

Approved Saturday, May 4, 1991
Date

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

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

1:30 ~~am~~/p.m. on Wednesday, February 13, 1991 in room 123-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except:

Senator Montgomery, excused

Committee staff present:

Mr. Ben Barrett, Legislative Research Department
Ms. Avis Swartzman, Revisor of Statutes
Mr. Dale Dennis, Assistant Commissioner of Education
Mrs. Millie Randell, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee:

Education - Restructuring

Dr. John Myers, education program director, National Conference of
State Legislatures
Mr. Terry Whitney, education facility associate, National Conference
of State Legislatures

After calling the meeting to order, Chairman Joseph C. Harder informed members that, due to Committee request, he had invited Dr. John Myers, education program director, and Mr. Terry Whitney, education facility associate, National Conference of State Legislatures, to attend today's meeting as a follow-up of their presentation yesterday. He welcomed Dr. Myers and Mr. Whitney to the Committee.

Dr. Myers, acknowledging that Mr. Whitney and he had proceeded swiftly through yesterday's presentation, said he would open the floor for Committee questions. First, however, he called attention to a packet of information consisting of: Table I, School System Characteristics (background information), Attachment 1; Table 24, State Accountability Systems (a relationship of data and assessment systems at the national level), Attachment 2; Appendix A, Key Education Statistics, 1989-90, Attachment 3; "Basic Education" excerpt, Attachment 4; and Executive Summary (accountability options), Attachment 5.

Referring to Table 24, Dr. Myers noted that Kansas did not sign up as a 1990 National Association of Education Progress math trial participant.

Comments and responses by Dr. Myers and Mr. Whitney include the following:

The Executive Summary, Attachment 5, gives more detail on accountability systems. They are most effective when used in a combination adapted to local and state goals.

The average teacher salary in Appendix A, Attachment 3, does not include fringe benefits. These figures have been used by national groups for evaluation purposes.

A statewide education goal must be formulated preparatory to restructuring an educational system. Other attributes include professionalism, site base management, early childhood education, and parental involvement. Those states which best accomplish restructuring include all of these elements.

Parental involvement is one area in which schools have not been successful. Parents who become involved during the early childhood years are more likely to remain involved. Parental involvement in Milwaukee can be attributed to the voucher system, but we must remember that we are responsible for educating all children.

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION,
room 123-S, Statehouse, at 1:30 ~~xxx~~ am/p.m. on Wednesday, February 13, 1991

A changed or improved outcomes product can be evaluated through a new assessment mechanism and a long list of indicators, including some kind of test that is not standardized. Testing should be more subjective and include more thinking process.

The western United States, including Kansas, is less regulated than the eastern states.

Significant changes in education reform are needed in Kansas, or it will be left behind.

Standardized testing and the way you teach are inseparable. One cannot be changed without changing the other.

A new method of evaluating teachers is being formulated and will affect teaching and how teachers are being trained.

Although the United States is not ranked high internationally, there is some focus at the postsecondary level.

There is a national trend toward providing for gifted education, but all programs should respond to the individual talents of the students.

Some schools are contracting with the private sector, such as for the language discipline.

The Kansas Legislature should be commended for studying and attempting to initiate educational reform; but because of the self-executing powers of the State Board, it is up to the Board to implement change.

Accountability is the key to success, with less emphasis on rules, regulations, and mandates.

States which have been most successful in using weighting as a criteria for funding are those which provide a lot of data on local school district expenditures, including actual costs and various types of needs. Size and sparsity would be two attributes of weighting. The Chair indicated his desire to include weighting sometime in the school finance formula.

The Chair thanked Dr. Myers and Mr. Whitney for returning to share their expertise with the Committee and adjourned the meeting.

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

TIME: 1:30 p.m. PLACE: 123-S DATE: Wednesday, February 13, 1991

GUEST LIST

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ADDRESS</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>
Melanie Furjanic	6229 SE Paulen Rd.	Page
Toni Myrick	714 NE Twiss	Page
Lisa Ables	721 Forest	Page
Mark Lavin	6014 McElkham Ft. Leavenworth	page
Johanna Miller	612 Grant Ave Ft. Linn.	page
Jacquie Dabek	Topeka	SQIE
Chuck Stuart	Topeka	USA
JIM HAYS	TOPEKA	KASB
ROBERT NICHOLS	WICHITA	Wichita Public Schools
Bernie Koch	Wichita	Wichita Area Chamber
CB Sonny (Arenabe)	Lynsane	State Board of Education
Diana Walker	Osawatomie	
Connie Davis	Lane KS	
Russell Davis	Lane KS	
Krista Wardell	Topeka, KS	ASK

TABLE 1

SCHOOL SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

Public Schools

	FALL MEMBERSHIP		SCHOOL DISTRICTS		NUMBER OF SCHOOLS
	1988-89	Number 1988-89	Membership Under 1000	% Membership Under 1000	1988-89
ALABAMA	724,751	129	2	1.6%	1,292
ALASKA	106,481	55	42	76.4%	453
ARIZONA	574,890	238	142 (1)	50.8%	1,023
ARKANSAS	436,387	329	223	67.8%	1,094
CALIFORNIA	4,618,120	1,077	530	49.2%	7,312
COLORADO	560,081	176	106	60.2%	1,339
CONNECTICUT	463,488	166	54	32.5%	973
DELAWARE	96,678	19	4 (1)	15.8%	168
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	84,792	1	0	0.0%	187
FLORIDA	1,720,930	67	1	1.5%	2,432
GEORGIA	1,107,994	186	14	7.5%	1,728
HAWAII	167,488	1	0	0.0%	231
IDAHO	214,615	115	65	56.5%	561
ILLINOIS	1,794,916	972	608 (1)	62.0%	4,225
INDIANA	960,994	303	50 (1)	15.8%	1,923
IOWA	478,200	433	328	75.8%	1,622
KANSAS	426,596	304	217	71.4%	1,465
KENTUCKY	637,627	177	36	20.3%	1,394
LOUISIANA	786,683	66	0	0.0%	1,582
MAINE	212,902	210	172	81.9%	751
MARYLAND	688,947	24	0	0.0%	1,217
MASSACHUSETTS	823,428	359	179	49.9%	1,826
MICHIGAN	1,582,785	561	179	31.9%	3,284
MINNESOTA	726,950	436	287	65.8%	1,559
MISSISSIPPI	503,326	152	10	6.6%	957
MISSOURI	806,639	544	377	69.3%	2,153
MONTANA	152,191	549	517 (1)	92.5%	761
NEBRASKA	269,434	862	826	95.8%	1,512
NEVADA	176,474	17	5	29.4%	315
NEW HAMPSHIRE	169,413	170	118 (1)	62.9%	435
NEW JERSEY	1,080,871	602	317 (1)	48.7%	2,257
NEW MEXICO	292,425	88	49	55.7%	651
NEW YORK	2,573,715	721	242 (1)	33.1%	3,983
NORTH CAROLINA	1,083,156	140	4	2.9%	1,949
NORTH DAKOTA	118,809	296	282	95.3%	681
OHIO	1,778,544	613	120	19.6%	3,738
OKLAHOMA	580,426	609	500 (2)	82.1%	1,832
OREGON	461,752	304	214	70.4%	1,206
PENNSYLVANIA	1,659,714	501	44	8.8%	3,298
PUERTO RICO	661,693	1	0	0.0%	1,676
RHODE ISLAND	133,585	37	4	10.8%	302
SOUTH CAROLINA	615,774	91	6	6.6%	1,103
SOUTH DAKOTA	126,910	191	165	86.4%	792
TENNESSEE	821,580	141	17	12.1%	1,565
TEXAS	3,283,707	1,062	613	57.7%	5,856
UTAH	431,119	40	6	15.0%	730
VERMONT	93,464	276	258 (1)	83.0%	331
VIRGIN ISLANDS	23,492	1	0	0.0%	34
VIRGINIA	982,393	136	13 (1)	7.4%	1,765
WASHINGTON	790,918	296	160	54.1%	1,870
WEST VIRGINIA	335,912	55	0	0.0%	1,065
WISCONSIN	774,857	430	236	54.9%	2,009
WYOMING	97,793	49	23	46.9%	408
U.S. TOTAL	40,876,809	15,378	8,365	54.4%	84,875

SOURCE: Common Core of Data, E.D. Tabs March 1990, No. NCES 90-094, National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education.

NOTES: Fall membership figures include pre-kindergarten counts. (1) This figure may vary because some districts did not report the size of their enrollment. (2) Oklahoma student counts were aggregated from the school records associated with each district. Data for DoDDS are not available from the Common Core of Data collection.

EDUC
7/13/91
A1

STATE ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEMS

State Data Reporting

	Report Comprehensive System of Indicators?	Data Reported in Relation to Demographic Factors	Rewards or Sanctions in Accountability Systems	1989-90 Dropout Data Pilot Participants	1990 State NAEP Math Trial Participants
ALABAMA	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
ALASKA	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
ARKANSAS	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ARIZONA	No	No	No	No	Yes
CALIFORNIA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
COLORADO	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
CONNECTICUT	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
DELAWARE	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	--	--	--	Yes	No
FLORIDA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
GEORGIA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
HAWAII	Yes	No	Sanctions	No	Yes
IDAHO	No	No	No	No	Yes
ILLINOIS	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
INDIANA	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
IOWA	Yes	Yes	Sanctions	Yes	Yes
KANSAS	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
KENTUCKY	Yes	Yes	Rewards	No	Yes
LOUISIANA	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
MAINE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
MARYLAND	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
MASSACHUSETTS	No	Yes	Rewards	Yes	No
MICHIGAN	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
MINNESOTA	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
MISSISSIPPI	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
MISSOURI	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
MONTANA	No	No	No	No	Yes
NEBRASKA	No	No	No	No	Yes
NEVADA	Yes	No	Rewards	No	Yes
NEW HAMPSHIRE	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
NEW JERSEY	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
NEW MEXICO	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
NEW YORK	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
NORTH CAROLINA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
NORTH DAKOTA	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
OHIO	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
OKLAHOMA	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
OREGON	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
PENNSYLVANIA	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
PUERTO RICO	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
RHODE ISLAND	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
SOUTH CAROLINA	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
SOUTH DAKOTA	No	Yes	Rewards	No	No
TENNESSEE	No	No	Sanctions	No	No
TEXAS	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
UTAH	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
VERMONT	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
VIRGIN ISLANDS	No	No	Yes	No	No
VIRGINIA	No	No	Rewards	No	Yes
WASHINGTON	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
WEST VIRGINIA	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
WISCONSIN	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
WYOMING	No	No	No	Yes	Yes

SOURCE: Council of Chief State School Officers' 1989 Survey: Accountability Reporting in the States.

NOTES: "--" indicates data not reported. Other territories participating in the Dropout Pilot test are: Northern Marianas and American Samoa.

EDUC
2/13/91
A 2

APPENDIX A
KEY EDUCATION STATISTICS
1989-90

STATE	TOTAL REVENUE BY SOURCE			AVERAGE TEACHER	AVERAGE
	FEDERAL	STATE	LOCAL	SALARY (ALL TEACHERS)	EXPENDITURE PER PUPIL (ADA)
Alabama	13.5%	67.1%	19.4%	\$26,700	\$3,319
Alaska	9.9*	60.5*	29.6*	43,500*	7,252*
Arkansas	4.7*	45.1*	50.2*	33,592*	3,858*
Arizona	9.7	59.5	30.8	22,693	3,272
California	8.0	66.8	25.1	37,640	4,620
Colorado	4.8*	38.1*	57.0*	35,586*	4,878*
Connecticut	3.7	44.7	51.6	41,909	7,930
Delaware	7.9	66.8	25.3	34,700	5,848
Florida	6.0	53.6	40.5	30,197*	5,051
Georgia	6.5*	60.9*	32.6*	31,685*	4,456*
Hawaii	7.9	92.0	.1	32,956	4,504
Idaho	7.2*	59.9*	32.9*	24,444*	3,016*
Illinois	7.7*	37.9	54.4	34,139	4,853
Indiana	4.5*	59.2*	36.2*	30,472*	4,126*
Iowa	5.3	51.0	43.7	27,619	4,590
Kansas	5.2	43.3	51.5	30,154	4,706
Kentucky	9.2	69.7	21.1	27,431	3,824
Louisiana	11.3*	54.4*	34.3*	23,754*	3,313*
Maine	6.7	53.2	40.1	27,829	5,577
Maryland	4.9	38.7	56.3	37,515	5,887
Massachusetts	4.4*	42.4*	53.2*	40,377*	6,740*
Michigan	4.7	36.3	59.0	37,286*	5,073
Minnesota	4.4	53.2	42.4	33,340	4,935
Mississippi	15.5	56.7	27.8	25,156	3,220
Missouri	5.6	38.0	56.4	28,381	4,226
Montana	8.0	47.7	44.3	29,526	4,254
Nebraska	4.8*	24.3*	70.8*	26,198*	3,874*
Nevada	4.1	36.7	59.3	31,810	4,260*

EDUC.
 2/13/91
 A 3-1

STATE	TOTAL REVENUE BY SOURCE			AVERAGE TEACHER	AVERAGE
	FEDERAL	STATE	LOCAL	SALARY (ALL TEACHERS)	EXPENDITURE PER PUPIL (ADA)
New Hampshire	2.7%*	7.8%*	89.6%*	\$28,958*	\$4,833*
New Jersey	3.8*	41.5	54.7	37,777	8,439
New Mexico	12.0	76.4	11.6	25,988	4,180
New York	5.0	43.4	51.7	40,300	8,165
N. Carolina	6.3	65.7	27.9	28,947	4,164
N. Dakota	7.0*	49.7*	43.3*	23,788	3,581*
Ohio	5.4	47.1	47.5	32,380	4,394
Oklahoma	8.7	59.1	32.2	23,944	3,484
Oregon	6.3	26.8	66.9	31,887	5,085
Pennsylvania	5.3	45.9	48.9	33,219	5,728
Rhode Island	4.4	43.8	51.8	36,704	6,523*
S. Carolina	7.7	53.3	39.0	28,266	3,692
S. Dakota	9.3	27.3	63.4	22,120	3,312
Tennessee	9.4	48.3	42.4	27,949	3,503
Texas	7.9	43.1	48.9	28,558	4,011
Utah	6.3	56.7	37.0	24,793	2,733
Vermont	5.3	36.5	58.2	29,159*	5,418*
Virginia	4.7	34.7	60.2	31,862	4,986
Washington	5.8	73.4	20.8	31,825	4,639
W. Virginia	8.2	64.3	27.5	23,842	4,094
Wisconsin	4.1	39.1	56.8	33,788*	5,763*
Wyoming	4.5	56.8	38.8	29,304	5,391

Source: National Education Association, Estimates of School Statistics, 1989-90. Washington, D.C.: NEA

* = Estimate by NEA

BASIC EDUCATION

A Monthly Forum For Analysis & Comment

Patte Barth, Editor

Of Southpaws and Sneezers Page 1

It's Not Critical Page 3
by John Holdren

The Cheshire Cat and Reform . . . Page 7
by John Barth

Reflecting on Failure Page 10
by Beverly Bimes-Michalak

Replaying *Romeo and Juliet* . . . Page 13
by Barry Kritzberg

CBE in Brief Page 16

Basic Education is published monthly, except in July and August, by the Council for Basic Education.

CBE OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS

- Thomas W. Payzant, *Chairman*;
- F. James Rutherford, *Vice Chairman*;
- Ina H. Brown, *Treasurer*;
- Mrs. Talcott Bates, Mrs. Barry Bingham, Charles Blitzer,
- Carl J. Dolce, Maxine Frost, Michael Harreld, Arturo Madrid,
- Mrs. Edward B. McMenemy, Thomas C. Mendenhall,
- Dr. Diane Ravitch,Carolynn Reid-Wallace, Donald M. Stewart,
- Mrs. Keith S. Wellin.
- Jacques Barzun, Clifton Fadiman, *Directors Emeriti*.
- A. Graham Down, *President*.

ISSN 1964984

Copyright 1990, The Council for Basic Education

THE CHESHIRE CAT AND REFORM

by John Barth

American education is in trouble. So we hear from the pundits and prophets, in our newspapers and journals, from politicians and business. Too many students fail to successfully transit our educational system, and too many of those who do are not prepared to function effectively in a changing and increasingly demanding workplace.

Educators may wish to quibble with this assessment, and they certainly can point to schools and school systems that are performing in exemplary fashion. But a thorough and honest search of their own experience would force them to concede that most of the fusillade from the critics is on the mark.

This sense of crisis has spawned a plethora of remedies ranging from longer school years to changes in curriculum to empowering various players in education. Some of these ideas are good, some bad, and realistically, most will have little effect on the outcomes that should concern us most, student learning and performance.

The observer of the reform movement cannot escape an unsettling sense that not only is something awry with our educational system, but that something is missing from the process proposing to change it. Phillip Schlechty, executive director of the Gheens Professional Development Academy, of the Jefferson County (Kentucky) Public Schools, commented that when it comes to school reform, "We are on the cutting edge of ignorance."

We know instinctively as well as intellectually that change is necessary. The new terrain upon which educators must operate, the new demands placed upon the system—the most basic being the economic, political/cultural, and moral imperative that we educate all of our children—suggest to us that change may need to touch every aspect of the educational undertaking.

EDUC
2/13/91
A4-1

And yet, despite what we know in our heads and hearts, beyond the difficulties and uncertainties always associated with radical transformation, our efforts at restructuring American education have been characterized by a series of fitful lurches and dizzying spins.

There is a natural human aversion to altering the patterns that are familiar to us, and, as one frustrated school reformer quipped, "Educators are the benchmark for resistance to change." But there is another aspect to our difficulty in establishing a cohesive reform effort. As the Cheshire Cat reminded Alice, if you don't care or don't know where you want to go, "Then it doesn't matter which way you go."

In the name of reform and educational improvement, we have been exhorting our educational troops to greater and more valiant effort, but we have failed to provide them with a clear statement of their objectives. The nation lacks even a narrow consensus on what our schools should be, what outcomes they should produce, what our children should learn. As a result, our periodic impulses to education reform take on a certain spasmodic character, focusing, often exclusively, on the latest high-profile problem or perceived crisis. Those called upon to implement the reforms experience a sense of *déjà vu*, recognizing, correctly, that much of this has been around before. They also surmise, again correctly, that if they delay and drag their feet long enough, this too shall pass, leaving them where they were before this untidy reform business was unleashed on them.

The national education goals adopted by President Bush and the nation's governors following the Charlottesville Summit are an important initial step in addressing the lack of direction and purpose that hamper our efforts at education reform. The six goals and the twenty-one accompanying objectives are our first national statement of expectations for education. The next critical step in this process is the work undertaken by the National Education Goals Panel, which has been charged with the responsibility of developing the process for measuring and reporting the progress toward the national goals. The panel's decisions on what is to be measured, how it is to be measured, and how it will be reported will add the necessary specificity to the goals program.

There are readily apparent advantages to this strategy. Because they were developed in partnership with the governors, the goals stand as a national agreement rather

Basic Education/8

than a federal mandate. As such, they are more likely to be met with acceptance rather than resistance from educators across the country. In addition, the existence of the partnership enhances the prospects for the goals to be adopted and enhanced in all fifty states. Vermont, for example, through the leadership of Governor Kunin, Commissioner Richard Mills and the State Board of Education, and after discussion with educators and citizens across the state, adopted and the legislature affirmed four state goals and is in the process of developing specific objectives. To date, thirty-seven states have developed or are in the process of developing state education goals.

This exercise must be repeated in every state, every school district, and, for that matter, in every school and classroom. While remaining consistent with the broad goals articulated at the national level, the goals and objectives adopted at the state and local level will reflect the unique circumstances and needs that exist there. We will find as we move at every level to greater specificity on outcomes that we will foster greater diversity. As

***Education reform
cannot move forward
without first deciding where
we expect the journey to end.***

rank-and-file educators and parents join forces to define the expectations they have for the students in their schools, different visions of education will emerge. Coupling this with the freedom of educators, parents, and students to gravitate to those visions of education consistent with their own beliefs will produce a harmony of purpose that cannot help but contribute to improved educational outcomes.

Education reform cannot move forward without first deciding where we expect the journey to end. In fact, the major reform initiatives widely advocated today—accountability, regulatory relief, empowerment and school-based management, performance incentives—all require a clear statement of expectations to succeed. The process has begun. Our challenge is to carry it forward.

John Barth is director of intergovernmental affairs for the United States Department of Education. This article was prepared by him in his private capacity. The views are those of the author, and no official support by the U.S. Department of Education is intended or should be inferred.

9/December

EDUC

2/13/91

A4-2

Executive Summary

This Executive Summary is presented to inform the debate on this issue and does not necessarily represent the position of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.

Accountability Options: Most Effective When Combined

As the public continues to demand that schools be held accountable for how well they educate their students, policymakers are being called upon to decide which types of accountability systems to implement.

In *Accountability: Implications for State and Local Policymakers*, a paper commissioned by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), author Michael W. Kirst of Stanford University examines six accountability options. He argues that they are most effective when used in a combination adapted to local and State goals.

The concept of school accountability is not new. For more than a century, schools have been held responsible for how much students learn. In mid-nineteenth century England, for example, students were given a standard exam; their schools were then paid according to exam scores. This practice sparked immediate debate when English administrators dropped geography and history in order to spend more time on the 3 R's—subjects on which the students were tested. Today, accountability policies fall generally into six broad categories: performance reporting; monitoring and compliance; incentive systems; reliance on the market; changing the locus of authority or control of schools; and changing professional roles.

Performance Reporting

The *performance reporting* approach, similar to the audit report of a business, uses techniques such as statewide assessments, school report cards, or performance indicators to measure a school's success. This approach can be used to spur individuals or groups into action to improve education. A negative assessment report, for example, may convince an aroused parent group to lobby the school board for a new principal.

Ideally, techniques that assess performance should:

- measure what is actually taught;
- provide information that is policy relevant;

- focus on the school, rather than the district;
- encourage fair comparisons; and
- provide a maximum amount of information with a minimum reporting burden to schools.

Monitoring and Compliance

The *monitoring and compliance* approach to accountability addresses a school's compliance with standards or regulations. The key accountability criterion concerns *procedural* compliance, such as individualized education plans for handicapped children and targeting funds under Chapter 1 (Elementary and Secondary Education Act) programs. It includes such legal issues as the due process rights of handicapped students and auditing approaches, such as budget reviews. This strategy is most useful as an accountability tool when it is combined with other strategies that measure what students learn.

Incentive Systems

The *incentive systems* approach uses such incentives as merit schools, performance-based accreditation, and teacher merit pay. These systems, however, have been plagued with technical problems and resisted by educators. Merit pay, especially, has run into trouble. One reason is that, while schools seem able to identify incompetent teachers, they appear unable to sort out the top 10 or 20 percent who perform exceptionally well. As a result, attention has shifted to the school site as the unit for performance measurement, avoiding competition among teachers. However, developing assessments considered fair by everyone involved is still a problem.

Reliance on the Market

Accountability through *reliance on the market* depends on consumers to choose among schools, with the less successful schools presumably "run out of business." This approach runs the gamut from vouchers or tuition tax credits to the more limited strategy of open enrollment. However, free market systems have not been fully tested in the United States because of various obstacles, in-

cluding political resistance and concerns about equity.

Where choice remains a prominent issue in many areas, analysts caution it is neither a panacea nor a low-cost school improvement. Choice programs must offer diversity and quality, be well planned, and carefully implemented. They must include procedures to ensure racial balance and to promote racial integration.

Changing the Locus of Control

Some strategies for making schools more accountable would change the *locus of authority or control*. This relies on creating parent advisory councils, implementing school-site decentralization or community-controlled schools, or initiating State takeovers of local school districts. Radical decentralization in Chicago is an example of parents controlling school policy; while in Rochester, New York, the teachers' contract provides for their participation in school-site councils with membership "parity."

In the past, the public has depended on local school boards to hold schools accountable. Although many citizens are losing confidence in school boards, they still prefer that they, rather than the State or Federal governments, retain control of the schools.

Changing Professional Roles

The final concept examined by the author is *changing professional roles*. The emphasis here is on professional accountability mechanisms, such as peer review for tenure or dismissal and teacher-controlled boards for initial licensing. For this approach to work, policymakers must trust teachers to provide sufficient accountability and allow enough flexibility in classroom practice for professional discretion to be exercised.

The Policymaker's Role

All six accountability concepts have their strengths and weaknesses, and each is more or less appropriate for certain types of educational interventions and contexts. At the same time, the six categories are not mutually exclusive and should be combined in creative and effective ways. Besides recognizing the need to combine accountability strategies, policymakers must be aware of a number of other policy issues involving accountability.

1. Data systems and performance indicators have improved substantially, providing an array of potential input, process, and outcome variables useful for accountability. However, the problem remains of how to develop and fund a data base that adequately covers the full range of educational endeavor.

There is also a need to scrutinize the assessment tests used in local school districts to determine whether they overemphasize minimum competency and low-level general skills at the expense of higher level skills such as analysis, synthesis, inference, and expository writing.

2. Many policymakers are rethinking their heavy reliance on legal and bureaucratic accountability. While regulations remain important and are essential for certain programs, it is important to allow several models of practice to develop within categorical programs and to let local practitioners experiment to see which one works best in a local context.
3. The incentive system approach that uses incentive pay to promote better input-output relationships remains questionable. Merit pay seems to have lost whatever slight political momentum it had in the early 1980s, and merit schools are spreading very slowly through the States. Incentive systems that are part of the normal school budget process also are not gaining ground and the approach needs more experimentation.
4. A major issue is the debate over who should make the decisions regarding the best way to get educational results: politicians and parents, or educators. Decentralization is a popular outgrowth of this debate, especially when combined with restructuring, professionalism, and community control. Educators also are examining industrial restructuring concepts that allow school-site employees to make more of the decisions.
5. Many questions remain about the market accountability approach (vouchers, choice, etc.) which is focused more on public than private schools. As open enrollment within and between public school districts becomes more available, it is not clear if—or why—students will use it. For example will parents choose a school because it is close to their workplace or because it is a good school? Will parents' knowledge that they have a choice be an important accountability technique? And will those schools that lose pupils improve their educational performance or continue to deteriorate?

* * *

For information about ordering a copy of the full report, *Accountability: Implications for State and Local Policymakers* (Publication Number IS 90-982), contact OERI, Education Information Branch, 555 New Jersey Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20208-5641. Please include the publication number with your request.

IS 90-982a
July 1990

EDUC
7/13/91
A 5-2