	23	35
Slight	28	27
None	45	32

c. on the students in your building?

	1982	1983
A great deal	5	6
Moderate	22	34
Slight	28	30
None	45	30

Teachers

The sampling plans for obtaining teacher responses in 1982 and 1983 were devised to maximize the information obtained from a variety of teachers at all grade levels with different content responsibilities while still allowing the primary analysis to focus on teachers with reading and/or mathematics instructional responsibilities. The 1982 sampling plan differed from 1983 primarily in that the 1983 plan requested that teachers completing the questionnaire have primary teaching responsibility in either reading or mathematics. The 1982 plan included reading and mathematics teachers, but specifically requested responses from teachers whose primary teaching responsibilities were in content areas other than reading or mathematics including teachers of exceptional students. As previously indicated in Table 1, questionnaires were received from 1358 teachers in 1982 and 816 teachers in 1983. All grade levels in terms of teaching responsibility were represented in the sample of respondents. The content area teaching responsibilities for both samples are summarized in the following chart.

Primary Teaching Responsibility	1982 Number (%)	1983 Number (%)
Reading only	248 (18.3)	218 (26.7)
Math only	158 (11.6)	165 (20.2)
Both Reading and Math	630 (46.4)	385 (47.2)
Neither Reading nor Math	306 (22.5)	48 (5.9)
Missing Data	16 (1.2)	- -

The median number of years of total teaching experience for the respondents was approximately 11 years and the median number of years of teaching in the current district was approximately 16 years.

The 1982 and 1983 responses to items on the Teacher Questionnaire are summarized in Table 5 as percentages. It should be noted that the base number on which the percentages for 1982 responses were calculated is different for item sets 1-8 and 9-18. For items 9-18, only those responses from teachers who had direct responsibility for reading and/or mathematics

instruction were used (n=1036). The percentages reported for these latter items can be directly compared to the percentages reported for the 1983 sample as both samples are comparable. The 1982 percentages reported for items 1-8 were calculated using all respondents as the base number (n=1358). Because this latter group contains 306 teachers whose teaching area responsibility was other than reading or mathematics, the percentages reported are underestimates for a sample comparable to the 1983 sample. However, these percentages better reflect the responses of a general teacher's population. If a comparison of 1982 to 1983 data is desired, a general rule-of-thumb based on a more detailed analysis is to increase the 1982 percentages by one third the difference in the 1982 and 1983 percentages reported in Table 5 for items 2-8. In all instances for comparable samples, the percentages are higher in 1983 than 1982.

The percentages reported in Table 5 indicate several trends in the data. Rather than describe these results item by item, the following comments focus on the general trends. In all instances, the percentages for 1983 are higher than for 1982. A greater proportion of teachers in 1983 than 1982 indicated that:

a) communication/dissemination of test results and competencies occurred,

b) individual student test performance results were being used for specific purposes,

c) specific curricular/instructional actions were taken, and

d) the state minimum competency objectives were influencing instructional activities.

For many items, the percent increase was sizable (10-20%). Based on these data, it appears that the State Minimum Competency Testing Program is having an impact on educational activities at the teacher level and

the trend over the two reporting periods is of an increasing impact. Supportive of this trend are the responses to item 18 related to the amount of perceived pressure for a high level of performance. At least some pressure for a high level of student performance was perceived by an increase of approximately 20% of the teachers in 1983 over 1982.

While the comparative 1982 and 1983 data are important indicators of trend, the absolute percentage values also are important as indicators of the magnitude of the impact or influence. When examining these latter values, across items, the highest percentage of teachers reporting an effect on their instructional behavior is 50.3% (item 9c for 1983, increasing instructional emphasis on the state competencies). Only 40% (21% in 1982) report being encouraged to direct instruction toward the state competencies and only 38% (23% in 1982) indicated that they used the state list of competencies to plan instructional activities for students. Consistent with the latter percentages, only 56% reported that state minimum competency objectives were distributed to district teachers.

TABLE 5

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

1. How satisfied are you with your district's emphasis on basic skills instruction?

	1982	1983
extremely satisfied	17.5	20.8
satisfied	70.5	69.5
dissatisfied	11.5	8.3
extremely dissatisfied	0.4	1.4

The remaining questions ask for information about minimum competency testing as it has been implemented in Kansas. In the Spring of 1982, Kansas students in grades 2, 4, 6, 8 and 11 were tested under the mandated minimum competency testing legislation. Results of this testing were returned to districts in August 1982. The following questions reference the 1982 test administration and reporting.

	1982 YES	1983 YES
2. Was there a reporting by central administration to teachers of the district's performance on the 1982 Kansas Minimum Competency Tests?	50.0	78.9
3. Were the following test results available to you for review?		
a. individual student results	28.9	45.6
b. summary of building results	40.5	64.0
c. summary of district results	41.4	67.6
4. Did you examine any of the following information?		
a. summary building performance data	29.7	53.3
b. summary district performance data	29.7	52.2
c. test results for individual students	21.7	33.8
5. Did you use individual student performance results for the following?		
a. to inform students of their status	4.1	4.3
b. to make reports to parents	4.1	8.0
c. to evaluate the adequacy of instructional methods in basic skill areas	21.6	45.7
d. to group pupils for instruction	4.4	8.2
e. to diagnose individual pupils' learning difficulties	13.7	22.6
f. to motivate pupils to study	9.5	17.3
g. to assess teaching effectiveness	19.2	37.6
h. to determine each pupil's instructional level	9.3	15.6
i. to assess whether students were meeting district performance expectations	17.7	40.1

	1982 YES	1983 YES
j. to match instructional methods to individual performance levels	11.0	17.8
k. to assign students to remedial instruction	7.0	11.7
l. to work with counselors or school psychologists in decision-making about individual students	9.3	11.5
m. to increase your understanding about a student	17.9	30.0

6. Was the test result Interpretation Manual available for your use when reviewing the performance data? 13.3 23.4

7. Based on students' level of performance, were you particularly concerned about student performance

	1982 YES	1983 YES
in Reading?	26.5	37.7
in Mathematics?	24.3	40.0

8. How would you describe the reactions of the following groups/individuals to student performance in your building on the 1982 Kansas Minimum Competency Tests?

		Satisfied	Mixed	Dissatisfied	Indifferent	Don't Know
a. school board members	'82:	11.6	8.2	4.2	1.1	74.8
	'83:	16.5	16.4	9.4	0.6	57.1
b. central administrators	'82:	15.7	10.6	5.7	1.0	67.0
	'83:	23.7	20.3	12.9	0.6	33.1
c. your principal	'82:	21.4	13.3	5.6	1.5	58.2
	'83:	33.3	22.1	11.9	1.3	31.4
d. parents	'82:	10.1	7.7	2.1	2.2	77.9
	'83:	19.1	9.9	2.2	3.2	65.6
e. other teachers	'82:	16.1	18.5	4.8	1.8	58.8
	'83:	24.3	29.7	8.9	2.8	34.3
f. your reactions	'82:	20.1	20.7	7.1	4.1	57.9
	'83:	31.9	33.6	12.6	4.4	17.5

9. Which of the following actions did you take as a result of the availability of 1982 test performance information?

	1982 YES	1983 YES
a. Revised the instructional scope and sequence		
in Reading.	16.1	22.3
in Mathematics.	20.5	30.6
b. Added lessons/units to the curriculum.	28.7	40.3
c. Increased instructional emphasis in the existing curriculum on the state minimum competency objectives.	36.9	50.3
d. Sought out additional instructional materials to supplement teaching		
in Reading.	34.8	40.8
in Mathematics.	28.0	48.1
e. Attended inservice meetings on the use of test results.	7.1	13.6

	1982 YES	1983 YES
f. Changed the focus of student evaluations toward an objectives-referenced testing format.	8.0	11.2
g. Developed remedial instruction for students whose performance was poor.	24.3	28.4
h. Requested the assistance of an aide to work with students		
in Reading.	10.0	10.5
in Mathematics.	9.0	9.5
i. Studied the tests to assess their match to curricular instructional objectives.	26.2	44.4

10. Has the Minimum Competency Testing Program served to accelerate decisions on curricular change?

1982 YES 13.6 1983 YES 29.7

The following questions reference this year's (1982-83) state mandated minimum competency testing.

	1982 YES	1983 YES
11. Were the 1982-83 state minimum competency objectives distributed to district teachers?	47.3	56.4
12. Did you use these objectives to plan instructional activities for your students?	23.3	38.2
13. Were you encouraged to direct instruction toward the state minimum competency objectives?	21.1	40.5
14. Did you scarifice instruction in other areas/ skills to teach toward the state objectives?	5.6	9.2
15. Have you changed your instructional methods because of the minimum competency testing program?	7.4	15.4
16. Are there indications that due to the minimum competency testing program the school curriculum is being narrowed?	10.3	15.9
17. Has the presence of minimum competency testing led to such activities as drills, coaching, practice on test items, etc.	16.2	26.6

18. How much pressure for a high level of performance on the Kansas Minimum Competency Tests has there been

a. on you as a teacher?

	1982	1983
A great deal	6.7	12.6
Moderate	15.7	25.2
Slight	14.9	21.8
None	62.7	40.4

b. on the teachers in your building?

	1982	1983
A great deal	8.4	14.0
Moderate	20.7	29.6
Slight	18.8	22.8
None	52.1	33.6

c. on the students in your building?

	1982	1983
A great deal	6.3	8.3
Moderate	19.2	30.4
Slight	23.5	26.3
None	51.0	40.0

Summary and Conclusions

This report addresses the impact of the Kansas Minimum Competency Testing Program on schools, school personnel and select school practices. Competency testing was first introduced state-wide in April, 1980. Testing, under new legislation, was carried out again in April of 1982 and 1983. Concurrent with testing in 1982 and 1983 school board members, superintendents, principals and teachers were surveyed to gather information on the consequences the testing program was creating. Although different sampling plans were utilized in each year, information obtained supports the comparability of the groups over time. Sufficient data were collected from members of each group to provide stable statistics on the variables and conditions being studied.

The body of this report addresses specific findings unique to each group studied. Here we wish to point to findings that are consistent over those groups surveyed. Based on analyses and reviews of the data collected, there appear to be four major conclusions to be drawn from evaluating the question-impact of the minimum competency testing on education in Kansas.

First, between 30 to 50 percent of the districts at this time are taking steps in direct response to the program. Actions in these districts are neither minimal, superficial, cosmetic nor without expense. They are reasonable and justifiable responses to attending to the task at hand. By comparison, there are an additional 30 to 40 percent of the districts wherein actions representing change are just now surfacing or where change has occurred but the amount is moderate at best when judged in relation

to the first mentioned group. In effect this group acknowledges the program, has decided that it requires attention, but are not as yet willing to commit their education enterprise to change on the basis of the program. Finally, there is a third group, comprised of 20 to 30 percent of the districts, that in effect have not altered in any discernable way their practices in reaction to or as a result of the program.

The second major conclusion from the study is that change is a continuing process. That is, in reference to the first point, there is movement by districts toward entry into the first group mentioned. As the program remains in place, it is likely that yearly as many as 20 to 25 percent of the districts in a category will shift toward a category reflecting greater impact. At this time, it cannot be determined if districts in higher impact categories will shift downward.

The third point to be found in the data examined relates to the matter of communication and perception. It is clear that for the four groups studied, as one moves closer to the actual classroom, impact would appear to be not as great as that perceived by the various administrative categories studied. Yet, this trend does not suggest evidence of contradiction or inconsistency in the data over groups. It perhaps best reflects the complexity of the education process, and the impact or priority the program justifiably deserves when viewed against the diversity of tasks warranting attention.

The final conclusion is that from the data assembled, there is little, if any, evidence that the minimum competency testing program is restricting school programs at this time. Schools appear to be dealing with the program on their terms. It does not appear, as might have been earlier predicted, that a monster has been created.