

Approved: 1/18/96  
Date

MINUTES OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Bill Mason at 3:30 p.m. on January 10, 1996 in Room 519-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except: Barbara Ballard (Excused)  
John Ballou (Excused)  
Gary Hayzlett (Excused)

Committee staff present: Ben Barrett, Legislative Research Department  
Avis Swartzman, Revisor of Statutes  
Dale Dennis, Department of Education  
Beverly Renner, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee: Dr. Sharon Freden, Assistant Commissioner, Learning Services Division, State Department of Education  
Dr. John Poggio, Co-Director - Center for Educational Testing and Evaluation - School of Education, University of Kansas

Others attending: See attached list

Dr. Sharon Freden presented an overview of the state curriculum standards, which are the foundation for the state assessments (Attachment 1). During the 1992 legislative session, the School District Finance and Quality Performance Act was enacted and amended in 1995 to add development of standards for social studies and science to what the state had already done for mathematics and communication (reading and writing). Advisory committees made up of school district people, both teachers and administrators, as well as representatives from higher education and business and industry worked with State staff to develop these standards. Revisions were made after soliciting comments and suggestions for improvement from Kansas educators and an outside review was contracted with the University of Kansas Center for Educational Testing and Evaluation to see if the four sets of standards were of sufficient rigor to be called "world class". These standards are only one measure of accountability for the local school and the only state-wide data that we have to look at school improvement and student performance.

Dr. John Poggio followed with information regarding the Kansas Assessment Programs (Attachment 2). He distributed copies of middle-level exams to members of the committee to study and note changes from current standards and those of turn of the century expectations and the packets were returned at the end of the meeting. State assessments attempt to reflect the state curriculum standards and place a premium on problem-solving, reasoning, critical-thinking and decision-making.

The chairman opened the meeting to questions from committee members.

Representative Horst moved and Representative Morrison seconded a motion to prepare certificates for those Teachers named outstanding Kansas teachers for the current year and investigate the possibility of presenting a resolution to the Master Teacher from the floor of the House of Representatives. Motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

The next meeting is scheduled for January 11, 1996.



# *Kansas State Board of Education*

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

---

January 10, 1996

TO: House Education Committee

FROM: Dale M. Dennis  
Interim Commissioner of Education

SUBJECT: Information About Kansas State Assessments

Kansas curriculum standards and assessments have been recognized nationally, so staff of the Kansas State Board of Education are especially pleased to provide the House Committee on Education with information about them.

Attached for the information of the committee is an overview of the development of the state curriculum standards, which are the foundation for the 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 development, administration, scoring, and reporting of the state assessments, has prepared materials and will distribute them separately.

Our staff will discuss the enclosed materials with the committee.

Sharon E. Freden  
Assistant Commissioner  
Learning Services Division  
(913) 296-2303

House Education  
1/10/96  
Attachment 1

## **Introduction**

The Kansas state assessments are based on state curriculum standards, and one of their intended uses is the measurement of school and student accomplishment of the standards. Because they are so closely linked, our discussion will include information about both state curriculum standards and state assessments.

## **Background**

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 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.

In March, 1991, the State Board adopted Kansas Quality Performance Accreditation. Included in the indicators for measuring achievement of three of the Quality Performance Accreditation outcomes were specific references to state assessments in communications and mathematics. The first mathematics assessment was also administered in the spring of 1991.

During the 1992 legislative session, the School District Finance and Quality Performance Act was enacted. That legislation included a directive to the State Board of Education to develop curriculum standards and state assessments in a minimum of three grades in the subject areas of mathematics; science; communications, including reading, writing, speaking and listening; and social studies, including American history and geography.

1995 amendments to the School District Finance and Quality Performance Act directed the State Board of Education to establish curriculum standards for mathematics, science, reading, writing, and social studies, stating that the standards must be equal to the best standards. Amendments also directed the Board to provide for assessments in the core academic areas of mathematics, science, reading, writing, and social studies, with the assessments to be administered at three grade levels, as determined by the State Board.

## **Development of Curriculum Standards**

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 had already been made once. While the State Board had 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, along with requests for suggestions for improvement of the standards. 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, the committees prepared a further revision of the standards 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." Such a review against such a standard was required by the 1992 legislation.

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 refinement 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 review by the summer of 1996.

The communication standards have been enhanced significantly with the assistance of funding from a federal grant. They are currently being distributed to schools for comment and suggestions after having been revised by an advisory committee of Kansas educators and reviewed by the State Board.

At the request of the State Board of Education, both the science and social studies standards were revised during the last year to make more clear what the specific subject area content expectations are.

It should be noted that the current state curriculum standards have never been curriculum guides, though their content forms the basis for the state assessments. 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.

### **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 are the basis for 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. 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 preceding statement 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. Many districts continue to use national, norm-referenced assessments as a measure of student progress, along with a variety of other measures, such as teacher-made tests, district and building criterion-referenced tests, and teacher judgment.

## **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, administration, and scoring of the state assessments with the Committee.



## INFORMATION REGARDING THE KANSAS ASSESSMENT PROGRAMS: 1995 - 1996

John Poggio  
Center for Educational Testing and Evaluation  
School of Education  
University of Kansas

The Kansas assessments were envisioned and created to highlight and underscore the direction for needed curriculum and instruction changes in Kansas education. The assessments grow out of the premise that what is tested is what is taught in schools. There has not been any shrinking away from this intention by the State Board of Education. The assessments set out academic challenges and high standards for Kansas students and educators. The assessments present challenging tasks whose performance standards are expected to increase as successive performance hurdles are cleared; further, they use unfamiliar testing methods and approaches as well as focus on content that is only now finding its way into textbooks. At this time the state assessments are constructed to provide input toward understanding a student's overall achievement level with reference to the Kansas subject area Curriculum Standards and to inform officials as to the performance of schools toward achieving these Standards. Any other use, action or inference based on performance on the Kansas assessments is not supported.

### **WHO IS TESTED, WHEN, AND OVER WHAT?**

All Kansas students at the designated grades including special education and Limited English Proficient students are tested. Students in both public and private schools (accredited and non accredited) 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; separate individual, building and district summary reports are prepared for these students. Examinations are administered on a variable calendar: reading and mathematics from mid-February through mid-March; and, writing from mid-November to mid-March. This academic year will see a shift from the recent past and is being done in an attempt to return results prior to the end of the school year. District results are planned to be returned to school administrators by May 1, 1996.

The assessments grow from the Kansas Curriculum Standards in five subject fields. Curriculum standards are regularly reviewed and changes are made as determined by state curricular advising committees. Curriculum standards are targeted at higher order outcomes including critical thinking, diverse communication skills, problem solving, reasoning, and decision making instructional outcomes. Using the Kansas Curriculum Standards as the beacon, annually the state assessments are crafted by Kansas educators identified by their districts and state professional association leaders. The assessments are a product of Kansas educators whose development is coordinated by the Center for Educational Testing and Evaluation at the University of Kansas. The state assessments are not used by other states, thus a direct comparison to how others do on the Kansas examinations is not possible. (Recently we have initiated discussions with a state whose efforts are similar to ours to share tests and potentially yield comparative data.)

House Education  
1/10/96  
Attachment 2



## 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 set of questions on each examination is carried forward in order to be able to evaluate performance trends over time. The approach to development of an assessment 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 begin the 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 from the first stage 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 tryout (CETE and KSBE coordinate and finalize)
- items to appear on an assessment are reviewed for bias, insensitivity and offensiveness by a committee of impacted class members; when testing is completed, empirical procedures are used to evaluate for evidence of bias (CETE and KSBE coordinate and finalize)
- test booklets, administration manuals and scoring guides are finalized, printed and distributed to districts. When results from testing identify a problem, test scoring is modified before final reports are returned to schools.

The sections that follow detail features and characteristics of the mathematics, reading, science (Fall 1996) and writing assessments which are coming on-line this calendar year. (Note: districts or buildings may elect to administer the state assessments as a local option at grades other than those mandated (referred to as "Off-Grade assessment"); also at their discretion, they can also obtain assessment materials to continue the science and social studies assessments during this "off-cycle" year, if desired.)



**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. The design of the assessment will allow a direct comparison across years to evaluate growth.
- Scoring answer sheets are provided for computer processing of the objective questions, whereas local teachers score all performance assessment papers. A sample of papers are returned for state scoring and analysis. 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 reported.

Assessment results (percent correct) 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 and migrant education status, socio-economic level, student mobility, and "at-risk" classification. Growth over time indices are reported at the building and district level. Building and district performance with reference to the state's Standard of Excellence and Continuous Improvement Scale are also 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 selections. The selections used are nominated by Kansas librarians and educators, then reviewed by classroom educators as to their appropriateness. Final determination of the selections used is made by the state's reading advisory committee.
- 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 computer scoring of objective test items. Open-ended (essay type questions) items are scored locally by the students' instructors. A sample of papers are returned to the state for verification and analysis.
- Reporting the student's percent correct for each text type along with building and district summary information. 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 as well as performance trends over time.



**WRITING** (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 the assessment is designed to support and encourage local practice and provide staff development opportunities for writing instruction. Duration of the writing assessment is defined locally, but at least two sessions of student writing are required. The state assessment typically encompasses four class sessions of assessment effort (planning, drafting, revision and editing, and final copy production).
- Forms multiple prompts (that is, situations) provided by the state to which a student chooses the topic over which s/he decides to write. Local schools can restrict the number of choices available to students.
- 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 option is followed (in this case, a sample of papers (10%) are returned for state scoring and evaluation). The state will provide one week of training to approximately 200 teachers this June to complete the scoring of papers for the assessment.
- 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 are to be applied to building and district performance results. Performance trend information is also reported.

**SCIENCE** (ADMINISTERED IN FALL OF ODD NUMBERED FISCAL YEARS)

- Grades grades 5, 8, and 10 will be tested (is a shift from grade 11 in prior years).
- 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), and at grades 8 and 10 individual student projects are required (3 to 4 class periods).
- Scoring scoring of performance items is done by local instructors with a sample of project papers returned to the state for analysis and verification. Objective test questions are answered on response forms and then are computer 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 are to be reported.

---

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

Beginning with 1995-96 school year testing a Standard of Excellence and Continuous Improvement Scale were 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 page. Characteristics and features of the state's performance Standards include the following:

- the identifiers and descriptions are only now beginning to take shape. Over time they will evolve. Kansas educators and policy makers 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 (including science and social studies);
- 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.
- 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.

On the following page are the Kansas definitions for the Standard of Excellence and the Continuous Improvement Scale. The actual score performance standards that have been adopted by the State Board of Education (December 1994) are approximately equal to score values that range from 75 to 80 percent correct with reference to overall building averages. Rates of "continuous improvement" that have been adopted equate to -4% for the negative (-) classification, +4% for the positive classification, and +8% for the plus-plus (++) classification. Again the continuous improvement standards relate to growth between years based on and as evidenced by building average change. The actual standards to be applied based on comparison over years follow.



## 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

<i>Identifier</i>	<i>Description</i>
—	the school's performance in the assessment area shows a decline from prior performance levels
<b>M</b>	no change from prior performance levels is observed. Delineated as: <b>M<sup>a</sup></b> maintenance of performance at or above the Standard of Excellence; <b>M<sub>b</sub></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



## Performance Standards for the Kansas Assessments

<b>Mathematics</b>		<i>Continuous Improvement Values</i>			
<i>Level:</i>	<i>Skill Area:</i>	<u><i>Standard of Excellence</i></u>	<u><i>N (-)</i></u>	<u><i>P (+)</i></u>	<u><i>PP (++)</i></u>
Grade 4	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	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	Problem Solving	80%	-4%	4%	8%
	Reasoning	80%	-4%	4%	8%
	Communications	80%	-4%	4%	8%
	Total Power Score	80%	-4%	4%	8%
<b>Writing</b>		<i>Continuous Improvement Values</i>			
	<i>Trait:</i>	<u><i>Standard of Excellence</i></u> <i>(on 1 to 5 scale)</i>	<u><i>N (-)</i></u>	<u><i>P (+)</i></u>	<u><i>PP (++)</i></u>
Grade 5	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	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	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%
<b>Reading</b>		<i>Continuous Improvement Values</i>			
	<i>Text Type:</i>	<u><i>Standard of Excellence</i></u>	<u><i>N (-)</i></u>	<u><i>P (+)</i></u>	<u><i>PP (++)</i></u>
Grade 3	Narrative	80%	-5%	4%	9%
	Expository	77%	-5%	4%	9%
Grade 7	Narrative	84%	-5%	4%	9%
	Expository	81%	-5%	4%	9%
Grade 10	Narrative	84%	-5%	4%	9%
	Expository	81%	-5%	4%	9%

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

Attachment 2-7