Approved: January 12, 1995
Date

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Dave Kerr at 1:15 p.m. on January 11, 1995 in Room 123-S of the Capitol.

All members were present.

Committee staff present: Ben Barrett, Legislative Research Department
Carolyn Rampy, Legislative Research Department
Avis Swartzman, Revisor of Statutes
Brenda Dunlap, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee:
Dr. Sharon Freden, Assistant Commissioner, State Department of Education
Craig Shove, State Department of Education
Dr. John Poggio, Associate Dean for Graduate Studies, School of Education, University of Kansas

Others attending: See attached list

Senator Oleen made a motion to approve the minutes of the January 10, 1995 meeting. Senator Walker seconded the motion, and the motion carried.

Dr. Freden, State Department of Education, presented a brief overview of the development of curriculum standards, their implementation, and their current status. She discussed Standards of Excellence with emphasis on its definition; and also the definitions for Levels of Continuous Improvement which she feels are very important to achieving "world class" schools. (See Attachment 1)

Dr. Freden stated that the State Board of Education contracted the University of Kansas Center for Educational Testing and Evaluation to review the standards for mathematics, communication, national science and social studies. Dr. John Poggio is one of the persons who conducted this review.

Dr. Poggio, University of Kansas, School of Education, presented an overview of the Kansas assessment programs. He discussed the testing guidelines and the methodology and procedures for assessment development. He also discussed the criteria, expectations and descriptions for the Standard of Excellence and the Continuous Improvement Scale associated with the Kansas Assessments. (See Attachment 2)

Chairman Kerr informed the committee that anyone can review the test materials by visiting their local school and reviewing them with the principal. In addition, he stated that he had personally pushed the State Board of Education to develop these new "very high standards" because he hopes the higher standards will promote community involvement and discussion about higher academic achievement, and community involvement in creating a plan that ensures higher academic achievement.

Charlie Warren, President of Kansas Inc., addressed the Committee and stated he had been a member of the review team and that he believes that Dr. Poggio's "material is world class" and excellent.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

The next meeting is scheduled for January 12, 1995.

Date 1-11-95

VISITOR SHEET

(Please sign)

Name/Company	Name/Company
Karen Rooney / KASB	
Mark Tallman / KASB	
Trish Hannenstiel	LPA
Janet Loebel	KSBE
Christine O'Brien	KSBE
Greg Ochell	KSBE
Margie Hill	Blue Valley Schools #229
Marsha Strahm	CWA of Ks.
Arlyn Johnson	
Sharon Stringfellow	CWA of KS
Elaine Frisbie	Division of Budget
Gerald Henderson	USA of KS
Don Vague	USD 442 Hoxie
Herschel Boor	Wellsville
Gene Neely	KNEA

Kansas State Board of Education

120 S.E. 10th Avenue, Topeka, Kansas 66612-1182

January 11, 1995

TO: Senate Education Committee

FROM: Lee A. Droegemueller
Commissioner of Education

SUBJECT: Quality Performance Accreditation

I am pleased to present the attached materials to the Senate Education Committee. The information addresses Kansas curriculum standards, Kansas state assessments, and performance goals for the state assessments.

Staff of the State Board of Education and Dr. John Poggio, University of Kansas Center for Educational Testing and Evaluation, will discuss the materials with the Committee.

Lee Droegemueller
Commissioner
(913) 296-3201

Senate Education
1-11-95
Attachment 1

REPORT TO SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE
JANUARY 11, 1995

STATE CURRICULUM STANDARDS

Introduction

Through its strategic planning process, the State Board of Education identified in the late 1980's that the education requirements for Kansas students would have to change if those students were to be successful in the future. Among the many indicators of the need for change were the concerns expressed by employers about the capabilities of recently-hired personnel, the increasing use of many forms of technology in both the home and the workplace, the national reports about the lower achievement of our nation's students as compared with students in other countries, and the increasing number of publications indicating the need for a "new" kind of worker if the country were to remain economically competitive.

One example of the kinds of information the State Board received and studied is summarized on the following page. Economic development experts at the University of Kansas surveyed businesses of all sizes in Kansas and asked them to identify the most important skill needs of their new employees. The results of this survey have since been confirmed through separate meetings with chief executive officers and personnel officers of Kansas businesses. The left column shows the skill needed and the right column indicates the percentage of those surveyed who identified it as important.

In support of the Kansas survey results, What Work Requires of School, the national report of the Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills (SCANS), commissioned by Secretary of Labor Elizabeth Dole, identified similar kinds of skills as necessary for the work force of both the present and future.

The results of both the national report and the state surveys are reflected in the outcomes, standards, and indicators which make up the Quality Performance Accreditation document.

SKILLS NEEDED BY WORKERS

Skill	Percent
Adaptability/flexibility	72
Problem-solving	72
Teamwork	71
Goal-setting & personal motivation	71
Proper attitudes toward work & work habits	70
Comprehension/understanding	68
Organizational effectiveness & leadership	68
Microcomputer	67
Listening and orgal communications	65
Business/management	58
Computation	56
Interpersonal relations	56
Technical	56
Reading	51

--from a survey of Kansas businesses

Development of Curriculum Standards

In the fall of 1989, the State Board of Education adopted the Kansas Mathematics Improvement Program and, as part of the program, initiated the development of rigorous, challenging curriculum standards in mathematics. While the State Board had developed and issued curriculum guidelines for voluntary use by school districts over the years, for the most part they did not reflect what was emerging as a result of new research on teaching and learning or the learning needs of students if they were to compete in an international marketplace. A group of Kansas educators from elementary, secondary, and higher education completed the first draft of the Kansas Curriculum Standards in Mathematics in the spring of 1990, using the standards of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics as a model.

In early winter of 1989, the State Board appointed its Outcomes Accreditation Task Force, the work of which led to the Board's adoption in March, 1991, of Kansas Quality Performance Accreditation. Included in the indicators for measuring achievement of three of the ten Quality Performance Accreditation outcomes were specific references to state assessments in communications and mathematics.

In the fall of 1990, the State Board initiated its Communications Development Program, and draft curricular standards for communications, including reading, writing, speaking, listening, and viewing, were completed in 1991.

During the 1992 legislative session, the School District Finance and Quality Performance Act was enacted. That legislation included the Quality Performance Accreditation program, along with the following directive to the State Board of Education:

> "...the state board of education shall incorporate a comprehensive outcomes process under which standards indicating an identified level of excellence will be established and shall provide a means of assessment for attainment by pupils in kindergarten through grade 12 of a minimum of three benchmark levels in the skills domains of mathematics, science, communications, including reading, writing, speaking and listening, and social studies, including American history and geography. In order to ensure that the academic standards established under this subsection are equal to or greater than those in the rest of the United States and other parts of the world, and in order to ensure that the outcomes process, standards and assessments emphasize higher order thinking skills, the state board of education shall utilize the services of one or more consultants familiar with world wide standards of education."

Implementation

As noted above, by 1992 staff of the State Board had already begun work in developing curricular standards in mathematics and communications. Revision of the initial mathematics standards already had been made once. While the State Board had curriculum guidelines in a number of subject areas for several years, they were typically not stated in terms of expected student learning outcomes. With the 1992 legislation, efforts were redoubled to make certain that the mathematics and communications standards were so constructed, and work was begun on developing standards in science and social studies.

Four committees, one for each subject area, were continued or formed for this work in the summer of 1992. Each writing committee included both Kansas elementary and secondary school educators and higher education faculty. Through the intensive work of the writing committees, drafts of new standards or revisions of existing standards were completed and mailed to Kansas educators in September. Suggestions for improvement were solicited from Kansas educators. A total of 769 responses were received, 239 about the communication standards, 171 about science, 159 about social studies, and over 200 about mathematics. Using the comments received, a further revision of the standards was prepared in the spring of 1993.

The resulting work in communications, science, and social studies was mailed to schools and districts in May 1993. The mathematics standards, which had undergone two revisions since their initial publication in 1990, were being enhanced through the inclusion of example problems prepared by still another group of Kansas educators, and they were not distributed until late July.

Outside Review of Standards

The State Board of Education contracted with the University of Kansas Center for Educational Testing and Evaluation to conduct a review of the May 1992 versions of the four sets of standards to see if they were of sufficient rigor to be called "world class." The process for conducting that review is detailed in Appendix A, in the memorandum from Dr. Poggio and Dr. Glasnapp.

While the reviews of the national consultants were positive and affirmed that the curriculum standards were "world class," they also contained suggestions which have been considered in subsequent revisions.

Current Status of Standards

All of the advising committees continue to work with staff of the State Board of Education, both on matters related to continued development and enhancement of the curriculum standards and on the development and implementation of the state assessments.

The mathematics standards have not been revised since 1993, but additional materials to assist school districts in developing their local curricula using the state standards and to assist teachers in developing techniques to help students learn what is called for in the standards have been developed. As required in state law, the standards will be subject to a formal revision at least by the summer of 1996.

The communication standards will be enhanced significantly over the coming year, with the assistance of funding from a federal grant. Several committees of Kansas educators have been formed or continued for this purpose, and the first meetings of the primary advising group for the new enhancement effort is scheduled for later this month. The standards will be mailed to schools and districts for review, as in the past, and revisions will be completed during the 1995-96 school year. Staff development materials for use by local district teachers will also be developed as part of this grant.

At the request of the State Board of Education, the science standards have been revised to make more clear what the specific subject area content expectations are. We expect to mail the new draft to school districts within the next six weeks.

The social studies curriculum standards are also being revised at the request of the State Board. Again, the intent is to add more information about the curriculum content to the standards. The next draft will probably be available to school districts in late March or early April.

It should be noted that the state curriculum standards are not curriculum guides. The development of curriculum is a local district responsibility, as is the determination of instructional programs and strategies. The state curriculum standards indicate what is thought to be important at the state level. School districts are encouraged to add to the state standards or otherwise modify them to meet local needs and to develop local curriculum designed to help students achieve the standard.

Use of Nationally-Developed Standards

As indicated above, the committee writing the Kansas Curriculum Standards for Mathematics were able to use as guidelines the standards developed by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. Those standards have been well-received and generally praised, and have been followed by much

useful material about topics such as staff development and assessment of student achievement of the standards. The groups working to develop curriculum standards in the other subject areas have not had the advantage of completed work representing the thinking of people from across the country.

Communication standards have been developed nationally only to the point of having drafts which are not available for public release. Federal funds for the standards-writing in communication were withdrawn from the original contractors, and it has recently been announced that no further federal funds will be allocated for this project. National professional organizations in reading and English are continuing to develop standards, with the intent of releasing them for voluntary general use.

National science standards have been under development for a number of years. In fact, several groups have worked to develop standards in science. The work of the national science teachers association has reached the point that a second draft has been distributed for public comment. A final edition may be published late this spring.

Social studies encompasses a number of subject areas, including at least American history, American government, civics, geography, world history, anthropology, and sociology. National standards have been developed in several of the subject areas, though some of them have been received with controversy. It is especially problematic in social studies that each subject area nationally has developed enough material in their standards to require a great deal of classroom time for students to learn what is included in each subject area. One estimate of an earlier set of history standards was that students would have to study only history for eight school years in order to master the material recommended for inclusion in the kindergarten through grade twelve curriculum.

In spite of the difficulties noted above, the national work is helpful to Kansas committees as they attempt to make certain that the standards developed for Kansas use are equal to or greater than that which is required in the rest of the country, as required by state law.

State Curriculum Standards, State Assessments, and Quality Performance Accreditation

The Kansas curriculum standards for each of the subject areas of mathematics, science, social studies, reading, and writing give direction to the state assessments or tests in each of those subject areas.

The state assessments are an important part of Quality Performance Accreditation, since they are one of the indicators used to determine if schools are making progress toward the desired results in student learning. As noted in materials presented to the Committee on January 10,

performance of all student groups on state assessments measured against standards of excellence is one of the criteria the State Board intends to put into regulations for the Quality Performance Accreditation program.

The key to the statements above is the word one. While the state assessments are important, they are but one of the factors to be considered in accrediting a school under the Quality Performance Accreditation program.

State Assessments

Dr. John Poggio, co-director of the University of Kansas Center for Educational Testing and Evaluation, with whom the State contracts for the state assessments, will discuss the development of the state assessments with the Committee.

Standards of Excellence

The 1992 School District Finance and Quality Performance Act also required that the State Board of Education establish expected levels of performance on the state tests or assessments. Sufficient experience with the state assessments in mathematics, reading, and writing allowed the State Board to establish such standards this fall.

In September, several teachers, principals, superintendents, and representatives of the major education organizations in the state met to discuss with State Board staff and staff of the Center for Educational Testing and Evaluation the establishing of performance levels. The group was also to advise the State Board regarding terminology and definitions to be used in arriving at the standards.

The group recommended that a single performance level be established and, in keeping with the concept of Quality Performance Accreditation, advised that categories of continuous improvement levels toward the standard also be established. It was determined that the performance levels would be called standards of excellence and that five improvement or progress categories would be established.

Following are the definition of standard of excellence as well as the symbols and definitions of the continuous improvement categories.

Definition of Standard of Excellence

Student performance demonstrates capability with rigorous subject matter. Comprehensive application and integration of knowledge, concepts, and processes to new, unfamiliar or highly complex real world situations is evident when compared to world class standards of education.

Capability with information and skills in the content area is at a high level. Breadth as well as depth of understandings are evidenced. The ability to go beyond mechanical application to appropriate information is in evidence; proficiency with difficult, rigorous, and formidable materials is observed.

Symbols and Definitions for Levels of Continuous Improvement

- the school's performance in the assessment area shows a decline from prior performance levels.

m no change from prior performance levels is observed.

- m+ maintenance of performance at or above the standard of excellence
- m- maintenance of performance below the standard of excellence

\+ gains and advanced toward the standard of excellence are evidenced

++ strong gains are noted to indicate commendable progress toward the standard of excellence

The subject area advising committees in communication and mathematics met in late September and further defined the terms in order to relate them to the specific subject areas of mathematics, reading, and writing. The subject area definitions are included in Appendix B.

In early November, 1500 teachers and administrators from around the state participated, via satellite teleconference, in making recommendations about the expected standards of excellence and the continuous improvement levels, using the 1994 state assessments as the decision-making point. Following tabulation of the results of this work, the subject-area advising committees met to go through the same process of recommendation and to review the recommendations of the educators who had participated in the teleconferences.

In early December, a small group representative of the state's Goals 2000 panel and of the state's Business/Education Partnership met to review the recommendations derived from the work of the teleconference and the subject area committees. The following week, the State Board of Education adopted the standards of excellence and the continuous improvement levels.

It was at their December meeting that the State Board also determined that progress toward the standards of excellence on the state assessments would be a part of the criteria for determining the accredited status of schools under Quality Performance Accreditation.

The standards of excellence set the targets toward which schools are expected to work. The continuous improvement levels will be used to mark school progress from one testing period to another.

Dr. Poggio will discuss the standards of excellence and the continuous improvement levels with the Committees.

APPENDIX A

The University of Kansas

Center for Educational
Testing and Evaluation

Memo to: **Lee Droegemueller, Commissioner**
Dale Dennis, Deputy Commissioner

From: John Poggio and Doug Glasnapp
Date: September 30, 1993

RE: **Findings from the "World Class" curriculum standards review**

Synopsis: Over the summer there has been a formal review of the Kansas Curriculum Standards in Communications, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies. A dozen highly qualified individuals working independently and representing business and industry and the professional disciplines participated. Many of the reviewers are involved directly with the formation of the national curriculum Standards. The object of the evaluation was whether the Kansas Standards can be judged "World Class." From the reactions and judgments received, the response is decidedly yes. Independent evaluations indicate that the state's evolving Standards are on target and progressing toward those perceived as "World Class." Observations and suggestions obtained will aid in strengthening the relevance and appropriateness, as well as enhance the utility, of the Kansas Curriculum Standards.

In response to the directive of the 1992 Kansas School Finance Act and at your request, we have coordinated over the past four months an independent expert review of the state's Curriculum Standards in Communications (includes Reading, Writing, Speaking, and Listening), Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies (includes American History and Geography). We have been able to complete the project following the approach we had discussed and finalized with your office. The principle mission of the review and evaluation activity was to determine the extent to which the Kansas Curriculum Standards for each discipline could be identified appropriately as "World Class." In the sections that follow presented are the methods we used to obtain evaluation information and our findings. After studying this report, please do not hesitate to contact us for additional information or clarification as may be needed.

409 Bailey Hall • Lawrence, Kansas 66045-2327 • (913) 864-3537 • FAX (913) 864-3566

I-12

BACKGROUND

State and federal attention to K - 12 curriculum Standards has held center stage for the past five years and deservedly so. Kansas and many other states (e.g., Oregon, California, Kentucky, Maryland, Connecticut, Minnesota, etc.) concurrent with national initiatives as the National Education Goals Panel, the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, and the Mathematical and Sciences Education Board have provided not only rhetoric, but genuine efforts to construct frameworks, blueprints and curricular specifications that target newly defined and desired learner outcomes. The outlines and plans being developed are intended to strengthen and help assure America's competitive presence in a worldwide marketplace where the requirements of the workplace are being shape by rapidly advancing technological and communication capacity. Business and industry leaders describe tomorrow's workplace as characterized by adaptable employees capable of problem solving in an environment marked by the ability to change. To achieve successfully this competitiveness for all our citizens means that new skills must be understood, realized, and delivered by educators, and then learned by students in America's schools. For many, this is what is embraced and expected by the concept of "World Class" standards.

Kansas has not been late in coming to this realization or planning. Beginning in 1988 the Kansas State Board of Education under the vigilance of the Commissioner of Education directed that curriculum standards in mathematics for Kansas schools be defined and shaped by emerging national trends in the professions and tailored to meet the needs of the private sector. A call for Curriculum Standards for Communications instruction followed shortly thereafter, and over the past eighteen months, curriculum Standards for Science and Social Studies instruction have come under development. Today, Kansas educators have access to these recently developed and descriptive curriculum blueprints that detail expectations for K - 12 instruction, curriculum and student learning.

THE PROCESS OF DEVELOPMENT OF THE KANSAS CURRICULUM STANDARDS

The construction and formulation of the Kansas Curriculum Standards in each of the disciplines has followed the same general process - visionary Kansas educators first draft specifications while being cognizant of and guided by emerging national Standards in their discipline. Following the initial development efforts, working committees then sought input and constructive critiques from vested in-state professionals, from both K -12 and higher education arenas as well as representatives from the Kansas private sector. Using their reactions as a basis for revision of the Standards under development, there followed widespread state distribution to invite further reactions and input. Though perhaps seeing this as the final step, in fact, it is best understood as the final step of the first act, which is to acknowledge that the process of development and specification is intended to be ongoing and always formative.

More than symbolic, the process of development of the Kansas Curriculum Standards has required considerable time and effort of very talented and committed individuals who are themselves committed to high quality educational opportunities for all Kansas students. Preparation of preliminary versions of a discipline's Standards, while initiated among a handful of skillful individuals, are very early on spread across a broader and deeper constituent base. The opportunity for many persons to contribute and react is a hallmark of the Kansas process. The quality of the Standards is a function of the vision and leadership of each discipline's steering committee. The speed and determination with which such Herculean efforts have been undertaken and completed must be credited to the state's Education leaders.

By May, 1993 each Standards area, Communications, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies, had carried out at least one complete development cycle: drafting by a steering committee, revision based on extensive and intensive Advisory committee participation, solicitation of broad field and discipline reactions, input, suggestions and guidance from business and industry, intermediate revisions then distribution to the at-

large Kansas education community for review and suggestion prior to their current formation.

THE "WORLD CLASS" REVIEW ACTIVITY

As a quality assurance step it was decided to carry out an external, independent evaluation of the state's Curriculum Standards for each of the discipline fields. The method agreed to for this evaluation was straight forward: contact national experts and vested private sector groups and ask for their candid assessment of the Standards as currently under development. Through their participation, persons were ask to study carefully and then evaluate the appropriateness of a claim that a discipline's Standards were indeed "World Class." Honoraria were offered participants as it was judged that a period of approximately three working days would be required to complete the requested evaluation review activity. It was discussed and agreed that three independent reviews for each of the four discipline areas, two professionals in the discipline and one person representing the private sector, were to be obtained. Nominees were first contacted by phone and enlisted in the activity. A detailed letter then was sent to those agreeing to participate. Sample copies of the letters of invitation (including instructions) sent to professionals and the private sector participants are included for reference.

The individuals identified and asked to participate in the independent appraisal process were professionals who are serving presently on committees that are developing (or revising) national Standards in disciplines that align with the Kansas Curriculum Standards. In each discipline, a prioritized list of national evaluators was prepared by the State Department of Education. Working from the top of each list, CETE then proceeded to contact nominees and solicit their participation. In Mathematics, Communications, and Social Studies two professionals among the top three persons identified agreed and did participate in the evaluation. In these discipline, persons who declined participation had

schedule conflicts that made participation not possible in within the time frame available.

In the science area, we needed to resolve some issues in obtaining evaluation reviewers for the Kansas Science Curriculum Standards. As the national Science Standards are only now about to come forward, there was expressed a concern by a few national leaders that reaction to the Kansas Standards prior to release of the National Standards might potentially create a conflict of interest for some reviewers whom we might wish to use as evaluators. Though having to inform our prospective evaluators of the issue that had surfaced (that an individual's evaluation of the Kansas Standards could be construed an early release and announcement regarding National expectations), nonetheless we were able to obtain desired and eminently qualified science professionals as independent evaluators for the Kansas Standards.

Obtaining the desired participation from the private sector proved to be considerably more difficult and time consuming than anticipated. The original and agreed to plan was to obtain reviews of the Kansas Standards by CEOs of leading corporations who had been vocal in calling for school reform. Not only was it next to impossible to have an opportunity to discuss the project with such individuals (as they in continuous demand and on the go, and their schedules are not easily accessible), but even when contact was made we were referred to an office in the corporation that is available to provide such study and analysis. When professionals in the discipline were contacted and asked to participate, they were prompt and reliable in meeting the time schedule set for return of reviews; on the other hand, participation by the private sector was characterized by delays and the need for repeated calls requesting that the evaluation be completed and returned. Because of the problems encountered, participation by the private sector is more limited than originally envisioned and planned. Nonetheless each Standards discipline received study and evaluation by at least two private sector reviewers.

EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

In all, twelve persons agreed and committed to participate in the review of the Kansas Curriculum Standards. Responses were received from eleven of the invitees. From our consideration of what these individuals provided in reaction to the Kansas Standards, it can be concluded that these participants have provided a credible, trustworthy and independent review and appraisal. We are confident that their study and written evaluations offer the expertise from which to go forward with development of state Curriculum Standards. Participants who returned evaluation materials are identified below.

- **Charlotte C. Anderson**, Ph.D., Chair, National Social Studies Standards Development Commission, Evanston, Illinois
- **Lynne Cheney**, Ph.D., Distinguished Fellow, American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, Washington, D.C.
- **Melanie Dean**, Ph.D., Editor and Chair, California Model Science Standards for California Schools; Member, Science Frameworks, National Research Council, Sacramento, California
- **James Doyle**, Director, Worldwide Business Education, Cargill Mills, Minneapolis, Minnesota
- **Janet Emig**, Ph.D., Chair, The Standards Project for English Language Arts, English Standards Board, Sanibel, Florida
- **Dan R. Paxton** , Senior Vice President, Human Resources, Pizza Hut, Inc., Wichita, Kansas
- **Alan C. Purves**, Ph.D., Professor, Teacher and Distinguished Scholar and Researcher of English, Editor, Encyclopedia of English Studies and Language Arts, New York
- **Thomas A. Romberg**, Ph.D., Member and past Director, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics Curriculum Standards Project, Madison, Wisconsin

- **Donald Schneider**, Ph.D., Member, National Council for Social Studies Task Force on National Curriculum Standards for Social Studies, Athens, Georgia

- **Catherine Seeley**, Ph.D., Member, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics Curriculum Standards Project, Austin, Texas

- **Robert Yager**, Ph.D., Member, National Committee on Science Education Standards and Assessment, Iowa City, Iowa

STUDY FINDINGS

Each reviewer was asked to consider and respond to a series of questions that were intended to guide her/his evaluation of the Kansas Curriculum Standards. Those questions are provided below. The written evaluations from each participant are included with this report. In addition, reviewers were asked, and indeed encouraged, to show recommended suggestions for revisions, modifications and changes directly in the Standards document(s) itself. As returned, these "worked over" documents are also enclosed. As most reviewers did provide written editorial suggestions within their copy of a document, making available copies to the appropriate Curriculum Standards development committees for their discussion and attention in subsequent drafts would seem most desirable and beneficial to the work of the state Advisory committees. The guiding evaluation questions and issues that the private sector and the discipline professionals were to consider in their evaluation follow.

Evaluation questions asked of business and industry reviewers:

I. Overall Evaluation: Completeness and Appropriateness

Based on your review, to what extent has the State captured the spirit, direction and focus of current thinking for Standards that can be said to be "World Class"? Do the Kansas documents fit such a claim and do so in an acceptable manner? Are the skills identified those you believe essential for students to master given what you believe will be the demands of tomorrow's work place?

2. Thoroughness and Depth

Are there critical omissions within a content area in terms of emphasis, concepts, ideas, operations, content or level of complexity that must be added to make the Kansas Standards "World Class?" As necessary, identify.

Evaluation questions asked of the discipline specific reviewers:

1. Overall Evaluation: Completeness and Appropriateness

Based on your overall review, to what extent has the State captured the spirit, direction and focus of current thinking for Standards that can be said to be "World Class"? Does the Kansas document fit such a claim and do so in an acceptable manner? Are the skills identified those you believe essential for students to master given what you believe will be the demands of tomorrow's work place? Is the document understandable, professional and presentable?

2. Thoroughness and Depth

Are there critical omissions in terms of emphasis, concepts, ideas, operations, content or level of complexity that must be added to make the Kansas Standards "World Class?" As necessary, identify.

3. Structure, Detail and Accuracy

Are there edits, revisions or modifications in the specific outcome statements that should be made to give certain direction for instruction and understanding of the intended focus of the outcome? As you read a statement if something comes to mind that would help to communicate intent, or focus the statement more toward an important "World Class" outcome, record your suggestions and edits on the document itself.

4. Clarity, Usefulness and Taxonomic/Behavioral Specificity

Are the standards (as defined by the goal and outcome statements) written at a level of specificity, allowing for sufficient communication of intent, but not altogether inhibiting the breadth and integration desired for instruction and assessment? Is there sufficient fidelity and direction to ensure the requirements of tomorrow's necessary skills (whether in the work place or in subsequent schooling) are being taught? Record your suggestions and edits in the document itself as you go through it and as you judge needed, comment on the usefulness of the Kansas standards.

The general tenor of the vast majority of the reviewers comments is very positive and certainly supportive of the Kansas development effort and the resultant Standards. For the most part, reviewers' reactions and evaluation indicate that a solid, credible foundation for development is in place. Whether the Standards are "World Class" appears to be affirmed, but suggestions for change are offered. Some reviewers had a difficult time responding directly to this specific inquiry since, in their opinion, what is meant by "World Class" is not itself well defined or understood.

One reviewer was critical of much of the entire effort. In a brief letter this evaluator decried process-based Standards, which is an accurate characterization of the focus of much of the state's curriculum Standards, as failing to attend to the content of a discipline. This reviewer then goes on to associate a process approach to defining Standards as a reform initiative that endorses outcomes based education which, as an approach, does not at all curry favor with the reviewer. Regardless of instructional philosophy and given this reviewer's evaluation, consideration of the need to provide greater subject matter content specificity, which is commented on by other reviewers as a necessary means to strengthen Standards' utility for classroom teachers, would seem to be in order by the Advisory committees.

Deficiency were noted in reviewer comments to suggest that areas of a discipline had been overlooked or not sufficiently detailed in the range of outcomes provided. Such criticism was observed typically with reference to those Standards that have been under development only over the past year and a half. Attending to these specific criticisms and the particular suggestions and observations in each reviewer's evaluation needs to be given attention and consideration by specialists in the discipline area who are charged with development of the Kansas Standards.

From our interpretation of the lengthy and detailed independent evaluation reports received, the following findings, conclusions and recommendations appeared with consistency across many reviewers.

- in each subject field the Standards must give deliberate attention to outcomes that recognize and deal with the cultural diversity of the student populations being served;

- to aid teachers' utilization of the Standards, the Standards must provide for greater subject matter specificity, attentiveness to relevance of content, and translation of concepts to instructional practice;

- in the Standards areas recently under development (Communications, Social Studies, and Science), reviewers identified specific gaps and omissions in the range of outcomes detailed and were able to provide suggestions that extend the breadth and depth of the curriculum outcomes;

- as a stylistic matter, utilize a consistent organizational structure and provide an informative orientation early on in the Standards document to facilitate reader understanding, interpretation and implementation;

- insure the presence of curriculum outcomes that address and are reflective of discipline connections across the Standards areas; and,

- disposition, that is attitude, of learners toward a discipline needs to be included as an outcome of the curriculum Standards in all areas.

Our interpretation from the reviewers evaluation and specific comments is that very useful informative and guidance has been obtained through this process. It is particularly encouraging that private sector evaluations were for the most part very positive in providing strong endorsement for the Kansas Standards. The beneficiaries of these independent reviews will certainly be the Standards development committees in the discipline fields. It is especially noteworthy that the Mathematics Standards, the area that has been under development three times as long as the other disciplines, received stronger marks and appears to be more in-line with the direction called for and suggested by reviewers in the other disciplines. From the reviews, our conclusion is that the Kansas Standards embody curriculum focus in the desired direction and that some of the areas (e.g., Mathematics) are further along in their progression toward Standards viewed as "World Class." The other curriculum areas, Communications,

Science, and Social Studies, must now be certain to allow time and engage in activities to continue to develop their Standards based on experience, input from the field, and emerging disciplines trends.

Through our coordination of this project, a perspective that we have been able to acquire is to recognize that curriculum outcomes and goals should be encouraged to come forward from a synthesis across the individual discipline Standards. That is, Curriculum Integration Standards, a recent procedural activity of the Kansas State Board, could well become the overarching and orchestrating force toward producing unified Standards that help to guide instruction and learning in Kansas.

Thank you for the opportunity to work with you on this facet of the Kansas Curriculum Development programs. If we can provide any additional information or clarification, please do not hesitate to contact us.

APPENDIX B

Definition of Reading Standards of Excellence:

Expository

Students who meet the standard of excellence in reading challenging expository texts will demonstrate expertise by:

1. Constructing and justifying meaning that recognizes the interaction among the reader, ideas and structures of the text.

2. Adjusting reading strategies appropriately to meet the purpose of the reader or the task.

3. Communicating a comprehensive understanding of informational text.

Narrative

Students who meet the standard of excellence in reading challenging narrative texts will demonstrate expertise by:

1. Constructing and justifying meaning that recognizes the interaction among reader, themes and story structure of the text.

2. Adjusting strategies appropriately to meet the purpose of reader or the task.

3. Communicating a comprehensive understanding of narrative text.

Writing Standards of Excellence:

Ideas:

Students who meet the standard of excellence for ideas in writing will demonstrate expertise by:

1. conveying ideas in a clear, focused, and interesting manner that holds the reader's attention.

2. supporting ideas with relevant examples, anecdotes, and details that enrich the central theme.

3. using experience and insights to shape ideas.

Organization:

Students who meet the standard of excellence for organization in writing will demonstrate expertise by:

1. moving the reader through the text in a way that is compelling and enhances the central idea.

2. sequencing details in a logical, effective way.

3. developing an introduction that draws the reader in and a conclusion that satisfies the need for resolution.

Voice:

Students who meet the standard of excellence for voice in writing will demonstrate expertise by:

1. speaking to the reader in a way that is unique and sincere.

2. using natural, provocative language that brings the topic to life.

3. communicating with a ring of conviction, appropriate to purpose and audience.

Word Choice:

Students who meet the standard of excellence for word choice in writing will demonstrate expertise by:

1. selecting words that convey the intended message in an interesting, precise, and natural way.

2. incorporating powerful verbs, strong imagery, and striking words or phrases.

3. using language that is fresh, appealing, and not overdone.

Sentence Fluency:

Students who meet the standard of excellence for sentence fluency in writing will demonstrate expertise by:

1. varying sentence structure and length to make oral reading fluid and musical.

2. using sentence structure and transitions to enhance meaning and to relate ideas.

3. choosing sentence beginnings that guide the reader readily from one sentence to another.

Conventions:

Students who meet the standard of excellence for conventions in writing will demonstrate expertise by:

1. using correct punctuation, capitalization, spelling and grammar to guide the reader through the text.

2. paragraphing to enhance structure and meaning.

3. manipulating conventions for stylistic effect.

Mathematics Standard of Excellence
(Nonroutine)

- Student performance demonstrates the ability to use rigorous mathematics in solving complex, real world problems. Comprehensive application with and integration of mathematical knowledge, concepts, and procedures to new and diverse problem situations is evident.

- Capability to identify problem situations, apply strategies, verify and interpret results, and generalize solutions is at a high level. A definite sense of expertise is reflected in the applications of previously acquired knowledge, concepts, and processes to situations where solutions are not apparent or routine.

Reasoning

- Student performance demonstrates the ability to use mathematical reasoning and logic. Comprehensive application with and integration of inductive and deductive reasoning is evident.

- Capability to recognize patterns, form conjectures, develop and/or verify arguments is at a high level. A high level of integrated reasoning skills is used to make selective judgment in the problem solving process. A definite sense of expertise is reflected in the ability to select and apply geometric, proportional, spatial, and other reasoning skills in diverse, complex situations.

Communicating Mathematics

- Student performance demonstrates the ability to communicate mathematics. Comprehensive application with and integration of appropriate mathematical vocabulary, notation, and structure in order to understand, interpret and evaluate mathematical ideas is evident.

- Capability to use mathematical language to communicate ideas and relate visual representations, written expressions and mathematical symbols is at a high level. A definite sense of expertise is reflected in the ability to interpret and/or communicate the basis of conclusions in the problem solving process.

Mathematics Performance Total Score

- Student performance demonstrates the ability to respond to various types of open-ended mathematical problems. Comprehensive integrated application and communication of mathematical concepts, procedures, and processes is evident.

- Capability to understand the problems, select and implement appropriate problem solving strategies, and report conclusions is at a high level. A definite sense of expertise is reflected in the ability to recognize, execute, and communicate appropriate procedures in response to all parts of complex and diverse problem situations.

Mathematical Power Score
(nonroutine problem solving, communication, and reasoning objective scores plus the open-ended total)

- Student performance demonstrates capability with rigorous mathematics. Comprehensive application with and integration of mathematical knowledge, concepts, and processes to new unfamiliar and highly complex real-world situations is evident.

- Capability to use mathematical reasoning and logic, solve complex problems, and communicate mathematically is at a high level. A definite sense of expertise is reflected in the ability to use information, to reason and think creatively and to formulate, solve, and reflect critically on problem situations. A broad scope as well as depth of mathematical understanding is observed.

OVERVIEW OF THE KANSAS ASSESSMENT PROGRAMS

JOHN POGGIO
CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL TESTING AND EVALUATION
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

STUDENTS BEING TESTED

All Kansas students at the designated grades including special education and Limited English Proficient students are tested. SPED and LEP students are only excluded from testing when the child's IEP specifically calls for the student not to be tested. Districts choose to test their students with learning difficulties at their instructional level or chronological placement. The scores of these students are not included in district or building performance summaries. Students in both public and private schools (accredited and non accredited) are tested. Examinations are administered on a variable calendar: reading and mathematics from early-March through late April; science in the early fall; and, social studies and writing from January through mid April. Results are returned to school administrators at the next start of the school year, except for science results which are returned after the first of the calendar year. In each discipline the knowledge, skills and abilities tested are those defined by the applicable subject matter Kansas Curriculum Standards.

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES FOR ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

Each year in which a content area is to be assessed, largely new testing devices are constructed for use. Typically a block of questions on each examination is carried forward in order to be able to evaluate performance trends over time. The approach to development relies almost entirely on Kansas educators and resources. The model of test construction is a content validation development approach (judgmental) that over time is then supported by empirical validation for alteration and change. A series of steps are followed leading to the creation of an assessment. These steps are ordinarily as follows.

- the appropriate state advising committee defines the general structure and format for the assessment (CETE and KSBE participate, review recommendations and finalize)
- 4 to 8 experienced, highly regarded Kansas teachers at the grade for the content area are selected based on nominations received from local districts; persons selected are trained on test development and to begin creation of the assessment questions using the applicable Curriculum Standards as the sole guide. Teachers work independently crafting their first draft items. (CETE and KSBE receive work products, review and finalize for next stage)
- the work products of the first stage developers are next reviewed, revised, modified and contributed to by a second round of developers comprised of 5 to 6 Kansas curriculum specialists, administrators, and higher education subject matter specialists (CETE and KSBE receive work products, review and finalize)

- the appropriate state advising committee reviews, reacts, revises, and directs changes for the emerging test questions
- the appropriate advising committee begins review and alteration of the existing performance assessment scoring criteria for the content area, as well as needed revisions for the administration manuals and scoring guides. (CETE and KSBE participate, review and finalize)
- test items surviving advisory committee review and recommendation for inclusion on the assessment are subjected to a limited field (that is, school) tryout (CETE and KSBE coordinate and finalize)
- items to appear on an assessment are reviewed for bias, insensitivity and offensiveness (CETE and KSBE coordinate and finalize)
- test booklets, administration manuals and scoring guides are finalized, printed and distributed to districts

The sections that follow detail select features and characteristic of each content area assessment.

MATHEMATICS *(ADMINISTERED ANNUALLY AT GRADES 4, 7, AND 10)*

-Format — as in recent years past: timed, multiple choice, multiple mark and performance appraisal (that is, open ended performance questions)

-Forms — one (1) test form administered in all Kansas USDs; two 60 minute sessions are needed to complete the assessment. A block of test questions are carried forward over years to allow monitoring of trend.

-Scoring — answer sheets are provided to allow machine processing of the objective test questions, whereas local teachers score all performance assessment papers. A sample of these papers (10%) are returned for state scoring, analysis, verification and audit. Scoring rubrics (i.e., criteria) are used to evaluate the skills of the performance assessment and focus on problem solving, reasoning and communications outcomes.

-Reporting — scores on problem solving, reasoning, and communication skills are provided combining the objective items with the performance assessment portions; a mathematics total, or power score, is also to be reported. The estimation section and the attitudinal measurement from prior years have been discontinued; these sections are made available as a local option to districts if desired.

Assessment results (percent correct and percentile rank) on mathematics reasoning, problem solving and communications are reported for each student, and then summarized by grade in each building and for the district as a whole. Further, summaries at the building and district level report performance by factors as gender, race, Title I status, socio-economic level, student mobility, and "at-risk" classification. Growth over time indices are reported. Building and district performance with reference to the state's Standard of Excellence and Continuous Improvement Scale are reported.

READING *(ADMINISTERED ANNUALLY AT GRADES 3, 7, AND 10)*

-Format — reading comprehension is assessed using multiple-choice multiple-correct test items and open ended performance assessment questions. Comprehension is assessed using lengthy, authentic text material. The selections used are nominated by Kansas librarians, then reviewed by classroom educators as to their appropriateness and then selected by the state's reading advisory committee. Reading attitude measurement has been discontinued, but is available to districts as a local option.

-Forms — one (1) test form is used with all students at each grade employing two (2) text-types (narrative and expository). Two class periods are required for the reading assessment. One selection is carried forward between years for the purpose of monitoring performance trends.

-Scoring — machine scoring of objective test items. Open-ended (essay type questions) items are scored locally by the students' instructors. A 10% sample are returned to the state for verification and audit.

-Reporting — student percent correct and percentile ranks by text type in relation to students in the state, and comparative buildings and districts summaries. Building and district performance are referenced to the state's Excellence Standard and Continuous Improvement Scale. As with mathematics, analyses and reports summarizing performance by different factors (mobility, gender, etc.) are provided for buildings and the district.

WRITING *(TO BE ADMINISTERED IN EVEN NUMBERED FISCAL YEARS)*

-Grades — 5, 8 and 10 or at adjacent grade levels when requested by the district and approved by KSBE.

-Format — designed to support, encourage local practice and provide staff development opportunities for writing instruction. Duration of the writing assessment is defined locally, but at least two sessions for writing are required. The state assessment typically encompasses one week of assessment effort (planning, drafting, revision, editing, final copy preparation).

-Forms — multiple prompts (that is, situations) provided by the state to which each student chooses the topic over which s/he decides to write.

-Scoring — a student's paper is scored to evaluate: ideas and content, organization, voice, sentence fluency, word choice, and conventions (spelling, grammar, punctuation, etc.). One local teacher and one state trained evaluator score the paper when the state program is followed; two locally trained readers are used when the local program is followed (in this case, a sample of papers (10%) are returned for state scoring and evaluation).

-Reporting — scores on each of the six traits are reported for students along with building and district averages. Information is reported to permit comparison based on local scoring procedures and state scoring of the assessment. Performance reports are returned that examine performance by factors mentioned previously. The Excellence benchmarks and Continuous Improvement Scale values will be applied to building and district performance results.

SCIENCE *(TO BE ADMINISTERED DURING ODD NUMBERED FISCAL YEARS)*

-Grades - grades 2, 5, 8, and 11 have been proposed for testing; 1994-95 provided for testing at grades 5, 8 and 11 only. On an experimental basis, science testing has been shifted to the fall for this current school year.

-Content focus on evaluating students' process skills (e.g., observation, recording, analysis, interpretation, conclusions and inferences, etc.) within content knowledge areas (earth, physical and life science).

-Format in addition to an objective format questioning section of each examination (one class period), each grade assessment includes a separate performance assessment. Small group cooperative problem-solving tasks are drive the assessments at grade 5 (3 to 4 class periods), at grade 8 individual student projects are required (3 to 4 class periods), and at grade 11 a restricted response testing approach (comparable to math open-ended testing) is employed.

-Scoring Scoring of performance items is done by local instructors with a sample of papers returned to the state for analysis and verification. Objective test questions are answered on response forms and then are machine scored.

-Reporting comparative reporting of student, building and district performance using percent correct and percentile rank scores. Results are reported at the building and district level breaking down performance by factors as gender, race, Chapter I status, socio-economic level, and "at-risk" classification. Growth/change indicators will be reported.

SOCIAL STUDIES *(TO BE ADMINISTERED DURING ODD NUMBERED FISCAL YEARS)*

-based on knowledge and information relating directly to American history, civic responsibility, economics and geography in the four thematic areas of: leadership, conflict resolution, social and cultural diversity, public health and the environment.

-skills evaluated include critical analysis and evaluation/thinking skills along with utilization and understanding of methods for social studies inquiry

-grades 5, 8, 12 will be tested for the first time beginning February

-an objective assessment and an extended instructional performance activity comprise the social studies tasks. Students sit for a standardized objective test segment (60 minutes). Two forms of the objective test are being developed for use this year. The instructional performance activity is initiated by local instructors who select then plan and provide instruction around one thematic area identified by the state. Following local instruction, students first work on an individual project and then in groups (optional) on a common project set out by the state. This year considerable local teacher direction and control of the instructional and performance activities are allowed and indeed encouraged. Individual student and group projects are evaluated by local instructors using criteria detailed by the state. Up to 6 to 7 sessions are needed to complete all phases of this assessment.

Criteria, Expectations and Descriptions for the Standard of Excellence and the Continuous Improvement Scale associated with the Kansas Assessments

Beginning this year a Standard of Excellence and Continuous Improvement Scale are to be used to interpret school and district performance on the Kansas Reading, Writing and Mathematics Assessments. The Excellence Standard and Improvement Scale, as currently defined, are presented on the following pages. Bear in mind the following:

- the identifiers and descriptions are only now beginning to take shape. Over time they will evolve. Kansas educators will continue to have opportunities to contribute;

- the standard and scale are to be used at all grades tested; if feasible, they will be used to serve all content areas for which there is state assessment (also science, social studies, speaking and listening);

- the Excellence Standard and Improvement Scale are intended for use when interpreting the performance of a group of students at a grade in a building or for a district. Given the relatively short length of tests in the skill areas assessed, it is not recommended or advisable to classify individual students based on their performance. And;

- the Standard of Excellence and the Continuous Improvement Scale are designed to be used in tandem. The Excellence standard establishes a "world class" benchmark of performance for a group of students for the particular skill assessed. Then, the Improvement scale is used to identify a building's or a district's progress toward the Excellence Standard.

Following are the Kansas specifications for the Standard of Excellence and the Continuous Improvement Scale. Immediately following are the general definitions and criteria to be applied regardless of the content area being considered. Following the general statement of expectations are enhancements and elaboration of the Standard of Excellence for mathematics, reading and writing.

Standard of Excellence and the Continuous Improvement Scale for Kansas Assessment Results in Reading, Writing and Mathematics

STANDARD OF EXCELLENCE

General Statement:

Student performance demonstrates capability with rigorous subject matter. Comprehensive application and integration of knowledge, concepts and processes to new, unfamiliar or highly complex real world situations is evident and meets achievement expectations at world class standard levels.

Capability with information and skills in the content area is at a high level. Breadth as well as depth of understandings are evidenced. The ability to go beyond routine application of appropriate information to achieve solutions is in evidence; proficiency to deal with difficult, rigorous and formidable material is observed.

* * * *

CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT SCALE

Identifier	*Description*
—	the school's performance in the assessment area shows a decline from prior performance levels
M	no change from prior performance levels is observed. Delineated as:
	$\mathbf{M^a}$ maintenance of performance at or above the Standard of Excellence;
	$\mathbf{M_b}$ maintenance of performance below the Standard of Excellence
+	gains and advance toward the Standard of Excellence are evidenced
++	strong gains are noted to indicate commendable progress toward the Standard of Excellence

Mathematics Standard of Excellence

Specific statement for Problem Solving:
Student performance demonstrates the ability to use rigorous mathematics in solving complex, real world problems. Comprehensive application with and integration of mathematical knowledge, concepts and procedures to new and diverse problem situations is evident. Capability to identify problem situations, apply strategies, verify and interpret results and generalize solutions is at a high level. A definite sense of expertise is reflected in the applications of previously acquired knowledge, concepts and processes to situations where solutions are not apparent or routine.

Specific statement for Reasoning:
Student performance demonstrates the ability to use mathematical reasoning and logic. Comprehensive application with and integration of inductive and deductive reasoning is evident. Capability to recognize patterns, form conjectures, develop or verify arguments is at a high level. A high level of integrated reasoning skills is used to make selective judgment in the problem solving process. A definite sense of expertise is reflected in the ability to select and apply geometric, proportional, spatial and other reasoning skills in diverse, complex situations.

Specific statement for Communications:
Student performance demonstrates the ability to communicate mathematics. Comprehensive application with and integration of appropriate mathematical vocabulary, notation and structure to understand, interpret and evaluate mathematical ideas is evident. Capability to use mathematical language to communicate ideas and relate visual representations, written expressions and mathematical symbols is at a high level. A definite sense of expertise is reflected in the ability to interpret and/or communicate the basis of conclusions in the problem solving process.

Specific statement for Performance Assessment:
Student performance demonstrates the ability to respond to various types of open-ended mathematical problems. Comprehensive integrated application and communication of mathematical concepts, procedures and processes is evident. Capability to understand the problems, select the implement appropriate problem solving strategies and report conclusions is at a high level. A definite sense of expertise is reflected in the ability to recognize, execute and communicate appropriate procedures in response to all parts of complex and diverse problem situations.

Specific statement for Mathematics Total Test Power Score: (includes problem solving, reasoning and communications as well as the performance component)
Student performance demonstrates capability with rigorous mathematics. Comprehensive application with and integration of mathematical knowledge, concepts and processes to new unfamiliar and highly complex real-world situations is evident. Capability to use mathematical reasoning and logic, solve complex problems and communicate mathematically is at a high level. A definite sense of expertise is reflected in the ability to use information, to reason and think creatively and to formulate, solve and reflect critically on problem situations. A broad scope as well as depth of mathematical understanding is observed.

Writing Standard of Excellence

Specific statement for Writing skills:

Students who meet the Standard of Excellence in writing will demonstrate expertise by:

(for Ideas/Content)

1. conveying ideas in a clear, focused and interesting manner that holds the reader's attention;
2. supporting ideas with relevant examples, anecdotes and details that enrich the central theme; and,
3. using experience and insights to shape ideas.

(for Organization)

1. moving the reader through the text in a way that is compelling and enhances the central idea;
2. sequencing details in a logical, effective way; and,
3. developing an introduction that draws the reader in and a conclusion that satisfies the need for resolution.

(for Voice)

1. speaking to the reader in a way that is unique and sincere;
2. using natural, provocative language that brings the topic to life; and,
3. communicating with a ring of conviction, appropriate to purpose and audience.

(for Word Choice)

1. selecting words that convey the intended message in an interesting, precise and natural way;
2. incorporating powerful verbs, strong imagery and striking words or phrases; and,
3. using language that is fresh, appealing and not overdone.

(for Sentence Fluency)

1. varying sentence structure and length to make oral reading fluid and musical;
2. using sentence structure and transitions to enhance meaning and to relate ideas; and,
3. using sentence beginnings that guide the reader readily from one sentence to another.

(for Conventions)

1. using correct punctuation, capitalization, spelling and grammar to guide the reader through the text;
2. paragraphing to enhance structure and meaning; and,
3. manipulating conventions for stylistic effect.

Reading Standard of Excellence

Specific statement for Narrative material:

Students who meet the standard of excellence in reading by challenging narrative texts will demonstrate expertise by:

1. constructing and justifying meaning that recognizes the interaction among reader, themes and story structure of the text;
2. adjusting strategies appropriately to meet the purpose of reader or the task; and,
3. communicating a comprehensive understanding of narrative text.

Specific statement for Expository material:

Students who meet the Standard of Excellence when reading challenging expository texts will demonstrate expertise by:

1. constructing and justifying meaning that recognizes the interaction among the reader, ideas and structures of the text;
2. adjusting reading strategies appropriately to meet the purpose of the reader or the task; and,
3. communicating a comprehensive understanding of informational text.

Performance Standards for the Kansas Assessments

The system that has been created (relying exclusively on the state assessments) identifies a world class benchmark (referred to as the "Standard of Excellence") for each skill assessed. The performance of students in a building is then to be evaluated as having met or not met the appropriate performance Standard. Then, annually a school's progress is to be monitor by its rate of growth using the "Continuous Improvement Standards." For example, at grade 4 in mathematics the building Standard of Excellence for Problem Solving is 75%. If a building's average score was 60%, then the building will be classified as not having met the Excellence Standard. If a year later the average percent correct was 66%, the building is still identified as below the Excellence Standard but would be also be characterized as having demonstrated positive (+) growth.

Grade 4 Mathematics

		Continuous Improvement Values		
Skill Area:	*Standard of Excellence*	N (-)	P (+)	PP (++)
Problem Solving	75%	-4%	4%	8%
Reasoning	75%	-4%	4%	8%
Communications	75%	-4%	4%	8%
Total Power Score	75%	-4%	4%	8%

Grade 7 Mathematics

		Continuous Improvement Values		
Skill Area:	*Standard of Excellence*	N (-)	P (+)	PP (++)
Problem Solving	80%	-4%	4%	8%
Reasoning	80%	-4%	4%	8%
Communications	80%	-4%	4%	8%
Total Power Score	80%	-4%	4%	8%

Grade 10 Mathematics

		Continuous Improvement Values		
Skill Area:	*Standard of Excellence*	N (-)	P (+)	PP (++)
Problem Solving	80%	-4%	4%	8%
Reasoning	80%	-4%	4%	8%
Communications	80%	-4%	4%	8%
Total Power Score	80%	-4%	4%	8%

adopted by the Kansas State Board of Education
December 13, 1994

Performance Standards for the Kansas Assessments

Grade 5 Writing

Trait:	Standard of Excellence	Continuous Improvement Values N (-)	P (+)	PP (++)
Ideas & Content	3.6	-5%	5%	10%
Organization	3.6	-5%	5%	10%
Voice	3.6	-5%	5%	10%
Word Choice	3.6	-5%	5%	10%
Sentence Fluency	3.6	-5%	5%	10%
Conventions	3.6	-5%	5%	10%

Grade 8 Writing

Trait:	Standard of Excellence	Continuous Improvement Values N (-)	P (+)	PP (++)
Ideas & Content	3.7	-5%	5%	10%
Organization	3.7	-5%	5%	10%
Voice	3.7	-5%	5%	10%
Word Choice	3.7	-5%	5%	10%
Sentence Fluency	3.7	-5%	5%	10%
Conventions	3.7	-5%	5%	10%

Grade 10 Writing

Trait:	Standard of Excellence	Continuous Improvement Values N (-)	P (+)	PP (++)
Ideas & Content	3.7	-5%	5%	10%
Organization	3.7	-5%	5%	10%
Voice	3.7	-5%	5%	10%
Word Choice	3.7	-5%	5%	10%
Sentence Fluency	3.7	-5%	5%	10%
Conventions	3.7	-5%	5%	10%

adopted by the Kansas State Board of Education
December 13, 1994

Performance Standards for the Kansas Assessments

Grade 3 Reading

Text Type:		*Standard of Excellence*	*Continuous Improvement Values* N (-)	P (+)	PP (++)
	Narrative	80%	-5%	4%	9%
	Expository	77%	-5%	4%	9%

Grade 7 Reading

Text Type:		*Standard of Excellence*	*Continuous Improvement Values* N (-)	P (+)	PP (++)
	Narrative	84%	-5%	4%	9%
	Expository	81%	-5%	4%	9%

Grade 10 Reading

Text Type:		*Standard of Excellence*	*Continuous Improvement Values* N (-)	P (+)	PP (++)
	Narrative	84%	-5%	4%	9%
	Expository	81%	-5%	4%	9%

adopted by the Kansas State Board of Education
December 13, 1994

Standard of Excellence
Building Classifications Based on
1994 Assessment Results

Grade	Content Area	With a Standard of Excellence of:	% of Buildings Meeting Standard in 1994	# of Buildings Meeting Standard in 1994
4	Mathematics	75%	.5%	4 of 873
7	Mathematics	80%	1%	5 of 465
10	Mathematics	80%	0%	0 of 358
5	Writing	3.6 (65%)	6%	26 of 444
8	Writing	3.7 (68%)	14%	39 of 277
10	Writing	3.7 (68%)	11%	19 of 168
3	Reading/Narrative	80%	2%	17 of 883
7	Reading/Narrative	84%	4%	17 of 474
10	Reading/Narrative	84%	1%	4 of 365
3	Reading/Expository	77%	.1%	1 of 883
7	Reading/Expository	81%	.2%	1 of 474
10	Reading/Expository	81%	.3%	2 of 365

1994-1995 Costs

State provided funds:

Total CETE Budget	$830,000

Content Area	*Amount*
Mathematics	25%
Reading	20%
Science	18%
Social Studies	37%

Items	*Amount*
Personnel	40%
Operating Costs	60%

Given the number of tests (24) created and the number of students tested (38,500) per level, the cost for all services (development, printing, scoring, reporting, computer disks, test evaluation and related assessment support, e.g., standard setting, staff consultation, etc.) is approroximately 90 cents per student.

District costs:	*Administration (per grade)*	*Scoring (class of 25)*
Content (grades)		
Mathematics (4, 7, 10)	2 class periods	6 hours
Reading (3, 7, 10)	2 class periods	4 hours
Science* (5, 8, 11)	5 class periods	6 hours
Social Studies (5, 8, 11)	7 class periods	8 hours

*Science projects at grades 5 and 8 necessitate materials be purchased. These costs likely average $10 to $15 a class.