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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

In recent years, our country's system of public education has been subjected to extensive scrutiny and criticism from taxpayers, parents, and legislators. The popular notion that schools must be held "accountable" for results, coupled with a wide-spread erosion of taxpayer support, are indicators that the basic viability of our public education system is in jeopardy.

The states are constitutionally responsible for the establishment, support, and supervision of the public schools. Although a great deal of authority has been delegated to local school districts, major education policies have historically been established at the state level. It would appear that the state governance systems, as the source of major educational policies in our country, should take much of the responsibility for providing leadership in dealing with criticisms so frequently placed upon the educational system today. In order for states to be able to provide this important leadership, we must begin by gaining a greater understanding of the process by which policies are made for the public schools.
One method of examining the policy process at the state level is through an issue area approach. This approach involves the selection of a broad concern and then the examination of how and why this concern was brought to light through the legislative process.¹ The issue area of accountability has been selected as the issue area for this study through which the policy process can be examined. In terms of a legislative area, the accountability issue has been with us now for about ten years. Recent focus on minimum competency bills in many states would indicate that this issue area continues to be viable, and, perhaps, may continue for years to come. It would seem then, that examination of the policy process for state level education policy through the issue area of accountability would not only shed some light on the general policy making process, but may also be helpful in that the particular area to be examined may be one that policy makers will have to continue to focus on in the future. This policy examination would also address to some degree the rising concern among state legislatures of "legislative oversight," the process of determining whether the effects of laws are consistent with legislative intent.²

Statement of the Problem

The movement toward accountability in education literally appears to be growing more each day. State level
legislation centering on accountability began to appear in the 1970's. By 1974, thirty states had enacted some aspect of educational accountability.\textsuperscript{3} As of 1978, virtually every state had seen some type of legislative effort in this area.\textsuperscript{4}

While segments of the population tend to agree that accountability is a desirable goal, the concept has, at the same time, generated considerable criticism. It appears that this criticism often stems from the way the accountability concept has been operationalized through the political process. It is this political process that is the focal point of this dissertation research. Specifically, this study is concerned with the politics of educational accountability legislation in three states: Colorado, Michigan, and Ohio.

The purpose of this research was to determine the policy process used to enact educational accountability legislation in three states and, through a comparative analysis, to draw some conclusions about the policy process. While the primary focus was on the policy process itself, the content of the legislation became significant as it affected the process and was examined accordingly.

**Research Questions**

The first major research question, with ten sub-parts, was as follows: How can the policy process for educational accountability be described in the states of Colorado, Michigan, and Ohio? Specifically:
1. Who initiated the demand for accountability legislation or was most responsible for making it an issue?

2. What was the position taken by that individual or group?

3. Which other individuals or groups, if any, were important participants? What role, if any, was played by the professional teachers' group(s)?

4. When did these activities take place? Did the early alignments and positions undergo major shifts over time? If so, how and why?

5. Was this state influenced by the legislation and related activity of the other two states? If so, in what ways?

6. What did the participants do to win support or neutralize opponents? Which participants seemed to be particularly effective? Why? What were their sources of influence and points of access?
7. When did the matter come up for formal consideration by the state legislature and/or the state board of education? While it was considered by the legislature and/or state board, what policy proposals were the main focus of attention?
   a. What was the content of each proposal?
   b. Who presented them? Who actually formulated them?
   c. Which of the contending individuals and groups supported each one?

8. Basically, how did the final decision get made? Who persuaded whom and how did they do it?

9. Which individual or group was most responsible for the decision that was finally enacted? Which individual or group might be said to have 'won' by this decision? Who might have 'lost'?

10. What events have taken place since the original decision? What do the present participants perceive as being the major results of the original decision? How have
the professional teachers' group(s) related to the issue since the passage of the legislation?  

The second major research question was: What differences in policy process were revealed upon comparing the states; and what factors possibly influenced these differences?

**Significance of the Study**

Three basic reasons can be given in support of this comparative study of educational accountability legislation.

First, after several thorough searches of the literature it became evident that very little has been written relating to the politics of educational accountability legislation. Sroufe presents a strong case that politics and educational evaluation are closely linked and will become a topic for research inquiries in the future. Only a minute portion of the literature on accountability could qualify as being research based. In a 1975 publication, Leslie Browder commented that, ",... while there is a long 'how-to-do-it' literature and even longer literature that might be labeled 'the rhetoric of accountability', there are also gaps . . . notably in the areas of actual development of the concept and research evidence of its effectiveness." It would appear that this condition still exists today.
Second, this research was an attempt to describe a phenomenon of importance at a particular point in time. The number of states which have already adopted accountability legislation has already been mentioned. The fact that these state mandated laws affect the daily lives of millions of students, professional educators, and parents should be evidence enough to warrant the continued research into the varied ramifications of accountability in education.

Third, this research was an attempt to describe why this phenomenon of educational accountability legislation existed in three states and to offer some insights as to why certain differences in the policy process occurred among the states examined. It is hoped that this attempt to answer some questions relating to the politics of educational accountability would be useful both to future students of the politics of education and to the actual participants in the making of educational policies.

Scope of the Study

The scope of this research was limited in that it pertained only to the development of educational accountability policies in three selected states, and to the roles played in the development of accountability legislation by important policy actors. While the results of this research
cannot be fully generalizable to other states, they did provide a unique vantage point from which to view the educational policy development process in the issue area of accountability in Colorado, Michigan, and Ohio.

**Definitions of Terms**

Certain terms that are utilized have been operationally defined in order to avoid any misunderstanding. The terms are as follows:

**Policy:** a written, authoritative course of action which establishes the goals and priorities that direct subsequent choices.  

**State Department of Education (SDE):** the professional staff of a state organization that has been legislatively designated to administer public education provisions in the state.

**Chief State School Officer (CSSO):** a title used to designate the chief administrative officer of the SDE. Common titles are the Commissioner of Public Education or the State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

**State Board of Education (SBE):** a state-level educational policy-formulating body whose executive is the CSSO. The policies of this body are generally implemented through the SDE. The Board, the CSSO, and
the SDE may be collectively known as the State Education Agency (SEA).

**Interest Group**: any group outside of official public government having a vested interest in educational accountability legislation such as organized teacher or administrator associations.

**Actors**: any recognized participant in the policy process. Common actors in the accountability issue area were the SDE, SBE, the state legislature, the CSSO, and the organized teacher groups.

**Accountability Legislation**: a state level policy outlining policies, processes, and/or procedures designed to help schools better describe or evaluate what they are actually doing.

**Organization of the Study**

A brief overview of the organization of this study may be helpful. The following chapter (Chapter II) is a review of the literature, the focal points of which are educational policy development and educational accountability. Chapter III contains the methodology employed in this research effort. Chapters IV, V, and VI are descriptions of the process through which the accountability legislation was developed and implemented in Colorado, Michigan, and Ohio.
Each of these case studies is concluded with a synopsis consisting of summary responses to the ten sub-parts of the first major research question. Chapter VII, the concluding chapter, provides a brief overview of the study and then a comparative analysis of the data across the three states. This analysis is an attempt to account for the policy process differences and similarities among the states, particularly in terms of participating actors. Finally, the analysis is followed by a series of findings, conclusions, and recommendations regarding the policy process.
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FOOTNOTES

1 For a detailed description of the issue area approach as it pertains to the examination of the policy process, see: Roald F. Campbell and Tim L. Mazzoni, Jr., State Policy Making for the Public Schools, Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Co., pp. 16-20, 1976.

2 For a brief oversight of a national perspective of legislative oversight as well as a comprehensive examination of legislative oversight in Florida, see: Improving Education in Florida, A Reassessment, prepared for the Select Joint Committee on Public Schools of the Florida Legislature, Luvern L. Cunningham (Coordinator of the consulting team), pp. 369-438, 1978.


5 The research questions cited were derived from nine similar questions used for the Educational Governance Project to develop issue area case studies for twelve states. See Campbell and Mazzoni, op. cit., p. 21.


8  Campbell and Mazonni, *op. cit.*, p. 5.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

The focus of this study was on state-level policy making in the area of educational accountability legislation. Particular interest was given to the role of the professionals in this policy issue area. With these emphases in mind, the review of the literature was based on: (1) the development of education policies at the state level, (2) the development, definitions, and approaches to accountability, (3) state accountability legislation, and (4) how professionals have viewed accountability.

Policy Development at the State Level

Public opinion, reinforced by the literature and by educators themselves, supported the notion for years that education and politics were two separate entities. Recently, however, this notion has been laid to rest, and the fact that educational policy making is a highly complex political process has been generally acknowledged to be the more accurate representation of reality.

Bailey and his colleagues, in one of the first major attempts to research state level policy making, studied the
political influence surrounding the distribution of monies for education at the state level. The authors concluded that, contrary to general opinion, monies were not distributed to school districts solely based upon needs, rather, they concluded that, "The nature of these formulae and the amounts spent under them are products of political conflict and resolution."^2

In addition, Bailey, et. al., concluded that decisions regarding governmental support for education were the result of highly complex political struggles that involved a variety of groups.^3

These highly complex political struggles, performed by an amazing variety of actors, have been the focus of attention of a number of scholars who have attempted to expand our understanding of the process involved when educational policies are created at the state level.

The Policy Process

While recent literature clearly depicts state educational policy making as a highly political process, a simple or clear-cut description of this process is not easily drawn. The vast number of impinging forces, the great variety of actors involved, and the different political histories of each of the states make attempts to formulate a general description of the total process difficult, to say the least.
In 1964, Masters, Salisbury, and Eliot published the results of their research conducted on state educational policy making. They attempted, through their research, to determine how and by whom power is exercised when decisions are made concerning the public schools. Based on this research, the authors set forth a series of hypotheses, a sampling of which follows:

1. Public school decisions are made with a clearly identifiable power structure in which the influence relationships are clearly established, or in a political arena where power is fragmented, resulting in a high degree of uncertainty for the particular interests which are making claims.

2. Relatively few public school policy proposals entertained in . . . legislative halls . . . result from general public pressures or from wave-like "public" protests. Normally, general concern . . . that is presumed to emanate from the public is significant only when the organized interests themselves use it or are able to use it as a key element in making their claims upon governmental agencies.

3. The groups and individuals who articulate the policy proposals are those who have a direct stake in the outcomes of the decisions.

Nearly ten years after the Masters' study, Ralph Kimbrough asserted he had collected enough data to verify Masters' hypothesis that identifiable power structures can be identified at the state level. Kimbrough added that the shapes and dynamics of these structures differ among the
states, and that the political strategies needed and used to pass educational legislation vary from state to state.\textsuperscript{6}

Laurence Iannaccone, in 1967, offered a new description of the policy process through his identification of four structural types.\textsuperscript{7} While Iannaccone acknowledged that a variety of actors could be involved in policy formation at the state level, he was primarily concerned with the organized professionals as they attempted to influence legislation. Consequently, he maintained that the most important aspect of state-level educational policy making is the linkage that exists between the state legislature and the state educational interest groups.

The first of the structural types identified by Iannaccone is locally-based disparate. In this type, the primary characteristic is that it is the local school persons who interact with the state legislature. Second is the state-wide monolithic structure. This type is characterized by the existence of coalitions among the state interest groups. These coalitions interact with the state legislature as representatives of their various groups. The next type identified by Iannaccone is state-wide fragmented, which is characterized by groups unable to form coalitions and, therefore, that go to the legislature individually. Finally, the last type identified is state-wide syndical. This type
represented at one time by Illinois) is characterized by a state-wide organization under government sponsorship that represents education to the legislature.

Iannaccone contended that these four types were sequential in nature, and that most states could presently be categorized as type three (state-wide fragmented).

Kirst (1970) refuted Iannaccone's contention that the state policy process is depicted by the third stage of this typology (state-wide fragmented). Rather, he viewed state education politics as being characterized by "attempts at alliance formation of different education interest groups and, in some cases, the establishment of a united state-wide organization." According to Kirst, the coalitions tended to be temporary and to have been developed for specific purposes. Finally, Kirst noted that education coalitions often find themselves at odds with an organized opposition consisting of tax sensitive business groups, spokespersons for rural localism, and all types of political leaders and citizen representatives who are determined to halt increases in taxes.

Campbell and Mazzoni (The Educational Governance Project) utilized a political systems orientation as a basis for their conceptual framework for their research into state educational policy making. This orientation toward policy making offers additional insight into the policy process. According to these writers:
This orientation (systems) emphasizes the relationships among the actors who constitute education policy systems as demands are converted into authoritative decisions. We assumed . . . that education policy is a competitive process, the dynamics of which resides in the interplay of influence. The explanation for policy decisions . . . comes from revealing the pattern of accommodation among competing actors . . . These patterns are organized through a governmental structure as well as being channeled and constrained by other systemic features.\textsuperscript{11}

The policy system developed by the Educational Governance Project staff is shown in Figure 1.\textsuperscript{12}

In his 1980 research, Parkinson, using Ohio's state level policy system as his focus, constructed a theoretical policy making model that allowed a comparison to be made between the ideal and what currently exists. His utilization of a "macro-systems" approach created a view of the policy system as a whole and may have implications for future planning on the part of policy actors.\textsuperscript{13}

The Influential Actors

While the Iannaccone typology and the Governance Project policy system offer valuable insight into the conceptualization of the policy process, the human factor, which is not easily characterized, is an ever-present reality that warrants consideration. Who are the influential actors in the policy making process; and what factors determine the influence they bring and the role they play in this policy process?
Bailey provides us with a catch-all listing of the actors involved in making educational policy at the state level. Included in his listing are: "interest groups, parties, boards, commissioners and departments of education, legislative leaders and followers, courts, academic scribblers, opinion leaders in the mass media, and a host of lesser individuals and institutions."\textsuperscript{14} According to Kirst the power each of these actors brings to bear on the process is determined by a foundation which includes elements such as authority, respect, friendship, rational persuasion, salesmanship, and coercion.\textsuperscript{15}

The educational governance structure, which differs significantly among the states, is obviously of great importance in determining which actors wield the power elements cited above and, then, become influential actors in the policy process. The power given an actor by his position also varies along with the types of governance structures, due to the fact that the different governance models give the actors (commissioners, governors, state boards, etc.) varying degrees of legal authority to make and/or influence policy decisions. According to Wirt and Kirst:

One area of historic controversy has been whether education policy should be in the effective control of the governor, a separate board or boards, the legislature, a commissioner, or a combination of these.\textsuperscript{16}
While influential actors vary from state to state and from issue to issue, the literature supports the fact that the governors and the legislatures have maintained tight control over educational policies that deal with state financial aid legislation,17 and in fact, that they determine most vital education policies:

Issues of educational finance inevitably involve judgements on education programs and priorities, so the constitutional separation of education from general state government can never extend to many important education issues.18

Two additional actors within the state policy system are the chief state school officer (CSSO) and the state board of education (SBE). Recent research indicates that SBE's "... tend to be minor participants in establishing state policy."19 On the other hand, it was determined that CSSO's exert great influence in the state education agency arena; however, their influence within the legislative arena is generally much less.20

Finally, the educational interest group is also considered to be a significant part of the policy process. The Governance Project research on interest groups indicated that teacher groups have taken the lead as the most influential among the various associations due, in large part, to the tremendous resource advantage in terms of money and sheer numbers teacher organizations have over their competing groups.21 Another recent finding (and relevant to
this research) is that today's teacher groups emphasize "... political pressure for political decisions." In other words, teacher groups have recognized and are prepared to exert political pressure for political decision making affecting educational policy decisions. Just how and why this might come about will be considered in the following pages.

**Accountability**

**Historical Development**

Public criticism of the schools was generally scarce and concentrated on relatively few areas until the middle 1950's. With progressing intensity, the general public began to confront educators and legislators with pointed questions directed to the relevancy and productivity of our nation's educational system. Wilsey and Schroeder enumerate some of the alleged offenses of the schools, as seen by their critics, as follows:

1. Spiraling costs with little or no evidence that more dollars buy better education.
2. Lack of clear direction, or lack of clarity in goals and objectives.
3. Inefficiency in the operation of the schools.
4. A paucity of data on how well the schools are doing what they profess to do.
In the past, educators had been primarily concerned with quantitative input such as salaries of educational personnel, school buildings, textbooks, supplies, materials, equipment, and other related expenditures. However, public discontent, as has been evidenced by the numerous recent defeats of bond issues and school budget elections by taxpayers across the nation, has now placed the emphasis upon more precise measures of educational outputs. This shift in emphasis resulted in what we now commonly refer to as the "accountability movement."

While authors generally ascribe the accountability movement as resulting from high costs coupled with low pupil achievement, Stephen Young states that the underlying cause is political. His rationale is that the schools have turned into big business monopolies controlled by legislatures, school boards, and educators, resulting in the fact that parents have little control over the education of their children. Because the political channels for parents are either non-existent or dysfunctional, they demand accountability as a result of frustration.

The National Assessment Project probably laid the first foundation for accountability. This project was developed in 1964 by the Exploratory Committee on Assessing the Progress of Education which was appointed by the Carnegie Corporation of New York. The underlying purposes of the project are as follows:
A major purpose is to provide the lay public with census-like data on the educational levels of important sections of our population—data which furnish a dependable background of information about our educational attainments, the progress we are making, and the problems we still face in achieving our educational aspirations.

A by-product of this purpose is the development of an informed audience to which school administrators and teachers can report about local problems and seek support for help that may be needed.26

In 1965, Congress also contributed its share to the fledgling accountability movement with the passage of Title I (Financial Assistance to Local Educational Agencies for the Education of Children of Low Income Families). Included in this law was a clause (Section 205) that contributed to the concept of accountability by requiring the evaluation of educational outputs along with record keeping. The Federal government held state education agencies accountable, which, in turn, held the local education agencies accountable.27

The following year (1966), according to Schwartz, the concept of accountability received another push, this time in the form of the report written by James Coleman, *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. A major finding of this report indicated that input into school systems is not an accurate measurement of how good they really are.28 To determine how effective schools are, then, some method of measuring the actual educational output would be necessary.
One of the most notable persons addressing accountability in the years following the Coleman Report has been Leon Lessinger, presently Dean of the School of Education at the University of South Carolina. Lessinger developed and refined the theory of accountability. His involvement began during his term as U.S. Associate Commissioner of Education, where he incorporated accountability into federally funded projects under Titles VII and VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Lessinger initiated a study of eighty-six projects which were subjected to performance evaluation by independent educational achievement auditors.29

President Nixon, on March 3, 1970, gave his support to the accountability concept by promoting it in his educational message to Congress.30 Nixon discussed the idea that a new focus should be placed on educational outcomes and stated that a more precise measurement of achievement must be found. He also emphasized that local education agencies must work on the development of accountability measures for their schools.

While educational accountability has been promoted through various sources for some time, finding similar agreement with any single definition of accountability is, in fact, probably not possible.
Accountability Defined

Tronsgard defines accountability (or the process of being accountable) as "... the proper stewardship of educational funds, resources, and the generation of appropriate services for learners." Accountability may be viewed in narrow terms, such as by a specific type of legislative mandate, or more broadly, such as by parental expectations. In general, while accountability is often interpreted in a variety of ways, most definitions usually contain two elements: 1) the quality of educational experience, and 2) the cost of achieving a specified level of educational excellence.

Leon Lessinger views accountability as the product of process and further explains that:

At its most basic level, it means that an agent, public or private, entering into a contractual agreement to perform a service will be held answerable for performing according to agreed-upon terms, within an established time period, and with a stipulated use of resources and performance standards. This definition of accountability requires that parties to the contract keep clean and complete records and that this information be available for outside review. It also suggests penalties and rewards; accountability without redress or incentive is mere rhetoric.

Lessinger's definition encompasses some specific approaches to accountability, such as Performance Contracting, which will be reviewed later.
In discussing the Florida Department of Education's view of accountability as being designed to assure relevant information for decision making, Boone cites three aspects of accountability. These are: 1) placing a premium on clear thinking regarding educational values, 2) opening communication between the public and the professionals, and 3) explaining the manner in which available resources are used. Wilsey and Shroeder view accountability as the demand that the schools be answerable to the general public for the efficient use of resources and for the achievement of specified goals. Nyquist believes that accountability demands simply that one accept responsibility for one's performance -- or lack of it. Finally, the Colorado Department of Education sees accountability as being a way to enhance educational performance by measuring that performance, and, subsequently, reporting the results to the community.

While accountability is defined through numerous viewpoints, many would probably concur that the concept rests on three foundations:

1. It must be possible to demonstrate student learning by performance.

2. There must be independent outside review of student achievement. This is dependent upon the development of valid appraisal instruments.

3. The public must have access to information about student performance. This implies that educators must respond to feedback. The public must have the ability to change those factors thought to be responsible for unsatisfactory performance.
A first attempt at constructing a conceptual anchor for the accountability rubric was made by Henry Levin of Stanford University in *A Conceptual Framework for Educational Accountability*. Levin suggested that four relatively distinct stages of accountability are contained in the literature dealing with accountability. They are: 1) accountability as performance reporting, 2) accountability as a technical process, 3) accountability as a political process, and 4) accountability as an institutional process.

Levin views the first stage (performance reporting) as the most straightforward interpretation of the educational accountability concept, and sees it as a periodic report of the attainments of schools and other educational units. Within this stage is found the development of statewide testing programs as well as the provision of other information that is useful in interpreting test results among pupils. Two serious questions are raised by this stage, however. First, there is the assumption that there exists unanimity on the goals and objectives of education and that the information provided will be useful to all of the educational constituencies. Second is that of how the mere provision of information will provide 'results'. No mechanism appears to be provided to insure that information itself will bring desired changes within our school systems.
The second accountability stage is that of accountability as a technical process. This stage also assumes that there is reasonable unanimity on the goals of education and that the problem is a technical one of getting the goals delivered at a reasonable cost. Particular educational approaches are proposed for delivering educational services or for evaluating the operations of schools in the context of managerial decision-making. Some of the most widely publicized approaches to accountability in the technical sense are those of performance contracting and Program-Planning-Budgeting-Systems. The one factor that most of the technical methods share is their similarity to devices used in business and industry.

The third stage, accountability as a political process, contradicts the assumption contained in the first two stages that there exists agreement on the goals and objectives for education. This stage, according to Levin, focuses on the ability or inability of the schools to provide desirable outcomes for particular groups. These various constituencies oftentimes place conflicting demands upon the schools. As a result of the schools' inability to satisfy all of the competing demands and needs, it is usually the most powerful groups that are able to gain access to the political process, thereby having their demands satisfied. Some groups, then, (usually the most powerful) will continue to raise questions about the accountability of the system.
The final stage views accountability as an institutional process. The legitimacy of the whole process by which educational services are produced and delivered is questioned. Proponents of this stage conclude that schools serve to reproduce the class structure, sort children according to educationally irrelevant characteristics, and legitimize an unfair social reward structure. Since the political and economic institutions of society are heavily dominated by what they consider ruling class interests, they see no hope of changing the schooling institution.

A final comment on the Levin framework is that he considered the four stages for educational accountability to be sequential in nature. After having gone through the first two stages, he maintains, we are now in the midst of the third stage, accountability as a political process.

**Approaches to Accountability**

There are many approaches to accountability identified in the literature. Seven approaches, however, appear on a regular basis and will be discussed in the following pages. These approaches are:

1. Planning, Programming, Budgeting Systems (PPBS)
2. Alternative Educational Systems
3. Disclosure
4. Performance Contracting
5. State-wide Testing (or Assessment)
6. Minimum Competency

7. Legislative Oversight

Planning, Programming, Budgeting Systems is, in essence, an internalized accounting program where the process of planning, programming, and budgeting are integrated in order to improve decision making.\(^{40}\) It is designed to improve the efficiency of an organization in achieving its determined goals. In this type of management process nearly all organizational members are involved in delineating goals and objectives and in seeking the most efficient method of achieving those goals and objectives.

Borrowed from the U.S. Department of Defense, PPBS involves seven steps for a school system:

1. Develop broad goals and objectives.

2. Design a program structure.

3. Define objectives for each program -- including the means for measuring or indicating program effectiveness.

4. Identify or design alternative approaches for attaining program objectives.

5. Make cost-effectiveness analyses of the alternative approaches for each program.

6. Select the best approach for attaining program objectives and allocate funds.

7. Evaluate the results of operating each program and provide feedback to the planning process.\(^{41}\)

Through extensive analysis and evaluation of program, PPBS aids the decision-making process by finding ways to do
business faster, better, and less expensively. It offers a way of helping a school system to reach its objectives through limited resources.

The second approach to accountability, alternative educational systems, views education as a market system. Parents and students are given a choice of schools and/or programs and the educators are compensated accordingly. Schools that do not attract the necessary number of clientele will fall by the wayside and cease to exist.

The educational voucher plan is one way of providing alternative types of education to the public. Areen and Jencks point out that voucher systems may encourage parents to look after their children's interests more effectively than they have traditionally done when their children have been locked into one particular school.

One of the most notable examples of an operationalized voucher system began in Alum Rock, California, in 1973. In this program, each voucher school is required to offer at least two different educational programs, termed mini-schools, and a parent has the right to select any mini-school in any voucher building for his or her child. According to Joel Levin, several new forms of accountability have emerged from Alum Rock:
Principals and teachers must be responsive to their communities or else face a potential loss of enrollment and resources. In addition to satisfying their organizational supervisors, they must also satisfy their parents.

The income-out-go budgets have established a new kind of budgetary accountability at the school level. In addition to living within their expenditure budgets, program managers must also pay attention to income (enrollment); needs must be given priorities and budgets must be established in terms of finite resources brought to the school by the students' vouchers.44

When recalling some of the already mentioned definitions of accountability, such as those by Tronsgard and the Florida Department of Education, the meaning of the disclosure approach becomes evident. Simply put, this approach encourages educational organizations to communicate openly to the public with regard to educational matters and, particularly, educational results. Public disclosure has been mandated through accountability legislation in many of our states. State legislatures have at times been careful to stipulate that the information transmitted to the public be stated in easily understood terms.

In a performance contract, the fourth approach to accountability, a local educational agency contracts with private enterprise to achieve specific goals, within a specified period, for pre-determined costs. The supplier could be a group of teachers or an established teacher organization; however, it is usually a private firm.
The 1969 Texarkana Drop-out Prevention Program, under ESEA Title VII, was the first program to use performance contracting with private enterprise. The assumption behind the Texarkana approach was that a private contractor would have greater freedom to innovate and, therefore, would be more successful in motivating students than the regular school system. Unfortunately, the Texarkana project resulted in a 'teaching to the test' scandal in 1970 which has blenished the performance contracting concept to this day.

While performance contracting has run into problems, school districts are continuing to experiment with this approach. According to one recent publication, performance contracting provided the stepping stone for the concept of accountability. While Campbell and Lorion indicated that they had many reservations about performance contracting, they concluded: "Contracting may indeed represent an alternative to present school arrangements and it deserves a try." The state-wide testing or assessment approach to accountability places an emphasis upon the performance of students, in terms of test results. These testing programs may be either mandatory or voluntary, and may encompass the total student population or a sample population.
The initial state-wide testing programs generally employed norm-referenced instruments; however, the movement in recent years has leaned increasingly toward the use of criterion-referenced tests. Criterion-referenced tests are designed to measure certain designated objectives.49

Tronsgard, et. al., cite several reasons for the need for state assessment: 1) assessment can provide the raw material for helping to set priorities for education; 2) there is an innate curiosity on the part of educators and observers as to what the schools are really doing; 3) assessment can make comparisons possible; 4) schools and school districts can be held accountable; 5) since educational deprivation can be demonstrated by testing, measurement, and assessment efforts, poor educational performance can be attacked and reduced, thus, equity among children may be obtained; finally 6) assessment will aid in educational decision making.50

Lundstrom points out that there has often been a lack of follow-through on the part of state legislatures to see that the information they had requested in the first place is actually given to them. She also indicates that legislatures at times have expected more information than the tests can actually provide.51

While assessment programs provide information which has probably helped to improve the process of educational planning in many states, in some states assessment has resulted
in bitter controversy. Questions relating to how and to whom the data should be released, the educational objectives on which criterion-referenced tests should be based, and the implications test results have toward teacher performance are indicators of the volatile nature of the testing movement and of the type of political furor it has nurtured.

The sixth approach is an outgrowth of the testing movement which is now commonly referred to as 'Minimum Competency'. This approach may involve teachers as well as students.

As of 1978, thirty-five states had mandated or encouraged student competency testing. While the idea that students should be required to pass a test in order to graduate may seem simple at first, it has the potential to evolve into a legal quagmire of lawsuits from parents and students claiming test bias or lack of adequate programs to prepare students for the tests. While legislators initiated the minimum competency concept, it has been the educators who have been faced with enormous instructional, program and testing difficulties resulting from mandated legislation.

Minimum competency testing appears to have been designed to solve two problems. The first is the "devaluation of the high school diploma," and the second is "a minority of students fail to acquire the basic skills" while "a minority of the teachers fail to teach the basic skills."
While minimum competency tends to refer to testing, Competency Based Education (CBE) is a broader approach in which school district goals relate to what is actually occurring in the classroom. The required set of competencies is mutually agreed upon by the schools and the community and then the objectives, or competencies, must be demonstrated by each student and recorded in the student's file in order to receive a diploma.\textsuperscript{55}

Although the student competency idea took hold around 1975, the competency testing notion for professionals began several years later. The states of Georgia and Florida now require testing for teacher entry into the profession as well as for recertification.\textsuperscript{56}

Legislative oversight, the last approach, is a term applied frequently to legislative activity. It is the process of analyzing whether or not the product of that activity, the laws that are passed, actually do achieve the original intentions of the legislators.

A recent research report submitted to the Florida Legislature's Select Joint Committee on Public Schools provides a more thorough explanation of legislative oversight as follows:

It (legislative oversight) involves determining whether legislative intent is clear, whether it is communicated effectively to the parties who are to implement it, whether they have the capability to implement it, whether they do implement it, and what happens as a consequence.
Oversight clearly involves the review of executive agency performance. Beyond this, however, it can also provide feedback to the legislature regarding necessary and/or desirable changes in the statutes.  

An awareness of oversight has been evidenced in most states. Studies and programs initiated by the states themselves as well as by various foundations and institutions have encouraged oversight reforms through what is often called Education Program Review.  

There are four means of conducting legislative oversight:

1) through a special joint and partisan Program Review and Evaluation Committee;

2) through a program review undertaken as part of the regular legislative post audit;

3) by the staffs serving the fiscal and appropriations committees conducting program evaluation and providing evaluation information;

4) through a program review undertaken by the staffs of the substantive standing committees.  

**State-wide Legislation**

The states have adopted accountability laws varying greatly in complexity -- from relatively simple student achievement testing programs to more complex accountability programs, such as the Colorado Educational Accountability Act of 1971.
Accountability legislation can consist of one or more of the twelve following approaches: an accountability system, assessment of student achievement, program evaluation, educational goals, learner objectives, comprehensive planning, PPBS, management by objectives, management information system, uniform accounting system, competency based teacher education and certification, and school accreditation based partly on performance.

It appears that state legislatures feel an increasing responsibility to improve the quality of education in our schools. Legislators are currently rejecting the notion that schools will improve if better funded -- and the funds aren't available anyway. So the legislatures are opting for more control of the schools by demanding that they be accountable both to the legislatures themselves and to the public in general.

Professional Reaction to Accountability

The literature appears to validate the contention that the evergrowing accountability movement is viewed by the professional educators, and especially the teachers, as an ominous threat. The literature also shows that organized groups have the potential to react strongly and negatively against legislation perceived as being the source of a threat to their profession.
Although many teacher groups express their concern about accountability from the standpoint that the programs are not "educationally acceptable" or "child-centered," the literature reveals that their feelings are probably much stronger and much more negative than these types of concerns would imply, and that the deep-rooted cause for these attitudes probably involves a perceived threat to their professional security.

Indications that teachers view accountability as a threat are evident in a 1972 National Education Association publication on accountability. Excerpts from this publication follow:

Accountability . . . is a popular but often misused slogan that has caught the public fancy with its promise to improve the schools -- all too often by simply finding scapegoats . . . more and more students and teachers are being victimized as a result of so-called accountability laws enacted with increasing frequency by state legislatures. Unfortunately such laws are often ill-conceived and unevenly enforced, and their efforts in the classrooms of several states point already to a developing crisis of national proportion -- a crisis that involves not only members of the teaching profession, but the very foundations of our public school system.

Most of the proposed legislation and decrees are punitive, ill-conceived, and probably inoperative. And they have for the most part been developed without the collaboration and consultation of the organized teaching profession.
In fact, in 1972 the National Education Association passed a resolution directed specifically toward accountability. The following is an excerpt from that resolution:

The Association believes that educators can be accountable only to the degree that they share responsibility in educational decision making and to the degree that other parties who share this responsibility ... are also held accountable.63

And, more recently, a past president of the National Education Association condemned standardized testing (included in much of the state accountability legislation), declaring that it "... must go."64 According to this publication, "... tests can be harmful when used as a basis for allocating resources, determining student needs, and evaluating teacher performance."65

While the teachers themselves may not be particularly blunt about revealing their concerns for accountability due to its influence on their professional security, other experts maintain that this, indeed, is the case.

Gephart contends that the constraints being placed on schools today in the form of pressures for higher achievements of students and pressures on the part of the community to reduce tax dollars, have caused teachers to view accountability in a negative light.66 He goes further to say that it appears to everybody that things are going wrong in the schools, and that the teacher must be responsible to correct these deficiencies. This blame, then,
put on the teacher, coupled with the oversupply of teachers throughout the nation ". . . provides a tremendously threatening set of factors from the vantage point of the teacher." 67 Gephart also maintains that teachers feel they are in a threatening situation due to the fact that the "accountability" notion implies to them that their work is unsatisfactory, without being specific or providing specific targets for improvement. 68

A 1975 forum on accountability reaffirmed the fact that teachers very much want to be involved in the decision making involving accountability. 69 But the forum also revealed that teachers and other education professionals are extremely wary of accountability legislation and fear that in the long run it will be harmful. 70 The article noted the educators perceived ". . . the thinly veiled threat . . . that heads would roll as soon as assessment results came in." 71

Assuming professional educators, and especially teachers, perceive the accountability movement to be threatening, what kind of a reaction, if any, can be expected from the educational interest groups? While the literature does not provide an answer to this specific question, it does give some indication that professional groups may react to a threatening situation by attempting to thwart proposed or adopted legislation.
Theodore Marmour, in *The Politics of Medicare*, related the story of the evolution of a movement to redistribute medical services for the entire population to legislation (Medicare) designed only to help defray some of the hospital costs of social security pensioners. The medical profession, led by the American Medical Association, viewed this proposed health insurance as a threat, and, thereby organized a nationwide propaganda campaign (financed by a "war chest" raised by assessing each AMA member twenty-five dollars) to fight the proposed legislation. The AMA, in a sense, "won" the thirty year long battle; the final legislation was a mere ghost of the health insurance plan sought by President Truman and the others who fought the losing battle with the AMA.

It would seem likely that the type of influence utilized by the AMA in the Medicare battle, induced by a perceived threat to the profession, could take place within the educational arena. The literature appears to support this hypothesis.

Browder, in *Who's Afraid of Educational Accountability?*, supports the notion that the educational groups may rise to fight accountability:

The process of altering relationships from general to more specific responsibilities for accountability purposes carries political implications. For organized interest groups, the politics of accountability ... guarantee as much effort will be expended attacking the concept as promoting it on grounds other than dispassionate reason.
Browder also predicts that:

Organized efforts can be expected . . . to block statewide testing programs because . . . to quote a teacher spokesman, "the results of a testing program will eventually enable the authority to reward those who do his bidding and punish those who do not conform."75

Browder makes one final prediction concerning the accountability movement. He states that, without the continuance of outside pressures for the accountability movement coming primarily from advocates at the state and federal levels, it is doubtful that the accountability movement can stand-up against the powerful political pressures exerted by the organized teacher groups.76

Another author, Gephart, reiterates much of what Browder says. Gephart maintains that teachers, like other groups, will attempt to protect themselves and insure their futures in the best way possible in the face of the threat of accountability demands. He says that these activities should be expected at times to be detrimental to the development of educational accountability.77

The predictions of the above writers, the reality of the AMA's role in the Medicare story, and the results of recent research indicating that the state teachers' organizations are the most effective of the education groups indicate that the education profession has the capacity to influence the outcome of accountability legislation implemented, or about to be implemented, at the state level.
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CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

This study was an outgrowth of the Educational Governance Project, which was funded by the U.S. Office of Education under Title V (Section 505) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The Governance Project was completed under contract with The Ohio State University (1972-74) under the directorship of Roald F. Campbell and Tim L. Mazzoni, Jr.

The primary purposes of the Educational Governance Project were twofold: first, to expand the knowledge of how policies for the public schools are determined; and, second, to develop alternative models of state educational governance.

As a result of correlational analyses of certain variables in all fifty states, twelve states were selected for detailed case studies for the Educational Governance Project: California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, New York, Tennessee, Texas, and Wisconsin. Data were collected through the utilization of structured interview schedules administered to both formal and informal actors. Such actors included:
governors, members of the governors' staffs, legislators, legislative staff persons, state department of education officials, members of the state boards of education, educational interest group leaders, university professors, and news reporters.

Additional sources of information were research reports, minutes of board of education meetings, newspaper articles, state constitutions, state school codes, and any other types of documents available which shed light on the policy process.

The over four hundred structured interviews reflected a "policy systems approach" research strategy that focused on the perceptions that major actors had of the way educational policy systems typically functioned in their states.

A second research strategy utilized by Educational Governance Project researchers was the "issue area approach." Four issue areas were selected for each state based upon perceived importance (opinions were gathered through surveys sent out to the states) and the involvement of different actors in educational policy making. Of particular importance was that the issue areas afforded insights into the policy role of state boards and chief state school officers. Therefore, the following general issue areas were selected: school finance, certification, desegregation, and a program improvement area. The program
improvement area turned out to be educational accountability in five of the twelve Governance Project states; it was to be an area in which the state education agency was perceived to have exercised leadership.

In order to examine the issue areas for each state, researchers examined diverse sources, including official documents and reports, interest group publications, newspaper files, and any other type of information-providing materials available that related to the issues under investigation.

The researchers also conducted interviews, both with issue participants and with knowledgable informants. These interviews were not highly structured, nor was a single interview schedule used with all respondents. Questions were based on the perceived knowledge base of the persons interviewed and on the roles they played. The purpose of the interviews was to fill in gaps in information and to probe for information about the decision process.

**Problem of This Study**

While segments of the population tend to agree that accountability is a desirable goal, the concept has, at the same time, generated considerable criticism. It appears that this criticism often stems from the way the accountability concept has been operationalized through the political process. It is this political process that is
the focal point of this dissertation research. Specifically, this study is concerned with the politics of educational accountability legislation in three states: Colorado, Michigan, and Ohio.

The purpose of this research was to determine the policy process used to enact educational accountability legislation in three states and, through a comparative analysis, to make some statements about the policy process. While the primary focus was on the policy process itself, the content of the legislation became significant as it affected the process and was examined accordingly.

Research Questions

The first major research question, with ten sub-parts, was as follows: How can the policy process for educational accountability be described in the states of Colorado, Michigan, and Ohio? Specifically:

1. Who initiated the demand for accountability legislation or was most responsible for making it an issue?

2. What was the position taken by that individual or group?

3. Which other individuals or groups, if any, were important participants? What role, if any, was played by the professional teachers' group(s)?
4. When did these activities take place? Did the early alignments and positions undergo major shifts over time? If so, how and why?

5. Was this state influenced by the legislation and related activity of the other two states? If so, in what ways?

6. What did the participants do to win support or neutralize opponents? Which participants seemed to be particularly effective? Why? What were their sources of influence and points of access?

7. When did the matter come up for formal consideration by the state legislature and/or the state board of education? While it was considered by the legislature and/or state board, what policy proposals were the main focus of attention?
   a. What was the content of each proposal?
   b. Who presented them? Who actually formulated them?
   c. Which of the contending individuals and groups supported each one?
8. Basically, how did the final decision get made? Who persuaded whom and how did they do it?

9. Which individual or group was most responsible for the decision that was finally enacted? Which individual or group might be said to have 'won' by this decision? Who might have 'lost'?

10. What events have taken place since the original decision? What do the present participants perceive as being the major results of the original decision? How have the professional teachers' group(s) related to the issue since the passage of the legislation?

The second major research question was: What differences in policy process were revealed upon comparing the states; and what factors possibly influenced these differences?

Research Design

While the Educational Governance Project covered four issue areas in twelve states, this study was focused upon the issue area of educational accountability in three states (Colorado, Michigan, and Ohio) on a comparative basis. This
descriptive research effort covered approximately a ten year
time span (1969-1979) in contrast to the Educational
Governance Project's emphasis on the time period of 1972 to
1973 or 1974 (depending on the state).

The case study approach was employed for this study.
In conjunction with this methodology, major research
questions were posed.

Good provides the following definition of a case
study:

The essential procedure of the case-study
method is to take account of all pertinent
aspects of one thing or situation, employing
as the unit for study an individual, an
institution, a community, or any group con-
sidered as a unit. The case consists of the
data relating to some phase of the life history
of this unit or relating to the entire life
process, whether the unit is an individual,
a family, a social group, an institution, or
a community. The complex situation and
combination of factors involved in the given
behavior are examined to determine the existing
status and to identify the causal factors
operating.¹

According to Van Dalen, "A case study is similar to a
survey, but instead of gathering data concerning a few
factors from a large number of social units, the investi-
gator makes an intensive study of a limited number of
representative cases."² Although case studies are narrower
in scope, they are considered to be more exhaustive and
more qualitative in nature than a survey.³ Case studies,
according to Van Dalen, are designed to trace interrelation-
ships between facts that will provide a deeper insight into
the phenomena.⁴
Selltiz, et. al., define the case study approach as "... the intensive study of selected instances of the phenomena in which one is interested." The method of collecting data for case studies may include the examination of existing records and unstructured interviewing. According to Selltiz, et. al., researchers working in unformulated areas "... have found intensive study of selected examples to be a particularly fruitful method for stimulating insights and suggesting hypotheses for research." These authors recommend that cases that provide sharp contrasts or have striking features have been found to be useful.

Russett identifies four uses of case studies in the accumulation of knowledge: 1) they stimulate the production of hypotheses regarding possible regularities, 2) they can be used to test inferences in different contexts, 3) where a correlation pattern is established, they can be used to pursue and/or to probe causal relationships and to eliminate spurious relationships, and 4) they can be used to refine and/or qualify hypotheses.

According to Kirst and Mosher, a major advantage of the case study methodology is that it retains and probes the patternings, sequences, and configurations of variables, relationships that could be lost in research which treats variables in isolation.
A major limitation of case study methodology is that, while case studies may produce useful insights into the process, a generalization drawn from a few cases cannot be applied to all cases in a given population.\textsuperscript{11}

The time factor and bias are additional limitations. Gee suggests that the time invested in formulating case studies is justified on the basis of the fact that it is only through exhaustive studies that new relationships are discovered or described accurately.\textsuperscript{12} Jahoda, et. al., indicate that reasonable safeguards, including an awareness of bias, should reduce its effects to a minimum.\textsuperscript{13}

**Selection of the States**

The following factors influenced the selection of the states:

1) Of the twelve states in the Educational Governance Project, accountability or accountability-related legislation was selected to be a primary issue area in five of the states (Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Michigan, and Texas). The greatest degree of activity in the accountability area appeared to have occurred in Colorado and Michigan; consequently, the amount of information collected about the policy process in accountability was substantially greater in Colorado and Michigan than in the other three states.
2) In 1972, before the research was begun by Educational Governance Project researchers in the twelve states, extensive field-testing of interview schedules occurred in the state of Ohio. During this period of time, it became evident to this researcher that accountability was receiving considerable attention throughout the state. It is likely that accountability would have been selected as a primary issue area by the Educational Governance Project had Ohio been one of the states in which a case study was completed.

3) Colorado, Michigan, and Ohio represent three distinctly different types of policy outcomes by which to examine the policy process. Colorado passed accountability legislation based primarily on local initiative. Michigan passed accountability legislation that was developed and controlled at the state level. Ohio never implemented much of an accountability program, although a great deal of activity occurred and two pieces of legislation were passed.

4) The author wrote the original accountability issue areas for Colorado and Michigan while employed as a research associate for the Educational Governance Project. As a consequence, contacts were easily renewed to gather data for updating these case studies. Due to the fact that the author has resided in Ohio since 1972, and has worked as a school administrator, access to important policy actors in the Ohio accountability process was easily accomplished.
Collection of Data

As a research associate with the Educational Governance Project (1972-74), this author collected the data and wrote the issue areas for educational accountability which were a part of the larger educational policy making case studies for Colorado and Michigan.

In order to develop the original accountability issue areas for Colorado and Michigan, numerous documents, including relevant reports, position statements, newspaper accounts, state board of education minutes, and articles were examined. Informants identified knowledgable actors who were then interviewed (using the previously cited research questions) in an unstructured fashion.

Interview data and other data sources were collected to answer the major research questions and were used to make some statements about the policy process. During the interviews, the researcher took careful notes. As quickly as possible after each interview was completed, these notes were transcribed into as full of an accounting of the interview responses as possible. These responses and the numerous documents collected were read and re-read. Relevant items were marked or paper-clipped. As gaps in the data were discovered, notations were made and respondents were re-contacted to collect the missing information. Rough drafts were prepared and as inaccuracies or inconsistencies were discovered the drafts were rewritten.
The identification of knowledgable actors was fairly easily accomplished due to the fact that through the Educational Governance Project's numerous structured interviews (34 in Colorado and 39 in Michigan) many important contacts were made. Possibly due to the fact that accountability was perceived to be an example of state education leadership, most of the identified knowledgable actors were within the state education agencies.

Primary sources of information in Colorado and Michigan for the accountability issue area were chief state school officers and state education agency officials assigned accountability program responsibilities. Teacher association personnel and legislative services personnel were asked for written documents and interviewed to the extent possible.

In order to update the case studies for Colorado and Michigan from 1973 to 1979, the following informants were contacted via telephone interviews (many more than once) and letters: state department officials in charge of accountability programs, representatives from the state teachers' associations, and persons in legislative services.

Another vital part of the updating process was the author's continued effort to obtain relevant articles, reports, and any other pertinent documents which provided information about the accountability issue in those states over the years.
Since Ohio was used as a field test site for the Governance Project, no case study for Ohio was constructed through the auspices of the Project. Therefore, this researcher attempted to develop the accountability issue area from its inception by attempting to follow as closely as possible methods outlined by the Governance Project. First, through preliminary phone calls to persons knowledgable about state education policy making in Ohio, knowledgable actors in the accountability issue area were identified. As in Michigan and Colorado, State Department of Education officials (both past and present) were identified as being the most knowledgable actors in this area.

Second, a series of six unstructured interviews (using the ten subparts to the first major research question) were conducted. In addition to past and present state department officials (including the past chief state school officer), officials from the major teachers' organization, the superintendents' organization, and the school boards association were interviewed in order to ensure as complete a picture of what happened as possible.

Third, any and all available documents were thoroughly examined. These documents included: State Board of Education minutes, research reports, newspaper accounts, articles, and legislative bills.

In accordance with policy established by the Educational Governance Project, efforts were made to provide anonymity to
respondents to the degree possible. In certain cases, particularly those of chief state school officers and governors, due to the nature of their positions and the fact that they are one person actors, their identities were generally revealed.

While data validation occurred to a degree through consensus of both written documents and conversations with key actors, an additional method of validation was employed. Each case study was sent to two knowledgable actors in each state for review. Suggestions and corrections were requested and incorporated into the final case studies.

**Limitations of the Study**

Certain limitations are inherent to any research effort. In order to make this study manageable, the following limitations were made:

1. This study contained an examination of the policy process regarding educational accountability legislation in only three states.

2. A time span of approximately ten years (1969-1979) was chosen. The study went back to the late 1960's because it was at this time that accountability legislation was initiated in the states examined.
3. The informants were largely limited to State Department of Education officials due to the nature of the issue area itself.

4. While this study was an attempt to investigate the degree and adequacy of policy implementation at the state level, it did not follow the implementation of policies to the district, school, and classroom levels.

Analytic Framework

The ten sub-parts to the first major research question guided the collection of the data for the case studies. However, an analytic framework was necessary to provide a structure for the comparative analysis that was designed to address the second major research question.

The basic framework used in this comparative analysis consists of five stages: Issue Definition, Proposal Formulation, Support Mobilization, Decision Enactment, and Implementation. Following is an explanation of the derivation and definition of these stages.

In an effort to ascertain the relationships among actors that result in the determination of education policy, several political scientists have conceived of policy making relationships as a sequence of stages or of broad categories. Edward Scheiner identified a six stage process: 1) formulation, 2) articulation, 3) mobilization, 4) codification,
5) application, and 6) re-definition. Schubert divided the process of judicial policy making into six stages, and Snyder, et. al., used the terms 'predecisional activities', 'choice' and 'implementation' to describe the three stages which they considered significant.

Lasswell, in his 'decision process model,' presented seven concepts that provide a functional analysis of the process of policy-making: intelligence, promotion, prescription, invocation, application, termination, and appraisal. Recent research studies by Dickson and Parkinson utilized the Lasswellian framework for the purpose of policy analysis.

To facilitate analysis, the Educational Governance Project conceived of policy making relationships in relation to a sequence of four functional stages: 1) Issue Definition, 2) Proposal Formulation, 3) Support Mobilization, and 4) Decision Enactment. An explication of the four functional stages follows:

**Issue Definition:** This is the process by which the preferences of individuals and groups become translated into political issues (i.e., a demand that members of the political system are prepared to deal with as a significant item). This initial stage is the origin of the issue, and it is the point where private preferences are made public or where we find out who it is that authorities take seriously. Questions asked at this stage are:
1. How is it that private conflicts are made public?

2. How do problems become issues?

3. How does the wider public become involved in the issue? Or, does it at all?

**Proposal Formulation:** This is the process by which issues are formulated as specific proposals for a policy change or for maintaining the status quo. It is during this second stage that issues get translated into concrete proposals. This is a 'screening' point where certain actors are listened to, while others are not. It is also a 'combination' point where ideas are aggregated. Questions which are asked at this stage are:

1. Who developed the proposals?

2. Who was listened to and who was left out? Why?

3. Who was combined?

**Support Mobilization:** During this stage, individuals and groups are activated to support or oppose alternative policy proposals. This is the 'politics' stage, and it includes the tactics and strategies of securing allies and neutralizing opponents. Some questions asked at this stage are:

1. Who did important actors get to support them?

2. What techniques did they utilize in this effort?

3. Was there coalition formation? If so, who was involved?
4. How did the various actors attempt to influence each other?

**Decision Enactment:** The fourth stage is the process by which an authoritative (i.e., governmental) policy choice is made among alternative proposals. This is the stage at which bargains are made, arguments are evaluated, and a decision is reached. Questions asked at this stage are:

1. What were the trade-offs as a result of the bargaining?
2. What were the final bargains?
3. Who were the winners? And who were the losers?

For this research, the four stage division employed by the Educational Governance Project will be utilized; however, it will be expanded to include a fifth stage termed implementation.

**Implementation:** It is during this final stage that the enacted policy decision is carried out or implemented. Questions asked at this stage are:

1. With what degree of success has the enacted policy decision been carried out thus far?
2. Who are the proponents and opponents?
3. Have the positions of the various actors shifted from previous stages, and, if so, why?
The above five stage framework was used for this study. It also provided a way to relate this research more closely with that of the Educational Governance Project. These five stages of policy making are, of course, subjective; and different labels and definitions, as well as fewer or more stages could have been employed. However, it does appear that distinguishing between and among stages is analytically useful because it permits a fuller understanding of the relationships that lie behind a policy change.20

According to Mazzoni,21 there are three distinct advantages in using a functional stage conceptualization. First, a functional conceptualization constitutes a frame of reference for determining what actors actually do, as opposed to what they should do or are thought to do, in the deciding of policy. Second, it reveals clusters of activities that are likely to be found across policy systems. Finally, it stresses the pre-enactment processes that are crucial in determining the agenda of policy options from which the final choices are usually made.

Summary

In summary, the primary purpose of this research was to determine the policy process used to enact educational accountability legislation in three states, and, through a
comparative analysis, to make some statements about the educational policy process.

The two major research questions upon which the study was based were: (1) How can the policy process for educational accountability be described in the states of Colorado, Michigan, and Ohio? and (2) What differences in policy process were revealed upon comparing the states; and what factors possibly influenced these differences?

Finally, an overriding analytic framework was utilized to provide a structure for the comparative analysis. The framework consisted of five stages: Issue Definition, Proposal Formulation, Support Mobilization, Decision Enactment, and Implementation.
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CHAPTER IV
EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY IN COLORADO -
A CASE STUDY

The Setting

Colorado's political character in the late 1960's could probably best have been described as clean and oriented toward moderation rather than any ideological extreme.\(^1\) Political patronage and "buying" legislative votes by lobbyists were virtually non-existent in Colorado.\(^2\) In fact, the story was told that at the statehouse many legislators looked first to a man's feet because, according to western tradition, wearing cowboy boots signified honesty and lent credibility to the wearer.

Along with what appeared to be an ingrained respect for honesty came a tendency to maintain a conservative posture. Historically, the philosophy of many of the state's most successful politicians was "to worry about special state and district needs first and let the ideological needs come second."\(^3\)

Through the years, Colorado had maintained the image of a highly competitive, two-party state.\(^4\) It was labeled a
"swing" state as it had never actually belonged to either political party and in recent decades had swung from one party to the other.\(^5\)

While Colorado politics maintained a state of flux, education consistently held a position of prime importance and concern in the state. In the late 1960's, public elementary and secondary education in Colorado was the most expensive government service provided by state and local government.\(^6\) Also, at that time Colorado was a leader in terms of number of years of education completed by the population as well as in per capita expenditures for education.\(^7\)

Historically, Colorado had placed strong emphasis upon the importance of maintaining local control of education:

> Except for widely scattered Spanish and Mexican settlements in the southern part, the first permanent settlers of Colorado were miners. . . Among these people, rugged individualism and self-reliance were highly valued characteristics. As a consequence, education was for many years viewed as primarily a local concern. Although this point of view prevailed in all states in their early history, it received exaggerated emphasis in Colorado.\(^8\)

While Colorado legislators had been concerned with allowing for local control, they also displayed an interest in holding the state education community accountable for the expenditure of public funds. Because of this concern, the state legislature had increasingly played an important role
in the educational policy process in recent years. Examples of this involvement occurred in 1970 when the legislature established procedures for appropriating federal as well as state education dollars; and in 1971 when the legislature passed three pieces of pace setting accountability legislation.

**Accountability Legislation is Initiated**

Colorado Commissioner of Education, Donald Woodington (1971-1973) described needs assessment in a discussion of Colorado's accountability legislation as:

Educators ask the local school board: "What do you think public education should provide?" Board members assess their community's needs and expectations. They then translate those into educational goals.

Teachers ask parents: "What do you want your child to learn in school?" Parents assess their families' expectations. They then sit with the teachers and translate their hopes into educational objectives.

Legislators ask educators: "What are you doing with the money we appropriate for education?" School administrators, teachers, counselors, and staff get together and do some figuring: What are the costs, etc.

Educators ask one another: "What can we accomplish with the money that is made available? Do we use it well?" They get together again and decide that, for these children to reach agreed upon performance objectives, certain programs and resources are needed.

And so the process goes. This is a dialogue. This is needs assessment translated into goals and objectives. This is the basis for performance evaluation. It all adds up to accountability."
Woodington's viewpoint of accountability essentially defined the basic process utilized in Colorado's accountability legislation. This continual process is:

1) assessing educational needs, 2) setting goals, 3) specifying performance objectives, 4) designing a program based on the designated goals and objectives, and 5) evaluating the effectiveness of the educational program.

The three pieces of accountability legislation passed in 1971 included: 1) the Educational Accountability Act, 2) the Comprehensive Educational Planning Act, and 3) the Program Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation System Act.

While this legislation was formulated by a legislative study committee (The Committee on Public Education), the accountability movement actually began in Colorado a number of years before the legislation was passed.

Over a period of years the Colorado Department of Education, aware of the shortcomings of the State's educational system, had been discussing the need for clarifying goals and objectives in education. This topic was set forth at board meetings held throughout the State and in various speeches given by Byron Hansford who was Commissioner of Education from 1960 to 1971. In fact, Hansford had frequently urged the legislature to create a legislative study committee to study educational accountability.
The Department itself began to deal with some aspects of accountability as early as 1962. In that year the statement Goals for Education in Colorado was prepared by the State Board of Education. Through the use of these state goals the Colorado Evaluation Project, a task force in the Department, developed educational objectives and performance criteria. According to a study conducted by Leonard Burns, "The Colorado Evaluation Project was based upon the National Assessment Program and sought to resolve some persistent and vital issues in education at the state level." 

Another plan relating to accountability was developed by the State Department of Education in 1970. This plan originated in 1964 when the Division of Accreditation began to search for a better method of increasing the quality of education for school children in Colorado. Then, in September of 1970 a Contract Accreditation plan was developed to encourage districts to implement a comprehensive educational planning program. The relationship between this plan and the actual accountability legislation was described in Burns' study:

The "accreditation by contract" plan essentially includes the assessment of needs by the school districts, the establishment of objectives into action statements leading to a plan of operation with needed assistance supplied by the State Department of Education. These same characteristics later emerged in the accountability legislation.
While the State Department of Education was beginning to deal with accountability related projects, the General Assembly was also beginning to consider accountability as an important issue in education. The General Assembly, however, focused the need for accountability toward the Department itself. The Joint Budget Committee, which had the final word on educational appropriations, became especially concerned with questions of education results. Pressured yearly for increases in education allocations, the committee began to ask, "What for?" It became apparent that the Joint Budget Committee, along with the General Assembly as a whole, felt strongly that the state education agency had a major accountability responsibility. This belief was given specific form when the Joint Budget Committee commissioned two separate studies of the State Department of Education to be done by outside consultants.

In 1969 the Joint Budget Committee authorized Fry Consultants to conduct an independent study of the Department's effectiveness and impact. This study was to assess the Department in the following areas: (1) impact on local school districts, (2) administrative effectiveness and efficiency, (3) accountability for resources, and (4) consistency of Department objectives with work actually being performed.

The findings of the Fry Report indicated that while the Colorado Department of Education was ranked among the
top six to ten such departments by the U.S. Office of Education, the actual activities of the department had not led to any real impact. The Department, the study remarked, had "notable" administrative and personnel deficiencies. Another finding was that there were deficiencies in the setting of departmental priorities as well as priorities of the Colorado educational system. While this is not a complete list of the Fry Consultants' findings, these examples do give the sense of the report. The Fry Report also offered a comprehensive list of recommendations regarding Colorado's educational system. Included among the recommendations were suggestions for redefining the management responsibilities of the Department as well as ideas for strengthening its personnel administration.\(^{14}\)

Shortly after the Fry Report was commissioned, the Joint Budget Committee commissioned the Stanford Research Institute to conduct a more comprehensive study. The purpose was: 1) to study Colorado's system of elementary and secondary education, 2) to define the role and assess the performance of the Department of Education, and 3) to recommend changes and improvements in the system and its operations. The findings of the Stanford Research Institute Study were similar to those of the study previously cited; and they pointed even more strongly in the direction of educational accountability.
Some of the findings of this report were as follows:

1) Elementary and secondary schools . . . cost the people of Colorado about $150 million in state taxes in FY 1970-71. A number of Colorado students, parents, and employees believe that the cost is much too high for the value they are receiving. They are being asked by the Department of Education for an additional $32 million in 1971-72 . . .

2) The people of Colorado believe that the Department of Education has not provided, through the state's school system, the type of education they want.

3) The State Board of Education has not been responsive to public opinion in the establishment of educational policies and programs.

4) The people, the General Assembly, and the Governor of Colorado have no effective control over the Board or the Department of Education. They can attempt redirection primarily through budgetary action and the denial of state funds for undesired programs.

5) The Legislature must initiate action to redirect the course of education in Colorado to make it responsive to public opinion and control.¹⁵

While the two studies covered many areas, both "criticized the Department sharply for not leading out more strongly toward better public education -- for not setting clear goals, objectives, and standards for school districts."¹⁶ Both reports suggested the adoption of an accountability program as a way to solve the state's education problems.

A prior action of the legislature which opened the door for the 1971 accountability legislation occurred in 1969. In that year the forty-seventh Colorado General Assembly passed Senate Joint Resolution 14 establishing a committee to study education in Colorado. This Committee on Public Education was to be comprised of four members of the House
of Representatives, four members of the Senate, and seven members from the general public appointed by the Governor. As explained in the resolution, the purpose of the committee was "to conduct a comprehensive and systematic evaluation of the organization, structure, function, and efficiency of the state's public elementary and secondary school system both at state and local levels."\(^{17}\) This committee was requested to report to the Governor and the forty-eighth General Assembly not later than January 1, 1971.

In December of 1970, the Committee on Public Education, having worked closely with the Department of Education, submitted the requested report to the Governor and General Assembly. Included in the introduction of this report was the following statement giving the committee's rationale with respect to the concept of accountability for education:

> Public education may be suffering some lack of confidence from a variety of sources—the taxpayers, parents and students, as well as legislators and others. The broad concept of "accountability" which can take a number of valid forms, offers hope for bridging a "credibility gap" between the promises made for the system and its actual performance. An integral part of the accountability concept is provision for improving communication between interested groups.\(^{18}\)

With the hope of bridging the educational system's "credibility gaps," the committee recommended three bills dealing with accountability. These bills were subsequently passed by the forty-seventh General Assembly (1971). The passage of the bills was apparently done by the Legislature with little fanfare. According to respondents, the state's
educational interest groups had little to do with either the formulation or passage of the three accountability laws. In fact, one respondent from the Colorado Education Association remarked that the accountability legislation "caught us by surprise."

A brief synopsis of each of the accountability bills follows:

The Educational Accountability Act gave the State Board of Education responsibility for developing and supervising an accountability program. For this purpose, the initial legislative appropriation was $40,000. The bill also specified that a State Accountability Committee be set up to work in an advisory capacity with the State Board of Education. This committee was to consist of three persons named by the Speaker of the House, two by the President of the Senate, five by the Governor, and seven by the State Board of Education.

Also, the local boards of education were to appoint their own local advisory accountability committees (or boards). These committees were to consist of at least one parent, one teacher, one school administrator, and one taxpayer. Local school board members were permitted to serve on this committee.

Finally, this bill specified that in December of each year the local accountability boards must report to both district residents and the State Board of Education on each
school district's progress with respect to the stated goals and objectives.

The second piece of accountability legislation, The Comprehensive Educational Planning Act, was designed to stimulate the concept of long range planning in school districts. The bill carried an appropriation of $90,000 and offered the incentive grants of up to $5,000 to districts to be matched with local funds.

The three basic components of the plan were: 1) the evaluation of present educational programs, 2) the formulation of district educational goals, and 3) the development of a plan designed to meet these goals. The bill stated that community members, professional personnel, and students must be continually involved in this planning process. It also stated that the State Board of Education was to report to the General Assembly by February 1972 as to the progress of districts involved in long range planning.

The final piece of accountability legislation was The Program Planning, Budgeting and Evaluation System Act. This act required all districts by July 1973 to implement an accounting system relating to pupil achievement. The State Department of Education was designated to define and direct the PPBES program. This piece of legislation was the only one of the three accountability bills to carry with it a penalty. The penalty was that any school system which did not establish a PPBES program, "shall forfeit an amount equal
to ten per cent of its ensuing year's Public School Foundation monies." This bill carried with it an appropriation of $40,000 and required local school districts to report to the State Board of Education as to their progress twice each year.19

The accountability package included two important directives relating to Colorado's educational policy-making process. The first one was the fact that the State Board of Education was given the responsibility for developing and supervising the accountability program. The second directive was the establishment of a State Accountability Committee to work in an advisory capacity to the State Board of Education.

The Colorado State Board of Education is assigned the "general supervision" of public education by the Colorado Constitution.20 What was meant by general supervision had remained rather vague over the years. Partially as a result of this, the Board had traditionally held only loose reins on the local school districts. While the Board could collect data from the local districts and attempt to give them direction, the Board exercised little direct control over the state's local school districts. The passage of the Accountability Law by the General Assembly give the State Board of Education new authority and literally forced it into a new supervisory role with regard to the local school districts.
On the other hand, the establishment of the State Accountability Committee indicated that while the Legislature wanted the Board to take a more forceful role, the Legislature still wanted to be able to maintain a "watchdog" stance over the State Board of Education. The fact that a substantial portion of the membership of the committee was to be composed of legislators indicated that the General Assembly intended to take an active part in the accountability process. This provision indicated as well that, unlike many Board advisory committees, this committee was essentially guaranteed access to Colorado's General Assembly.

Implementation of Accountability

In 1973 the Colorado Department of Education reported on the first six months of operation of the 1971 Accountability Law. This report indicated that the local school districts' response to the legislation had been generally positive. For instance, 97 per cent of the districts had already appointed local accountability advisory committees. Sixty-five, or about one-third of the Colorado school districts planned to have an open meeting on educational goals. The report also indicated that about 20 per cent of the districts were beginning to establish performance objectives. However, the report did indicate a need for improvement in some areas. For instance, the report indicated that most school districts had not involved a wide base of participants in the
development of objectives. Also, infrequent disclosure reports (i.e., student achievement test grades to parents, etc.) indicated that persons most closely connected with education received limited amounts of outcome information.\textsuperscript{21}

While in the process of beginning to implement the accountability legislation, Colorado continued its leadership role in the accountability movement when the Cooperative Accountability Project was established in 1972. This seven state, three year project, financed by Title V funds of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, had Colorado designated as the administering state. The other participating states were: Florida, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Oregon, and Wisconsin. The overall purpose of this project was to develop an accountability system which could serve as a model for all state education agencies.\textsuperscript{22}

As was required by the 1971 Accountability law, the Colorado Department of Education reported yearly to the Governor and General Assembly as to the progress being made in implementing the accountability program. These reports not only indicated general compliance or non-compliance with the accountability mandate by school districts, but went so far as to categorize the degree of each district's progress (low, medium, high) in each of eight developmental areas: goals, needs assessment, student objectives, staff objectives, priorities, program development, program evaluation, and comparing costs. The reports listed the school districts in
alphabetical order with an easy to read chart beside each district's name giving the specific compliance information.

As can be seen in Table 1, during the years 1975 to 1978 there was, from the viewpoint of the Colorado Department of Education, considerable progress made in the accountability implementation process. For instance, while in 1975-76 40 per cent of the districts were designated "well into process," in 1977-78 55 per cent of the districts were rated "well into process" or an even higher rating of "exemplary." While in 1975-76 13 per cent of the districts were just "beginning development," in 1977-78 only 8 per cent of the districts fell into this category. While 6 per cent of the districts were making "no progress" in 1975-76, in 1977-78 3 per cent (or only 6 districts) were in this lowest category. Finally, a rather positive summation of the data revealed that in 1977-78 one hundred sixty school districts of the one hundred eighty-one districts in Colorado were making satisfactory gains in development and implementation of the planning/accountability process.

It was interesting to note in the department's 1977-78 accountability report that while the percentage of districts showing "no progress" dropped over the past few years, the actual districts in this group have varied somewhat from year to year. The department identified some factors that may have influenced this phenomenon as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of Progress</th>
<th>1975-76</th>
<th>1976-77</th>
<th>1977-78</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dist.</td>
<td>Dist.</td>
<td>Dist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well into Process</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory Growth</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Development</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Progress</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Exemplary category was not used in 1975-76.

A lack of stability and continuity of the district's leadership;

Priorities for the districts had not been set by the boards of education;

The accountability committees had no specific written charge from the local boards;

Both the local boards and the committees were unsure of their relationship and purpose in the development and use of the planning/accountability process.23

What kinds of problems have surfaced during the past eight years with regard to accountability implementation in Colorado? One possible problem were those few "no progress" or "beginning progress" school districts. In his 1979 letter to the Governor and General Assembly on accountability, Colorado Commissioner of Education, Calvin M. Frazier (1973 to present) stated, "Those school districts showing poor progress (5 to 15 each year, or 8 per cent of the districts) have been warned that while accountability is a local process, they must show progress and comply with the act."24 One could speculate that a departmental "warning", considering the fact that the accountability process had been implemented for eight years, may not have meant a great deal to those few districts not in satisfactory compliance.

Several other problem areas within Colorado's accountability system were identified by Dr. Frazier in an address given to the National Forum on Educational Accountability in 1975:
In Colorado we have tried the comprehensive approach, that is, each district has been charged with establishing a local accountability committee and with building a system with all of the key accountability concepts. Much local latitude is allowed with no state assessment program involved. . . . the program seems to have certain recurring problems: 1) the difficulty of the large district to incorporate the approach into its routine operation, and 2) the statewide problem of relating a district's identified goals and objectives to an implementation and evaluation plan.25

As can be seen from the above, the types of problems which have been identified with Colorado's accountability process are of an administrative nature rather than the types of problems which tend to develop from political controversy.

Additional Legislation is Considered

During the accountability implementation years, very few pieces of legislation were considered which would have altered or added to the original accountability program as legislated in 1971. No legislation has been enacted since 1971 to alter accountability in Colorado. In 1979, three bills relating to accountability were considered by the General Assembly. Even though each of these failed in the legislature, they are worthy of review here.

Senate Bill 153 can be summarized as follows:

Required the board of education of each school district to develop and administer a comprehensive examination for advancement from one grade level to the next and for graduation, including testing of reading comprehension and computation. Provides for advancement without passing such examination in certain cases and permits issuance of certificates of attendance or diplomas. Requires the state board to distribute examples of standards and examinations and repeals existing provisions concerning such testing.26
House Bill 1507 can be summarized as follows:

As part of each school district's educational accountability program, requires each board of education to establish a detailed, specified description of the courses in each grade level and of each course, to establish minimum educational objectives for each grade level and course, and to report each student's performance as measured by the minimum educational objectives to the parents and the state board of education. A plan of remedial instruction will be provided when needed. If a school district does not comply with these requirements, it shall not receive state equalization funds under the "Public School Finance Act of 1973." 27

Finally, Senate Bill 434 can be summarized as follows:

Adds quality to considerations of educational accountability, specifying factors relating to quality education. Requires the state board of education to develop instruments to identify and measure quality. Charges the state board with developing a procedure for public school accreditation, and makes an appropriation to fund the act. 28

The above cited pieces of proposed legislation were never really viewed as a "threat" by the educational organizations according to respondents. Two of the bills (S.B. 434 and S.B. 153) were proposed by the same legislator. Other than the legislator himself, not one other person testified in favor of S.B. 153 (which would have mandated a statewide minimum competency testing program).

S.B. 434 apparently did create quite a bit of discussion within Colorado's education circles. This bill was designed to develop a tie between Colorado's accountability and accreditation systems. While this notion was considered by many to have merit, other portions of the bill requiring identification and publication of "quality" of programs
caused concern, particularly in how this process could be operationalized and the implications that districts should be ranked according to "quality." According to one respondent from the State Department of Education, it became apparent to the Department and several education organizations that this piece of legislation was simply not needed. The accreditation rules adopted by the State Board of Education could be modified to tie in with accountability without legislative approval.

Accreditation and Accountability

The Colorado Department of Education had actually been attempting to encourage a change in the accreditation rules for sometime. A recent modification in the rules included the following section relating to accountability:

2.3 THE ACCOUNTABILITY PLANNING PROCESS REQUIREMENTS: A major criterion for accreditation is the implementation at both the district and individual school level of school improvement planning and accountability processes. These processes are outlined in the approved 1975 Accountability Rules. They are repeated here with minimal changes to enhance the process:

2.3.1 NEEDS AND STRENGTHS ASSESSMENT: This process operates at both the district and individual school level. It entails a gathering of information regarding the effectiveness of educational programs and regarding public, student, and staff opinions about how the schools can best be improved.

2.3.2 THE ADOPTION OF DISTRICT GOALS: Based on the needs identified in step one above, a district adopts or revises its major goals.
2.3.3 SETTING CURRENT PRIORITIES: Most needs and strengths assessments identify a fairly long list of needs. This list should be reduced to a manageable set of priorities.

2.3.4 DEVELOPMENT OF ACTION PLANS: Action plans are to be developed at two levels:

(1) a five-year district plan based on district priorities, and

(2) a current building-level plan for each building based on the district/building priorities. If a school district desires, its North Central Association member schools can use their annual accreditation reports, school self-studies, visiting resource team reports, and their current action plans (which must be up-dated annually) for following up the school improvement recommendations to achieve this purpose.

2.3.5 STUDENT OUTCOME OBJECTIVES K-12: Student outcome objectives are to be developed in each educational program. These student outcome objectives should be related to the student goals and should be the basis on which lessons are planned.

2.3.6 STAFF AND PROGRAM OBJECTIVES: Staff objectives are to be developed to define what the school board and the school staff are to do in order to help students attain their objectives. Program objectives are to be developed to define specific ways the district's educational programs are to be strengthened.

2.3.7 PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, MANAGEMENT AND EVALUATION: Programs are to be developed which are designed to guide instruction so that students attain their outcome objectives. Administrators, supervisors and teachers manage the programs in such a way that students are provided with learning activities which will result in their mastering the specified student outcome objectives. The program evaluation will identify, on the basis of pupil performance information,
the strengths and weaknesses of the program. On the basis of this information, the staff strengthens each program and the procedures for implementing it. Tests shall not be the sole means of program evaluation.

2.3.8 REPORTING TO THE COMMUNITY: Each district is to report to its community annually regarding the effectiveness of its programs, the achievements of its pupils and the degree to which its school improvement action plans have been implemented.29

While the accreditation rules cited above had not yet been officially adopted by the Colorado Board of Education as of August 1979, it is expected that the section quoted or a slight modification thereof will be adopted in the near future. Although the emphasis in Colorado's accountability program continued to be on local participation rather than state control, perhaps by linking accreditation with accountability the department will have more clout with non or low compliance districts than it has had thus far.

The Colorado Education Association (CEA) has played a rather low-key role in respect to accountability over the years. While the association has lobbied against new accountability-related legislation (S.B. 153, H.B. 1507, S.B. 434 cited earlier) and particularly legislation having to do with testing, the CEA has not proposed any modification what-so-ever of the original existing legislation. A respondent from the CEA indicated that Colorado teachers are not having difficulties with accountability as it has been implemented in that state. This respondent indicated,
in fact, that the feedback that has been received from teachers has tended to be positive.

Accountability in Colorado has led a fairly uncontroversial, yet highly visible life. Respondents indicated that it has been watched closely, and that there have been continual attempts to improve upon the administration of the program. There have been no legislative changes in the program since its inception. While at certain times during the past eight years there have been several legislators pushing toward more state control of the accountability process, there has never been any real legislative threat toward the program. Comments from several educational interest group and State Department of Education respondents seem to sum up accountability today in Colorado on a positive note:

We're pleased with accountability in Colorado. It seems to be functioning well in most districts.

Colorado will probably continue to stay on the track we're on -- I see no groundswell looking for change.

Accountability in Colorado is alive and well!

Analysis of Policy Development

As was discussed earlier, ten sub-parts to the first major research question were utilized in the development of the case study for accountability legislation in Colorado. The questions were used as general guidelines in the collection of data
and in developing the unstructured interviews given to respondents. As a succinct review of Colorado accountability legislation policy development, following are the research questions along with summary responses.

1) Who initiated the demand for accountability legislation or was most responsible for making it an issue?

The demand for accountability legislation in Colorado was initiated by the state legislature. In particular, the Joint Budget Committee raised the issue of accountability by contracting with two outside agencies for studies of the State Department of Education. Both the Fry Report\(^{30}\) and the Stanford Research Institute Report\(^{31}\) contained findings indicating the need for the consideration of the development of some type of accountability program.

Another legislative committee, the Committee on Public Education, actually initiated the legislation itself. This committee was composed of four members of the Senate, four members of the House of Representatives, and seven members from the general public appointed by the Governor. It was given the charge of conducting an evaluation of the state's public school system at both the state and local levels and was instructed to report back to the Governor and General Assembly by January 1, 1971.
2) What was the position taken by that individual or group?

The General Assembly, as was evidenced by the departmental studies, apparently had concerns about the overall effectiveness of the Department of Education in providing the necessary educational leadership to the public schools. After working for one year, the Committee on Public Education took the position that accountability legislation was needed due to a lack of confidence in public education in Colorado. The committee also viewed accountability as a process by which communication among all interested groups could be improved.

3) Which other individuals or groups, if any, were important participants? What role, if any, was played by the professional teachers' group(s)?

The State Department of Education was also a participant in the Colorado accountability issue. The department had begun to deal with some aspects of accountability as early as 1962. In that year, the statement Goals for Education in Colorado was prepared by the State Board of Education. Through the use of these goals the Colorado Evaluation Project, a task force in the Department, developed educational objectives and performance criteria. After the Committee on Public Education was formed, the Department worked closely with it in the development of the proposal for accountability legislation.
Neither the major Colorado teacher's group (CEA) nor any other educational interest group was involved in the formulation or passage of the accountability legislation. A CEA representative interviewed indicated that when the legislation passed it caught them (CEA) by surprise.

4) When did these activities take place? Did the early alignments and positions undergo major shifts over time? If so, how and why?

The Department began to discuss the accountability concept in 1962. The Joint Budget Committee initiated the two outside studies of the State Department of Education in 1969, and the General Assembly also established the Committee on Public Education in 1969. This committee was requested to report to the Governor and General Assembly by January 1, 1971.

The early alignments and positions did not appear to undergo major shifts over time. The legislature and Department continued their support of educational accountability over the years and there have been no legislative changes in the program since its inception.

The CEA's low-key role with regard to the accountability legislation has remained constant over time. The CEA has not proposed any modification of the legislation since it passed in 1971.
5) Was this state influenced by the legislation and related activity of the other two states? If so, in what ways?

From all evidence gathered, it did not appear that Colorado was influenced at all by related activity in Michigan and Ohio during the early stages of legislative development.

Following the passage of the accountability legislation, however, Colorado did display an interest in the implications for the nationwide impact of accountability legislation. Colorado became the administering state of the Cooperative Accountability Project when it was established in 1972. This seven state, three year project was financed by Title V funds of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The other participating states were: Florida, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Oregon, and Wisconsin. The overall purpose of the project was to develop an accountability system which could serve as a model for all state education agencies.33

6) What did the participants do to win support or neutralize opponents? Which participants seemed to be particularly effective? Why? What were their sources of influence and points of access?

The fact that the accountability legislation was initiated through a legislative committee (The Committee on Public Education), with a number of representatives appointed by the Governor, offered it immediate access to the policy system. The committee, by combining with the State Department
of Education to formulate the legislation, won the support of the Department. The major teachers' group (CEA) and other educational interest groups, possibly viewed as potential opponents to accountability, were, by all accounts, simply left out of the process.

There was apparently no need for the Committee on Public Education to have to drum up support for accountability within the General Assembly since prior activity (i.e., commissioning of studies of the State Department of Education; establishing the Committee on Public Education) indicated general legislative interest and support of the accountability concept.

7) When did the matter come up for formal consideration by the state legislature and/or the state board of education? While it was being considered by the legislature and/or state board, what policy proposals were the main focus of attention?
   a. What was the content of each proposal?
   b. Who presented them? Who actually formulated them?
   c. Which of the contending individuals and groups supported each one?

The accountability legislation was presented by the Committee on Public Education to the General Assembly in 1971. There were no competing proposals. The proposed legislation was actually formulated by the Committee on Public Education in conjunction with the State Department of Education. The legislation itself centered on the idea of local initiative of accountability programs designed to
suit the needs of individual school districts. It was actually a "package" containing three bills. The Educational Accountability Act gave the State Board of Education responsibility for developing and supervising an accountability program. For this purpose, the initial legislative appropriation was $40,000. The bill also specified that a State Accountability Committee be set up to work in an advisory capacity with the State Board of Education. This committee was to consist of three persons named by the Speaker of the House, two by the President of the Senate, five by the Governor, and seven by the State Board of Education.

Also, the local boards of education were to appoint their own local advisory accountability committees (or boards). These committees were to consist of at least one parent, one teacher, one school administrator, and one taxpayer. Local school board members were permitted to serve on this committee.

Finally, this bill specified that in December of each year the local accountability boards must report to both district residents and the State Board of Education on each school district's progress with respect to the stated goals and objectives.

The second piece of accountability legislation, The Comprehensive Educational Planning Act, was designed to stimulate the concept of long range planning in school
districts. The bill carried an appropriation of $90,000
and offered the incentive grants of up to $5,000 to
districts to be matched with local funds.

The three basic components of the plan were: 1) the
evaluation of present educational programs, 2) the formu-
lation of district educational goals, and 3) the development
of a plan designed to meet these goals. The bill stated
that community members, professional personnel, and students
must be continually involved in this planning process. It
also stated that the State Board of Education was to report
to the General Assembly by February 1972 as to the progress
of districts involved in long range planning.

The final piece of accountability legislation was The
Program Planning, Budgeting and Evaluation System Act. This
act required all districts by July 1973 to implement an
accounting system relating to pupil achievement. The State
Department of Education was designated to define and direct
the PPBES program. This piece of legislation was the only
one of the three accountability bills to carry with it a
penalty. The penalty was that any school system which did
not establish a PPBES program, "shall forfeit an amount
equal to ten per cent of its ensuing year's Public School
Foundation monies." This bill carried with it an approipa-
tion of $40,000 and required local school districts to report
to the State Board of Education as to their progress twice
each year.34
8) Basically, how did the final decision get made? Who persuaded whom and how did they do it?

The final decision occurred with little fanfare. It was simply proposed by the Committee on Public Education and was passed with no indication of a need for persuasion and no visible opposition. The concept of accountability had actually been discussed in the state for approximately ten years and over that time period had garnered strong legislative and State Department of Education support.

9) Which individual or group was most responsible for the decision that was finally enacted? Which individual or group might be said to have 'won' by this decision? Who might have 'lost'?

The Committee on Public Education (or the legislature) was most responsible for the final decision and could be termed the 'winner'. Also in the 'win' category was the State Department of Education, which was closely involved in formulating the final decision. The major teachers' association (CEA) and the other educational interest groups were basically left out of the entire process, but could not really be termed 'losers'.

10) What events have taken place since the original decision? What do the present participants perceive as being the major results of the original decision? How have the professional teachers' group(s) related to the issue since the passage of the legislation?

Colorado's accountability program has been fully implemented over the years as prescribed in the original
legislation. A relatively minor problem in implementation was that each year a small percentage of districts was viewed by the department as not participating in the accountability program in a satisfactory way.

No legislation has been enacted since 1971 to alter accountability in Colorado, although several "minimum competency" type bills have been introduced and subsequently defeated. It is expected that the State Board of Education will shortly adopt a new set of accreditation rules combining the accreditation of public schools function with the accountability program.

Present participants indicated that the program has been successfully implemented and will continue to remain viable. The major professional teachers' group (CEA) has played a rather low-key role in respect to accountability over the years. While the association has lobbied against new accountability-related legislation having to do with testing, the CEA has not proposed any modification whatsoever of the original existing legislation. A respondent from the CEA indicated that Colorado teachers are not having difficulties with accountability as it has been implemented in the state. This respondent indicated, in fact, that the feedback that has been received from teachers has tended to be positive.

Respondents who are present participants indicated that the accountability program has been closely watched in
Colorado and that there have been continual attempts to improve upon the administration of the program. Comments from a variety of respondents indicated a general positive feeling toward the accountability program and no movement at the present time toward substantive change in the program as it presently exists.

Five Stage Framework Analysis

The five-stage analytical framework shed some light on the accountability process as it occurred in Colorado. Below is a policy development summary using this five-stage framework. The process will be viewed in greater depth in the comparative analysis employed in Chapter VII.

**Issue Definition - Stage I:** This is the process by which the preferences of individuals and groups become translated into political issues (i.e., a demand that members of the political system are prepared to deal with as a significant item). This initial stage is the origin of the issue, and it is the point where private preferences are made public or where we find out who it is that authorities take seriously. Questions asked at this stage are:

1. How is it that private conflicts are made public?
2. How do problems become issues?
3. How does the wider public become involved in the issue? Or, does it at all?
The research indicated that the "accountability movement" of the 1960's did impact upon Colorado and, therefore, involve the wider public. It is probable, therefore, that the interest the General Assembly expressed in the effectiveness of the State Department of Education could have been directly influenced by the "accountability movement."

Accountability legislation in Colorado originated through activities initiated by the state legislature and the State Department of Education. The Department began discussing accountability in the early 1960's. The legislature, on the other hand, focused its accountability interests directly upon the Department by contracting with two outside agencies to evaluate it. Both reports indicated that an accountability program should be considered as a means to improve upon the overall state system of education.

Proposal Formulation - Stage II: This is the process by which issues are formulated as specific proposals for a policy change or for maintaining the status quo. It is during this second stage that issues get translated into concrete proposals. This is a 'screening' point where certain actors are listened to, while others are not. It is also a 'combination' point where ideas are aggregated. Questions which are asked at this stage are:

1. Who developed the proposals?
2. Who was listened to and who was left out? Why?
3. What was combined?
The accountability proposal in Colorado was developed by the Committee on Public Education (established in 1969 by the Colorado General Assembly to study public education in the state) working in conjunction with the State Department of Education. The major teachers' association (CEA) and the other educational interest groups were left out of the process.

**Support Mobilization - Stage III:** During this stage, individuals and groups are activated to support or oppose alternative policy proposals. This is the 'politics' stage, and it includes the tactics and strategies of securing allies and neutralizing opponents. Some questions asked at this stage are:

1. Who did important actors get to support them?
2. What techniques did they utilize in this effort?
3. Was there coalition formation? If so, who was involved?
4. How did the various actors attempt to influence each other?

The accountability proposal came from a committee within the General Assembly, therefore there was little need for much activity within this stage. As the General Assembly had shown prior interest in accountability (i.e., the two studies of the Department), the committee itself did not have to work within the legislature to gain support for accountability.
The legislative committee did get the Department to support accountability by involving the Department in the development of the accountability proposal. Since the Department had shown a long-standing interest in the development of accountability, the committee did not have to put forth any particular effort in gaining support and involvement from the Department.

There was no coalition formation, since other education interest groups were not involved. Since the primary actor (legislature) was also the decision-maker, there was apparently little or no need to attempt to influence other actors.

**Decision Enactment - Stage IV:** The fourth stage is the process by which an authoritative (i.e., governmental) policy choice is made among alternative proposals. This is the stage at which bargains are made, arguments are evaluated, and a decision is reached. Questions asked at this stage are:

1. What were the trade-offs as a result of the bargaining?
2. What were the final bargains?
3. Who were the winners? And who were the losers?

This stage in Colorado saw no trade-offs as a result of bargaining. The proposal that was recommended by the Committee on Public Education was enacted as recommended with the support of the Department of Education.

The accountability legislation in Colorado was an "accountability package" consisting of the Educational
Accountability Act, the Program Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation Act, and the Comprehensive Educational Planning Act. The legislation was based upon the concept of local control and did not include a mandated state assessment program. The legislation mandated local accountability advisory committees and a State Accountability Committee. Colorado funded its accountability program at a level of $170,000.

The 'winners' in this stage were the state legislature and the State Department of Education. While there were no visible opponents, the teachers' association and other educational interest groups were not included in the decision enactment stage.

**Implementation - Stage V:** It is during this final stage that the enacted policy decision is carried out or implemented. Questions asked at this stage are:

1. With what degree of success has the enacted policy decision been carried out thus far?
2. Who are the proponents and opponents?
3. Have the positions of the various actors shifted from previous stages, and, if so, why?

Colorado's accountability legislation has been fully implemented. According to data gathered by the department, the legislation has been successful and the vast majority of school districts have put forth local efforts in complying with the program. There has been little or no controversy over accountability as it has been implemented.
While several "minimum-competency" type bills have been introduced, they have each been soundly defeated. It is likely that in the near future the State Board of Education will adopt new accreditation rules for public schools designed to combine accreditation with the accountability program.

Colorado's accountability legislation has yet to see any opponents. While the major teachers' association was left out of the developmental process, it has never opposed the legislation. It appears that the positions of the various actors have remained fairly constant over the years, with the Department and legislature continuing to support accountability. Perhaps there has been a slight shift on the part of the teachers' group -- from no position to one that is somewhat positive.

Summary

The five-stage framework for analysis describing the development of educational accountability legislation in Colorado revealed a fairly straightforward process. The proponents of the legislation, the Committee on Public Education (established by the General Assembly) and the State Department of Education, developed the legislation and had no difficulty getting it through the legislative process. The legislation was passed as it was proposed with no visible opposition.
In the first stage, Issue Definition, we saw that Colorado's accountability legislation originated through activities initiated by the State Department of Education and the legislature.

It was revealed, in the second stage of Proposal Formulation, that the legislation was developed by the Committee on Public Education in conjunction with the State Department of Education.

Very little activity occurred in the third stage, Support Mobilization, since the proposal came out of a legislative committee and since accountability had been of general interest to the legislature for at least three years.

In the fourth stage, Decision Enactment, we noted that three pieces of accountability legislation constituting an "accountability package" were enacted.

Finally, in the last stage, Implementation, we saw that the accountability legislation was considered to have been fully implemented. Although highly visible, the accountability program was considered to have been and continues to be non-controversial.
CHAPTER IV

FOOTNOTES


2. Ibid., p. 58. This was also confirmed through Governance Project interviews.

3. Ibid., p. 60.

4. Ibid., p. 58.


7. Ibid., p. 5.


12 **Ibid.,** p. 8.

13 **Ibid.,** p. 9.


22 Colorado Department of Education, **Cooperative Accountability Project.** Denver, September 1972.


30 Fry Consultants, op. cit.

31 *Strengthening Educational Management in Colorado, op. cit.*


33 "Cooperative Accountability Project," op. cit.

34 E. Dean Cçon, op. cit.
CHAPTER V

EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY IN

MICHIGAN - A CASE STUDY

In simplest terms, we believe accountability is the guarantee that nearly all students without respect to race, geographic location, or family socioeconomic status, will acquire the minimum school skills necessary to take full advantage of the adult choices that follow successful completion of public education. If we, the professionals in education, fail on this promise, we will publicly report the reasons why.¹

John W. Porter, Michigan Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1972.

The Setting

Michigan, in the late 1960's and early 1970's, had a reputation for intense two-party competition coupled with a strong ability for creative innovation.² Since the depression years, two-party politics had been established in Michigan, often with intense rivalry between parties based upon their ideological positions.³ According to Ranney, of the twenty-six states classified as having a two party system between 1956 and 1971, Michigan and thirteen other states were considered to have a strong political party cohesion.⁴
Michigan was viewed by observers as being one of the most innovative states in the union in terms of its ability to create innovative programs in state government.5 Walker ranked the states according to degree to which new policies were being adopted. On a composite innovative scale, Michigan was ranked fifth among the states, being led by only New York, Massachusetts, California, and New Jersey.6

The disunity present between Michigan's political parties and the strong partisan nature of their cleavages prompted Scribner to comment in 1971:

Since Michigan's political culture is best characterized as fiercely partisan, where ideological doctrine is expressed and represented through party membership, even Republican Governors find it difficult to gain support for public policy proposals in disagreement with the conventional doctrine of their own party. Differences in Democratic and Republican value preferences on almost any issue consistently present each Michigan voter with options related directly to the party ideology of his choice.7

Michigan also had the reputation of being a leader in public education. The Michigan State Constitution reads: "Schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." Michigan created the nation's first superintendent of public instruction and was the first state to provide free high school education.8 In the early 1970's, Michigan's elementary and secondary schools stood well above the national average in overall per pupil expenditures and the state was third in teacher's salaries.9
One cannot view the political culture of Michigan without considering labor unions. Michigan had the most powerful labor movement of any state in the union in the early 1970's, with over one million union members. The unions grew out of the American auto industry whose major corporations are all headquartered in Detroit.

In general, the Michigan state level interest groups and organizations were viewed as being disunited. In a 1964 report by Elliot, Masters, and Salisbury, the authors observed that there was no visible decision-making pattern in state policy formulation evidenced in Michigan. They cited four contributing factors to this as being:

1) Education groups making demands on the legislature were not unified.

2) Wealthy and poorer school districts displayed self-consciousness over conflicting interests because of a failure to adopt a statewide school district reorganization plan after World War II. These divisions among school districts became visible within the legislature when either school district reorganization or state aid to education was an issue.

3) A longstanding political party cleavage along ideological lines tended to become apparent in the split party control of the executive and legislative branches. Education, particularly when money was involved, tended to be cast along political party lines.

4) There appeared to be a division between public school, and parochial and private school proponents, and the division was based more along economic than religious lines.
Many of the unique aspects of Michigan's political culture, particularly those of innovativeness and disunity, came to light during the formulation, passage, and implementation of its controversial accountability legislation.

In the early 1970's the state of Michigan stood out among the states as being "... further along than any other state in developing and using assessment as a part of an educational accountability model." The initial effort by the proponents of educational accountability in Michigan was fraught with controversy and opposition. However, as of August 1979, many of the original problems had been ironed out and the assessment program was still considered to be a vital part of Michigan's effort to assure equal educational opportunity to all of its students.

Many of the publications centering on the topic of accountability, in Michigan as well as in other states, conclude that the original societal force for educational accountability came in the form of a questioning of public education by rebellious taxpayers. Asked during the 1960's to increase greatly the dollars being expended for education, citizens began to ask "What are my dollars going for?" They demanded to see the results of their increased dollar input into education in terms of measurable education outcomes. It was the apparent inability of educators to respond to these demands that initiated the accountability movement in Michigan.
A probable force in the origins of accountability in Michigan, particularly the statewide testing component, was the J. Alan Thomas study of the Missouri schools. This study, completed in 1966, included a recommendation that a reading test be administered to fourth grade students. This proposal prompted considerable thinking and discussion in Michigan.

**State Department Initiative**

In response to a questioning citizenry, staff members in the Michigan Department of Education's Bureau of Research prepared a paper in late 1968 suggesting that the Department undertake a statewide testing effort. Because of the potential controversial nature of this proposal, the paper was given only to Ira Polley (the State Superintendent of Public Instruction at that time) and to one of his assistants. According to Polley, his initial reaction to the paper was very positive and he immediately began to consider possible ways of securing funding from the state legislature to initiate plans for a statewide testing program. Polley decided that the two most viable possibilities were: 1) to introduce legislation both mandating the program and providing the necessary funds, or 2) to establish and fund the program simply by adding a line item to the Department's annual budget for operations. When the program was finally introduced to the legislature the decision was made to ask for a line item addition.
While the Michigan Department of Education staff initiated the assessment proposal, Michigan State Board of Education members had actually been concerned with another aspect of accountability for some time. A number of Board members had felt strongly that the function of accrediting elementary and secondary schools should be removed from the University of Michigan and placed with the Department of Education. Polley, after reviewing the Department's assessment proposal, decided early in January of 1969 that he would present the assessment notion to the Board as a more productive means of accomplishing educational accountability than the transference of the accreditation function from one institution to another.

Before Polley presented the assessment idea to the Board, several significant events occurred. First, the proposal written by members of the Michigan Department of Education's Bureau of Research was circulated among Department staff members in an attempt to build a consensus concerning an idea which would be viewed by many people as being highly controversial.18 Second, the executive heads of four education interest groups were informed that an assessment proposal was going to be presented to the State Board of Education. These four groups were: The Michigan Education Association, The Michigan Federation of Teachers, The Michigan Association of School Administrators, and The Michigan Association of School Boards.19
Ira Polley, in a memorandum to the State Board of Education, publicly presented the assessment proposal to the Board on January 28, 1969. An excerpt from that memorandum follows:

... reliable information concerning the progress of education in Michigan is not available. It may be suggested that a periodic assessment of educational progress for the state could enhance the ability of educators and citizens to improve the quality of their schools. Such an assessment could consist of the statewide analysis of instructional outcomes -- as these outcomes vary according to the differing social, geographic, and economic patterns of the state. The assessment would be developed, conducted, analyzed, and interpreted by the State Department of Education. It would include procedures to assess the knowledge, understandings, and attitudes of the pupils who are attending the various public schools in Michigan. The results of each periodic assessment ... would permit a knowledgeable movement towards increased educational opportunity in the state through a continued identification of areas of educational disadvantage.20

In the same memorandum, Polley indicated that the assessment effort would have two purposes. The overriding purpose would be to provide educators, legislators, school board members, and citizens in general with comprehensive information concerning the educational progress of students. The second purpose, cited by Polley, would be to improve the basis for educational decision making in Michigan.21

The Board responded to Polley's memorandum by adopting a resolution favoring the details of a statewide assessment plan which would serve as the basis for legislation. The next memorandum from Polley to the Board
outlined a three-year planning period prior to the full implementation of a testing program. The Board, however, felt a need for more immediate action and asked for a plan in which statewide testing could be implemented the following school year (1969-70). After several more Board meetings, a compromise was finally reached on this issue. The program was to begin with an assessment effort at two grade levels for the school year 1969-70, and it was to be fully implemented over a three-year period.

**Legislative Action**

As was mentioned before, the decision was made by the Department to request the assessment legislation by asking for a line item addition to the Department of Education's budget. On August 12, 1969, the Governor signed the annual budget legislation with the inclusion of the assessment provision. One close observer made the following comment concerning the legislative route of the assessment plan: "The program's journey through the actual legislative process was fairly low-key, marked with no great fan-fare, and characterized by gentle persuasion rather than intensive lobbying."22

The assessment plan came under Section 14 of Act 307 of the Public Acts of 1969 and was funded at the level of $248,854. The Michigan Department of Education was given the mandate to undertake: 1) the planning and development
of a statewide program for a periodic and comprehensive assessment of certain basic skills at one or more grade levels during the 1969-70 school year. 23

Primarily as a result of the time constraint imposed by the legislation, the Educational Testing Service of Princeton, New Jersey, was hired by the Department to assist in developing and administering the assessment batteries and data gathering instruments, and in analyzing the findings. It should be reinforced that Polley and the Department staff had felt strongly that a three-year planning period was absolutely necessary before an assessment program could be implemented. The Board's insistence that tests be administered during the 1969-70 school year allowed the Department almost no alternative other than that of seeking outside assistance. The basic skills batteries (for reading, English expression, vocabulary, and math components) were designed to be given to all fourth and seventh grade students in Michigan. It should be noted that instruments selected for 1969-70 were designed to be reliable for groups of students, but not for individual students. These skills batteries were to require approximately 100 minutes of testing time. Twenty additional minutes were to be utilized for a questionnaire ("Pupil Background Questionnaire") designed to acquire information on socioeconomic background and pupil attitudes.
In September of 1969, the Department organized an ad hoc group composed of classroom teachers, curriculum consultants, and a parent. This group was 1) to review the assessment battery in terms of its relevancy to current curriculum, and 2) to review the relative emphasis placed on sub-areas under each of the sub-tests.

Also, in order to maintain communication with local school districts, the State Superintendent asked that a local district coordinator for the Michigan Assessment of Education be designated in each school district. The primary purpose of this person would be to serve as liaison between the school district and State Department of Education for all matters pertaining to the statewide assessment program.

As we have seen, the assessment legislation was initiated by the Michigan Department of Education and by the State Board of Education. Subsequently, the legislation was passed (with funding) by the legislature with little or no political complications. Complications and controversy of a political nature did occur, however, when the Department was required to release the reports of the 1969-70 round of tests, despite assurances to local educators that the results would not be released.

To back up a bit, the Department and Superintendent Polley had decided in the initial design of the 1969-70
program that the Department would not publish any ranking or comparative report regarding the 1969-70 assessment results in local school districts. Rather, the school districts were to be categorized into one of five community types and into one of four geographic regions. Only broad based comparisons would be made from the data; none of the school districts would be identified individually. Also, the Department went on record as stating it would not release data on individual school districts to anyone but local school administrators.24

Shortly after the Department released the assessment scores to the school administrators regarding their respective school districts, legislators, the Governor, and the press began to urge the Department to release the data publicly. Governor Milliken, who had been consistently supportive of the assessment program, requested that a single comparative report of the assessment results be sent to his office. Many requests came to the Department from legislators who wanted the assessment results for their districts. Finally, numerous press releases throughout the state pushed for the release of test results to the public.

These pressures for public disclosure of data produced, in the meantime, counterpressures from local school district superintendents. The superintendents contended that the Department had stated in the original agreement that test results would be released only to school officials and not
to the general public, and that any change in this plan would imply the Department had backed down on its word. The Department was placed right in the middle of a controversy of a highly emotional and political nature.

In the midst of this controversy however, an earlier piece of legislation was evoked to solve the Department's difficult dilemma. During the 1968 legislative session a section was added to the State School Act which established a categorical aid program designed to assist schools marked by a high degree of economic and cultural deprivation. During the 1968-69 academic year, $6.3 million in compensatory aid was allocated to forty-seven Michigan schools on the basis of criteria established by the Department. The program was continued, at a higher level of funding, the following year; however, in 1970-71 the criteria for funding were changed dramatically by the state legislature.

The legislature raised the level of funding of the 1970-71 State School Aid Act to $17.5 million. Following is a brief description of the important funding criteria changes found in the Act:

Section 3 of the 1970-71 State School Aid Act requires the employment of two criteria to determine eligibility for funding. The criteria require that, within attendance areas of individual schools, there is enrolled: (1) a high percentage of students with socioeconomic deprivation; and (2) a high percentage of students with low achievement levels. The legislation further provides that the results of the 1969-70 statewide assessment effort for grade 4 be employed to determine a school's relative standing.
on these two criteria. A school falling in the bottom quartile on composite achievement received points in relation to its rank within that quartile— one point if it were at the 25th percentile, twenty-five points if it fell at the 1st percentile. In addition, a school falling in the bottom quartile on relative socioeconomic level also received points—from one to ten points, depending upon its percentile ranking.25

Because this legislation required a ranking of school districts based on assessment results (and socioeconomic standing) as the basis for compensatory funding, the Department was thus forced to compile and release publicly comparative assessment results. The Department, then, did end up releasing local school district scores to the public. The State Board of Education backed up the Department in its action and also stated that the scores for the 1970-71 school year would be made even more useful and open to the public.

Nature of the Controversy

The controversy surrounding the Michigan assessment program described so far had resulted primarily from the reporting of the test results, however, this was not the only subject of controversy. Opposition to an equal or even greater degree arose from various segments of the public about the construction and content of the tests.

Section I of the tests consisted of twenty-six questions designed to provide measures for: 1) socioeconomic status, and 2) pupil attitudes and aspirations. Shortly after the
testing had begun in Detroit a strong protest emerged from the parents from a few of the city's inner city elementary schools. They protested against Section I "... on the basis that it was racist, uncalled for, and an unwarranted invasion of privacy."26 The press quickly spread the story across the state, and in some instances districts, of their own accord, deleted that section of the battery. The issue, in fact, went all the way to the State Legislature where a debate took place on the subject. In time, however, emotions subsided and Section I continued as a part of the 1970-71 assessment program. In 1971-72, however, this section of the battery was deleted.

Charges were also made, again at a highly emotional level, by a number of legislators that certain reading passages used in the testing were communistic and racist. Again, discussion reached the floor of the legislature, this time with the appearance of resolutions in both houses calling for a moratorium on the testing program. Again, however, the emotionalism abated and both resolutions were halted before reaching the floor for consideration.

Governor Milliken, long an advocate of the educational assessment concept, vocalized his concern that the 1969 assessment program did not furnish individually reliable pupil scores. Individual scores, he felt, were essential if local school administrators were to benefit from assessment by being provided data which would enhance local
decision making. The Governor, through the work of his Commission on Educational Reform, which was established in 1969, submitted a bill to the legislature in 1970 designed to give the assessment effort its own basis in statute as well as to ensure that individually reliable pupil scores would be provided by the tests. The bill was signed into law by Governor Milliken as Act No. 38 of the Public Acts of 1970. The thrust of the initial law was changed in that the two basic purposes of the assessment program (to provide information useful in making allocatory decisions and to enhance local decision making capability) would now receive equal emphasis.

In the latter part of 1969, Superintendent Polley resigned his position and John W. Porter was appointed Michigan State Superintendent of Public Instruction. While Porter did inherit the controversial assessment issue from his predecessor, Porter himself became a strong advocate of the assessment concept. In fact, he led the Department and the State Board of Education in the development of a full-scale accountability model for Michigan. The new state accountability model consisted of six major "thrusts," assessment being one. They were:

1. Identification, discussion and dissemination of common goals for Michigan education.

2. Approaches to educational challenges based on performance objectives consistent with the goals.

3. Assessment of educational needs not being met, and which must be met to achieve performance objectives and goals.
4. Analysis of the existing (or planned) educational delivery systems in light of what assessment tells us.

5. Evaluation and testing within the new or existing delivery system to make sure it serves the assessed needs.

6. Recommendations for improvement based upon the above.27

Opposition to various aspects of the assessment program continued to plague the Michigan Department of Education as the testing went into its second and third years. In 1971 forty-one superintendents, with the approval of their boards of education, threatened to withhold their test results unless the Department would answer some of their questions about the assessment program:28

Eventually, all districts did report scores to the State Board of Education, but only after much correspondence had passed between the superintendents and officials of the State Department of Education. Many of the questions raised in this correspondence were concerned with the eventual use that would be made of the data and with the "image" that "poor" results might impose on the district and thus on the administrative staff.29

The teacher associations responded, at both the state and local levels, to the assessment program, and in general the groups opposed the use of assessment tests.30 Following are excerpts from a resolution passed by the Michigan Education Association in 1972:

The Michigan Education Association views with growing concern the misuse of standardized achievement tests in the State of Michigan. After three years of using tests in the state assessment program, no significant contribution
to knowledge has been made as a result of this program. The current Michigan assessment program is expensive, unproductive, and tends to mislead the public . . .

Therefore, be it resolved that the Michigan Education Association opposes vigorously the use of standardized achievement testing for purposes which do not benefit the child and may be harmful to his welfare.31

In 1973 the testing program itself underwent a major change when the normative tests were replaced with criterion referenced tests in the areas of reading, math and verbal ability. The State Board of Education had Michigan educators prepare the performance objectives and test materials, and respondents indicated that these tests have generally been considered a more relevant and fair means of assessing student progress than the original tests.

The aura of controversy surrounding Michigan's accountability program heightened in 1973, when the Michigan Education Association and the National Education Association contracted for an "assessment" of the Michigan accountability system. The final report, prepared by Ernest House, Wendell Rivers and Daniel Stufflebeam, all recognized educators/researchers, was highly critical of the processes utilized by the Michigan Department of Education in collecting and analyzing data, as well as of the philosophical basis for conducting an accountability program led by the state rather than by local decision-makers. The report was widely publicized, with a condensed version appearing in Phi Delta Kappan.32
The laundry list of items for which the report strongly chastized the department included the following: utilizing a pattern of every-pupil testing rather than a sampling procedure; publishing test scores; forcing all districts to take part in the program rather than making it voluntary; planning to publish an accountability information booklet for parents; and not involving enough local educators in the planning of the various program components. Perhaps one of the most scathing comments contained in the report was the following:

One concerned state official has said, 'Sometimes I wake up at night worried about the direction we're going. It's like a giant snowball rolling downhill.' This statement captures the feeling of the panel toward Michigan accountability and assessment. Driven by intense political pressure from the legislature and the governor's office, the SDE leadership has launched a bold and well-intentioned effort to reform educational practice. Unfortunately, it was not thoroughly thought through, and it has gathered a momentum somewhat lacking in thoughtful control.33

Several months after the assessment report was published, the Michigan Department of Education offered a rebuttal in the form of a thirty-five page booklet titled A Staff Response to the Report: An Assessment of the Michigan Accountability System.34 The booklet, written by three members of the department, was, like its predecessor, condensed and published in September of 1974 in Phi Delta Kappan.35

The rebuttal contended that while a few of the criticisms had value for improving some aspects of the program, most of them were based on inaccurate or insufficient information,
or were simply a reflection of a different philosophical bent.

While it would be nearly impossible for this researcher to attempt to determine which of these reports most correctly interpreted the state of accountability in Michigan in 1974, suffice to say that the very fact that the reports were written and published indicated in itself that not all was well with accountability in Michigan -- at least on the political scene. While the Michigan Education Association and the National Education Association and the prominent educators/researchers they contracted with adamantly contended that no bias existed in the report, one can easily speculate that the teachers' associations were probably not unhappy with the resulting report and the reaction and publicity it subsequently received.

In 1975, the Michigan State Board of Education acted to ensure that there was input into departmental assessment procedures and policy from the educational arena. The Research, Evaluation, Assessment Services Advisory Council (REAS) was established by the board as a vehicle for educators and others to offer their counsel and advice to the department. The twenty-eight member council was to consist of representatives from the Michigan Education Association, Michigan Federation of Teachers, Michigan Association of Elementary School Principals, Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals, Michigan Association of School
Administrators, Michigan School Boards Association, and a variety of educational research, mathematics, and reading groups. Also included were several students and several representatives from the public at large.

The Long Range Plan

In 1975, the Michigan State Board of Education adopted a "Long Range Plan for Michigan's Assessment Program." The purpose of the plan was (1) to serve as a detailed public statement of the general direction of statewide assessment, and (2) to serve the assessment staff as a general model for development of the program over the next five to ten years. The plan was regarded by Department officials as being flexible and it was determined that it could be altered by the State Board of Education at any time.

The long range plan, basically an extension of the objective-referenced approach in utilization at that time, was developed by Dr. Frank Womer (University of Michigan) in conjunction with Departmental staff, the Research Evaluation and Assessment Services Advisory Council, and suggestions received from a survey of major professional organizations throughout the state.

The Long Range Plan for Michigan's Assessment Program identified as follows the eight goals for Michigan's assessment:
(1) to provide statewide information describing the current status of pupil achievement of minimum levels of basic skills and other common learnings and the current status of other relevant factors,

(2) to provide statewide information describing what progress is being made over time in pupil achievement of minimum levels of basic skills and other common learnings, and what changes are occurring in the status of other relevant factors,

(3) to provide statewide information that can help identify areas of success and areas in need of improvement and that can be used as a partial basis for allocation of state-level human, financial, and material resources designed to help ensure pupil achievement of minimum levels of basic skills and other common learnings,

(4) to provide a partial base of information to local school districts to assist them in: (a) describing the current status of pupil achievement of minimum levels of basic skills and other common learnings; (b) describing the progress being made over time in pupil achievement of these minimum levels; and (c) identifying district, school, classroom, and individual pupil areas of success and areas in need of improvement for purposes of further analyzing their own programs and, when appropriate, reallocating their own human, financial, and material resources in ways designed to help ensure pupil achievement of these minimum levels,

(5) to provide technical assistance and support to local districts in the development and implementation of comprehensive local needs assessment programs,

(6) to establish standards and instrumentation for individual pupil assessment of the achievement of minimum levels of basic skills and other common learnings,

(7) to promote optimum utility of assessment data by actively promoting the dissemination and utilization of Michigan assessment results to all concerned audiences, and
(8) to provide the State Board of Education with an annual systematic audit of the policies and procedures of the Michigan Educational Assessment Program, including input from the REAS Advisory Council and other appropriate advisory groups. 37

The Long Range Plan called, ultimately, for assessment to take place at five grade levels -- one, four, seven, ten, and twelve. As can be seen in Table 2, the plan called for full implementation by the 1978-79 school year.

While every-pupil testing would continue on certain identical objectives, sampling would also be employed for other objectives. Expansion would occur, according to the plan, not only by expanding the grade levels being tested, but also in terms of breadth of areas being tested. The plan called for assessment to expand to the following learner areas:

Grade 1 (desired minimums for end of pre-primary):

(1) affective
(2) cognitive
(3) psychomoter

Grades 4, 7, and 10 (desired minimums for end of grades 3, 6, and 9):

(1) art
(2) communication skills
(3) health education
(4) mathematics
(5) music
(6) physical education
(7) science
(8) social studies
Table 2
Tentative Timetable for Expansion of the
Michigan Educational Assessment Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grade 12 (desired minimums for exit competencies from high school):

(1) aesthetic, humanistic appreciations
(2) civic and social responsibility
(3) employment skills
(4) personal and family management

Finally, the Long Range Plan established a continuous process of review of the learning area objectives being tested. According to Dr. Womer, the plan's primary developer, "The most essential element of the review process is the widespread, active involvement of educators and lay persons. The objectives should represent a consensus of Michigan educators and other citizens."

In an article published by Dr. Womer in 1976, he reviewed, through a question-answer process, a series of twelve issues revolving around assessment in Michigan, particularly as they related to the Long Range Plan. Several of these issues are relayed below:

Should Michigan assessment exist? Current sentiments suggest that the answer for most Michigan educators is, "Yes, I think so." The Long Range Plan assumes a yes answer.

Can (should) state assessment results be used to evaluate individual teacher performance? No, categorically. There is no logical way to evaluate contributions of individual teachers to a classroom's state assessment results.

Is every-pupil testing necessary? Current legislation mandates it for grades 4 and 7. The Plan calls for every-pupil testing on some common objectives common to all students . . .

Are MEAP test administrations in the schools conducted satisfactorily? There have been rumors about the adequacy of test administration in the schools, but little evidence is available as to
their substance. The Plan calls for quality control measures . . .

Why does MEAP use so much testing time? . . . it is necessary to ask for responses to at least five items per objective, which can require several hours. The Plan proposes some reduction of testing time . . . 40

Several of the issues addressed by Womer had been raised by the 1974 House, Rivers, Stufflebeam study cited earlier, and/or had been raised through some means or other since the early inception of the assessment program. It was the ultimate goal of the developers of the Long Range Plan for Michigan Assessment to develop a consensus document that could be accepted by the public and the education community as a whole. We will see that while some consensus has apparently been reached toward assessment during the last few years, this goal has yet to be fully achieved in Michigan.

In accordance with the Long Range Plan for Michigan Assessment (see Table 2), the Michigan Department of Education pilot-tested first grade students during the 1974-75 school year. The pilot testing, according to state department sources, created some public concern about the plan to expand the testing program, therefore, the State Board of Education, apparently as a cautious reaction to this concern, placed a two year moratorium on the expansion of the state's assessment program (although pilot testing was permitted to continue). At the end of the 1974-75 school year the Department discontinued the pilot tests for first graders, but began a
pilot assessment of tenth grade students during the 1975-76 school year.

Assessment is Researched

The year 1975 saw the first major research effort directed toward teacher attitudes regarding Michigan assessment. In his study of a sampling of fourth and seventh grade teachers throughout Michigan, Aquino found that no overwhelming opposition existed among the teachers toward assessment. According to this study:

Approximately one-half of the fourth grade teachers and two-thirds of the seventh grade teachers would want their classes to take the assessment tests if they were conducted on a voluntary basis. Large percentages of teachers were supportive of some modification of the program -- including making it optional and expanding it to other grade levels or subject areas.

Another research effort, in 1976, shed additional light on the perceptions of Michigan school principals toward assessment. In his study, Steele found that:

1. School principals are using the MEAP test results. Principals make the most extensive use of MEAP test results for two purposes: (1) determining the general level of achievement of students in the school; (2) determining strengths and weaknesses in the curricular areas of reading and mathematics.

2. School principals in Michigan's elementary and junior high schools support continuation of MEAP.

3. Most elementary and junior high school principals support gradual expansion of MEAP to include other grade levels and subject areas.
4. School principals in Michigan's elementary and junior high schools feel that MEAP test results are having an impact on aspects of the instructional program of the schools.43

Yet another study, this one of a "watch-dog" nature, was conducted in 1978 by the Michigan Department of Management and Budget. This study focused on test score utilization by classroom teachers. The results of this study were less favorable than those previously cited:

The results of this study have indicated that MEAP test results are under-utilized, that teachers are skeptical about the program's impact on achievement and its utility as a diagnostic device, and that support for the program is less than enthusiastic. Given these findings, it is desirable that the department's goals for the program be assessed in light of the limited use of test results by teachers . . . 44

While all of this research was taking place, the Michigan assessment program continued to be administered and analyzed by the Department. The voluntary pilot testing program of tenth grade students yielded positive results: during the 1978-79 school year, two-thirds of the state's high schools volunteered to participate in the program. In the Spring of 1979, the Michigan State Board of Education acted to expand the testing program by initiating a mandatory 10th grade assessment to begin in the fall of 1979. (The State Board of Education moratorium on expansion had been lifted in 1977.)

With this expansion of assessment, the Michigan State Teacher's Association reaffirmed its stance in opposition to the testing component of Michigan's accountability program.
While the teacher's association attempted to lobby against assessment within the state legislature, the legislature fully funded the testing program for 1979 with its planned expansion.

What happened to the Long Range Plan for Michigan Assessment? As one can see by comparing Table 2 and Table 3, the Long Range Plan has never been fully implemented. A State Department of Education source indicated that one primary reason for the lack of the planned expansion of the assessment program was simply based upon not receiving the additional needed funds from the legislature. Another factor involved was that several facets of the Long Range Plan had raised questionmarks in the eyes of Department officials. For instance, the first grade pilot testing got off on a bad start, and testing at the twelfth grade level, in addition to being too late to provide help to students, comes too close, according to one State Department respondent, to the notion of a "graduation test" than the Department wanted to be. Every-pupil testing continued in math and reading and expansion to other learner areas (i.e., social studies, health, etc.) took place on a periodic sampling basis rather than through a full-fledged expansion.

The Michigan Accountability program, and in particular its assessment component, appeared to be going strong as of fall of 1979. While the anti-assessment teacher's association (MEA) had attempted over the years to impact upon the
TABLE 3

A CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS IN THE MICHIGAN

ASSESSMENT PROGRAM, 1969-1979

1969: Initial authorization of the Michigan Assessment program (as a line item on the Department of Education's 1969-70 appropriation bill). The Educational Testing Service of Princeton, New Jersey, was called upon to assist the Department in devising, administering, and analyzing the tests.

1970: First tests administered to students. Vocabulary, math, reading, and English skills were tested. Also administered was a "Pupil Background Questionnaire."

Report summarizing results by region and community type was released to public.

Assessment given its own basis in statute through Act No. 38 of Public Acts of 1970.

1971: Second administration of tests. Tests were lengthened to permit reliable scores to be reported for individual pupils. Socioeconomic items were revised extensively.

Reports released to local educators.

1972: Reports released to public.

Third administration of tests. No attitude or socioeconomic items included.

Local district results released to public in percentile form.

1973: Fourth (and last) administration of normative tests.
TABLE 3, Continued

1973-74: (Criterion) objective referenced tests administered for first time. Reading, math, and verbal ability were tested.

The schools received the results of the objective referenced tests in three basic reports: an Individual Student Report; the Classroom Listing Report; and the Classroom, School, and District Summary Report.

1974-75: In addition to regular testing, a pilot project in objective referenced testing for a sampling of first graders took place. The areas of student learning, attitudes, and motor skills were covered.

The "Long-Range Plan for Michigan's Educational Assessment Program" was adopted by the State Board of Education.

The State Board of Education formulated the Research, Evaluation, and Assessment Services Advisory Council.

Two year moratorium on expansion of testing program initiated by State Board (pilot testing was permitted to continue).

Pilot testing of 10th grade students began.

1977: Testing moratorium was lifted by State Board.

1979: Testing for all 10th grade students was made mandatory beginning fall of 1979.
legislature, no bills were presented which would have attempted to abolish or significantly "water down" the present program. While a few bills relating to the establishment of minimum competency ideas had surfaced during the last few sessions of the legislature, not one of these bills even made it out of committee. A State Department of Education respondent summed up the present tenor toward accountability in Michigan as being "... one of increased acceptance -- the vocal opposition that existed years ago is no longer heard."

**Analysis of Policy Development**

As explained earlier, ten sub-parts to the first major question were utilized in the development of the case study for accountability legislation in Michigan. The questions were used as general guidelines in the collection of data and in developing the unstructured interviews given to respondents. As a succinct review of the Michigan accountability legislation policy development, following are the research questions along with summary responses.

1) Who initiated the demand for accountability legislation or was most responsible for making it an issue?

The demand for accountability legislation in Michigan was initiated by the State Superintendent of Public Education and the State Department of Education. Initially, the Michigan Department of Education's Bureau of Research
prepared a paper suggesting that the Department undertake a statewide testing effort. The paper was given only to Ira Polley (State Superintendent of Public Instruction) and to one of his assistants. Polley indicated that his initial reaction to the testing proposal was quite positive and that he immediately began to consider possible ways of securing funding from the legislature to initiate a statewide testing program.

2) What was the position taken by that individual or group?

The State Superintendent and Department supported the idea of developing a statewide testing program. They also clearly understood that their notion was potentially controversial and attempted to move on the idea with discretion.

Polley decided that the two most viable possibilities to secure funding from the legislature were (1) to introduce legislation both mandating the program and providing the necessary funds, or (2) to establish and fund the program by adding a line item to the Department's annual budget for operations.

3) Which other individuals or groups, if any, were important participants? What role, if any, was played by the professional teachers' group(s)?

Superintendent Polley presented the assessment idea to the State Board of Education and quickly gained its support. The State Board became an important participant not only because it supported the assessment proposal, but also
because it did not accept the Superintendent's recommendation for a three year planning period prior to implementation.

The two Michigan teachers' groups (along with the administrator and school board groups) were informed by the Department that an assessment proposal was going to be presented to the State Board of Education. It was not apparent, however, that their opinions or concerns regarding the issue were solicited. In fact, it did not appear that the teachers' associations were involved in any way with the assessment issue prior to the passage of the legislation.

4) When did these activities take place? Did the early alignments and positions undergo major shifts over time? If so, how and why?

The original paper presenting the assessment program idea by the Michigan Department of Education's Bureau of Research was prepared in late 1968. Superintendent Polley presented the assessment proposal in memorandum form to the State Board of Education in January of 1969.45

The positive stance toward testing and accountability on the part of the Michigan State Superintendent, State Department of Education, and Board of Education has remained fairly constant over time. The only major departure from this position occurred in 1975 when the State Board of Education declared a two year moratorium on the expansion of the testing program. The moratorium was viewed by observers as a cautious reaction by the Board to some public concern about testing that was being expressed at that time.
5) Was this state influenced by the legislation and related activity of the other two states? If so, in what ways?

It was not apparent that Michigan was influenced by any of the related activities in Colorado and Ohio.

6) What did the participants do to win support or neutralize opponents? Which participants seemed to be particularly effective? Why? What were their sources of influence and points of access?

It appeared that the most activity within this area occurred among the support group members themselves when State Superintendent Polley and the State Board of Education were attempting to compromise on a proposal to take to the legislature. In his first memorandum to the Board on the subject of a proposed testing program, Polley outlined the basic purposes of such a program. The Board responded by passing a resolution in favor of the testing program concept.

In a second memorandum, Polley outlined a full implementation plan for a state testing program which included a three year planning period. The Board, however, felt a need for more immediate action, and passed a resolution which stated that the testing program was to begin that following school year at two grade levels and was to be fully implemented over a three year period.

The proposed testing program was then taken to the legislature as a line item addition to the Department's annual budget legislation. There was no opposition to this proposal by legislators. Governor Milliken was also fully supportive of the testing program proposal.
It is likely that the primary actors were effective due to the Governor's support and the fact that the press for increased accountability was a fairly commonplace phenomenon across the nation during that particular point in time. Obviously, the state legislature and the Governor were the final decision-makers.

7) When did the matter come up for formal consideration by the state legislature and/or the state board of education? While it was being considered by the legislature and/or board, what policy proposals were the main focus of attention?

   a. What was the content of each proposal?

   b. Who presented them? Who actually formulated them?

   c. Which of the contending individuals and groups supported each one?

The assessment proposal, as was previously explained, was given to the State Board by Superintendent Polley in January of 1969. The Board altered a portion of Polley's recommendation by discounting the need for three years in which to plan, and, instead, insisted that the assessment plan be implemented the following school year.

The assessment program was then taken to the legislature in the form of a line item addition to the Department's appropriation. There were no alternate assessment (or accountability) proposals.

The actual assessment proposal was formulated by the State Superintendent, State Department of Education, and
State Board of Education. It was presented to the legislature by the State Superintendent. The proposal gave the State Department of Education the authority to plan and develop a statewide assessment program to be implemented at one or more grade levels for the 1969-70 school year. The proposal carried with it a funding level of $248,854.

8) Basically, how did the final decision get made? Who persuaded whom and how did they do it?

The final decision was apparently made with little fanfare or conflict. The assessment proposal was presented by the State Superintendent and Department of Education, who persuaded the legislators and Governor to support it. From all accounts, very little persuasion was needed to gain this support. On August 12, 1969, Governor Milliken signed the annual appropriations with the inclusion of the assessment provision.

9) Which individual or group was most responsible for the decision that was finally enacted? Which individual or group might be said to have 'won' by this decision? Who might have 'lost'?

The State Department of Education, State Superintendent, and State Board of Education were the actors most responsible for the decision that was finally enacted. Since there were no opposing groups, there were no individuals or groups that actually 'lost;' however, the professional educator groups were not permitted to have significant input into the process.
10) What events have taken place since the original decision? What do the present participants perceive as being the major results of the original decision? How have the professional teachers' group(s) related to the issue since the passage of the legislation?

A great deal of controversy has surrounded accountability (particularly assessment) in Michigan since the original decision was made. Perhaps the most significant events that have taken place since the original decision are the following:

(1) The assessment component became an integral part of a state accountability model.

(2) The Michigan Department of Education was forced, through public pressure and prior legislation, to reveal district test scores publicly. This ultimately led to a ranking of school districts.

(3) The norm-referenced program was eliminated in 1973 and replaced with criterion-referenced tests.

(4) In 1975 a state assessment advisory council was established.

(5) In 1975 the "Long Range Plan for Michigan's Assessment Program" was established.

(6) Several "minimum competency" type bills surfaced in the legislature but none even made it out of committee.

Aside from the teachers' groups, the major participants apparently feel that the accountability program has been successful and should continue. Respondents indicated that the level of controversy has subsided considerably in the past few years.
The Michigan teachers' groups have opposed the statewide assessment program since its inception. In 1974, the Michigan Education Association and the National Education Association contracted for an "assessment" of the Michigan accountability system. The final report was highly critical of the program and received nationwide publicity. Other than contributing to the controversy surrounding the assessment program, it is not clear what impact the teachers' opposition has actually had upon the program. There have been no bills presented to the legislature which would have attempted to eliminate or "water-down" the present assessment program.

**Five Stage Framework Analysis**

The five-stage analytical framework shed some light on the accountability process as it occurred in Michigan. Following is a policy summary using this framework for the accountability legislation. The process will be viewed in greater depth in the comparative analysis employed in Chapter VII.

**Issue Definition - Stage I:** This is the process by which the preferences of individuals and groups become translated into political issues (i.e., a demand that members of the political system are prepared to deal with as a significant item). This initial stage is the origin of the issue, and it is the point where private preferences
are made public or where we find out who it is that authorities take seriously. Questions asked at this stage are:

1. How is it that private conflicts are made public?

2. How do problems become issues?

3. How does the wider public become involved in the issue? Or, does it at all?

In the 1960's Michigan was susceptible to the "accountability movement" sweeping across the nation. Because of its labor-oriented political environment, Michigan may have been more vulnerable to public pressure for accountability than other, more conservative, states.

Accountability actually became an issue at the initiation of the State Department of Education, the Chief State School Officer, and the State Board of Education. The Department's Bureau of Research initially submitted a proposal to the State Superintendent recommending that Michigan initiate a state-wide assessment program. The Superintendent supported the idea and presented it in memorandum form to the State Board of Education. The Board responded favorably to the proposed program; however, it deleted a requested three year planning period and insisted that assessment begin that following school year.

Proposal Formulation - Stage II: This is the process by which issues are formulated as specific proposals for a
policy change or for maintaining the status quo. It is during this second stage that issues get translated into concrete proposals. This is a 'screening' point where certain actors are listened to, while others are not. It is also a 'combination' point where ideas are aggregated. Questions which are asked at this stage are:

1. Who developed the proposals?

2. Who was listened to and who was left out? Why?

3. What was combined?

The Chief State School Officer, State Department of Education, and State Board of Education were responsible for the development of the assessment proposal. The initial recommendation was submitted to Superintendent Polley, who, in turn, gave a memorandum outlining the program to the State Board of Education. The Superintendent decided to request the program (with funding) through a line item addition to the Department's annual appropriation.

The educational interest groups appeared to have been all but left out of the picture during this stage. Before the proposal was submitted to the board, it had been circulated to the four major educational interest groups; however, respondents indicated that these groups were not given the opportunity to have input into the plan. It would appear these groups may have been left out due to evidence indicating a strained relationship between the educational
interest groups and the State Department of Education at that period in time. Also, accountability was probably considered by the Department to be a fairly easy issue to "sell" to legislators, without the aid of the various interest groups.

**Support Mobilization - Stage III:** During this stage, individuals and groups are activated to support or oppose alternative policy proposals. This is the 'politics' stage, and it includes the tactics and strategies of securing allies and neutralizing opponents. Some questions asked at this stage are:

1. Who did important actors get to support them?
2. What techniques did they utilize in this effort?
3. Was there coalition formation? If so, who was involved?
4. How did the various actors attempt to influence each other?

The State Department of Education, Chief State School Officer, and State Board of Education developed the assessment proposal. From all accounts, the Department had to do very little to gain the support of the legislature and the Governor. The Governor had previously stated his support of accountability. The bill went through the legislature with little fan-fare and was signed into law by the Governor.
There was no coalition formation because there was no need for one. The interest groups were not involved in either a support or opposition role.

**Decision Enactment - Stage IV:** The fourth stage is the process by which an authoritative (i.e., governmental) policy choice is made among alternative proposals. This is the stage at which bargains are made, arguments are evaluated, and a decision is reached. Questions asked at this stage are:

1. What were the trade-offs as a result of the bargaining?
2. What were the final bargains?
3. Who were the winners? And who were the losers?

In Michigan, there were no trade-offs as a result of bargaining. The Department's proposal was signed into law as it had been presented.

The line item addition to the Department's appropriations mandated that the State Department of Education develop a program to assess the educational progress of students, and that the assessment was to begin that up-coming school year. This meant that the tests had to be developed in just a four month time span. The Michigan assessment program was funded at a level of $248,854.

The 'winners' in Michigan were the State Department of Education, the Chief State School Officer, and the State Board of Education. While the educational interest groups
did not oppose the legislation, they were, in actuality, not given a part in the policy process.

*Implementation - Stage V:* It is during this final stage that the enacted policy decision is carried out or implemented. Questions asked at this stage are:

1. With what degree of success has the enacted policy decision been carried out thus far?

2. Who are the proponents and opponents?

3. Have the positions of the various actors shifted from previous stages, and, if so, why?

Several years after the assessment program was initiated, a full scale accountability model was developed by the State Department of Education. Assessment became the third stage of this six stage model. In addition, a long range expansion plan was established. Due to financial and political constraints, the long range plan has never been fully implemented and the assessment program itself has been substantially revised over the years.

Controversy erupted for the first time in the policy process during the implementation stage and has continued to be in existence to some degree to the present. Controversy has centered on many aspects of the program, including public release of test data and subsequent "ranking" of school districts, socio-economic test items, and the ultimate usefulness of test results.
The professional teachers' associations, while not involved in the first four stages, have maintained a strong opposition to assessment since its passage. They contend that the program is unproductive and has misled the public. At the same time, the program is still strongly supported by the State Department of Education and has not been altered by the state legislature.

**Summary**

The five stage framework analysis describing the development of educational accountability legislation in Michigan revealed that controversy occurred during the final implementation stage rather than during the developmental stages of the legislation.

In the first stage, Issue Definition, we saw that while the accountability notion had surfaced on a general level, it actually became an issue through the initiation of the State Department of Education, State Superintendent and State Board of Education.

In the second stage, Proposal Formulation, we noted that the State Superintendent, State Department of Education and State Board of Education were responsible for the development of the assessment proposal; and that the educational interest groups were essentially left out at this stage.

It was pointed out that there was not a great deal of activity during the third stage of Support Mobilization. The
Department easily gained the support of the Governor and legislature for its assessment proposal.

During the fourth stage, Decision Enactment, it was shown that there were no bargaining trade-offs as the Department's proposal was enacted in the form it was presented. The final legislation mandated that the Department develop an assessment program that was to begin that up-coming school year at two grade levels.

During the fifth stage, Implementation, a full scale accountability model was developed by the Michigan Department of Education. Controversy erupted for the first time during this stage and has continued to the present.
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CHAPTER VI

EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY IN

OHIO -- A CASE STUDY

The Setting

Republican dominated Ohio was, in the 1960's and early 1970's, considered to be a state of moderation.¹

... the salient political factors (were) generally rural and especially small city Republicanism, and the fact that metropolises like Columbus and Cincinnati -- despite great industries, labor unions, and black population -- have been so dominated by the thought patterns of their conservative establishments that they register Republican majorities in virtually every election.²

Education was not a top priority of the state. In fact, measured against its ability to pay, Ohio by the late 1960's stood 48th among the states in its support of education; 43rd in health and hospitals; 38th in public welfare; and 46th in its support of mental health programs.

Heavy manufacturing dominated the Ohio economy. This was due in large part to Governor (from 1963 to 1971) James A. Rhodes. Rhodes brought thousands of new industries into Ohio during those years with the slogan, "Profit is not a dirty word in Ohio."³ Prospective advertisers were reminded that Ohio had the lowest state and local taxes in
the country, and that they would stay that way if Rhodes had anything to do with it.

According to Peirce:

The hallmarks of the Rhodes approach were to keep taxes low, to move ahead of all the states in completion of interstate roads, to get state financing for industrial bonds to save businesses first investment costs, and to promote the Ohio State Fair until it became the nation's most successful.4

Organized labor in Ohio during the 1960's was fragmented. Unlike Michigan's UAW, Ohio had no single dominant union. The Ohio labor leaders were not considered to be issue-oriented like their counterparts in Michigan, but were viewed as "a bread and butter lot, from whom politics was a secondary consideration."5

Legislative lobbying was a million dollar business in Ohio.6 A 1969 series of articles on "How the Ohio Legislature Really Works," in the Cleveland Plain-Dealer, depicted a less than ideal picture of how legislative decisions were made. The articles indicated that while the days of cash pay-offs, big-time "bosses," and drunken brawls were gone, not gone were:

... the tremendous power of the special interest lobbyists who lurk in the legislative halls,
... the power of the press -- a power not always used with ethical detachment,
... the logrolling and pork-barreling which waste millions of dollars of tax money in the home districts of particularly powerful committee chairmen,
... a governor who will buy votes with promises of public works projects -- needed or not -- in legislators' home districts.7

In 1971, John Gilligan took over at the Governor's helm. Unlike Rhodes, Gilligan insisted that Ohio would need new taxes to provide adequate services to its people. The
biennial budget proposed by Gilligan in 1971 was 50 percent
greater than Rhodes' prior budget. Consequently, Gilligan
recommended that the Ohio General Assembly pass the first
income tax in Ohio's history.

Legislative Initiative

In 1971, the 109th Ohio General Assembly passed
Amended Substitute House Bill 475, an omnibus school
finance bill allocating over a two million dollar increase
toward the support of elementary and secondary education.
The fact that Ohio's legislators were doling out a higher
than customary appropriation to education that year apparent-
ly precipitated their legislating within H.B. 475 a specific
directive regarding accountability. The mandate as stated
in law was as follows:

The state department shall develop a
comprehensive system for providing educational
management and accountability capabilities. The
system shall be designed for eventual implemen-
tation on a state-wide basis and shall utilize
the technology of the computer and related
systems concepts. Developmental work by the
department shall utilize pilot school districts
and shall strive, with regard to all public
and non-public elementary and secondary schools in
the state, to (1) define those measurable objectives
for which each facet and level of public education
is to be held accountable; (2) identify pertinent
data elements and devise methods and systems for
fairly accurately and uniformly measuring and
reporting the extent to which the defined objectives
are met; (3) develop uniform files, methods, and
systems for collecting, processing, storing, and
analyzing data which will permit identification of
those factors in the teaching-learning process which
have the greatest relevance to student performance; (4) develop uniform accounting methods and systems learning outcome; and (5) develop uniform systems of reporting the findings to all interested persons.

The department may employ additional personnel and may contract with such experts and consultants as it deems necessary to carry out the duties imposed on it by this section. The department shall submit to the general assembly on or before June 30, 1972, a report on its progress in meeting the goals of the accountability program as herein expressed. It shall submit a final complete program and report to the general assembly on or before June 30, 1973, along with recommendations for complete implementation and maintenance of an ongoing educational management information and accountability system. 8

This accountability directive, according to respondents, did not originate from a large "ground swell." In fact, it apparently surfaced in conference committee as a "trade-off" to get the first statewide income tax passed. This becomes more understandable upon analysis of the impact of this major bill.

Amended Substitute House Bill 475 provided for the most significant state increase in school funding in Ohio in more than four decades. It included a graduated income tax and a corporate income tax for the first time in Ohio's history. The most significant financial benefits of this piece of legislation were: 1) a $217.6 million annual increase for elementary and secondary education, 2) a homestead exemption for providing retired householders relief from property tax, amounting to $30 million, and 3) a ten per cent rollback in property taxes for each Ohio taxpayer amounting to $133.9 million.
The general feeling of respondents was that the legislators, in order to appear responsible, wanted to examine accountability measures that would accompany their dollars; hence, the accountability directive. In response to the accountability mandate, The President of the State Board of Education appointed an Educational Redesign and Improvement Committee. A major project, termed the "Search for Consensus," was initiated by this committee under the direction of the State Department of Education and Superintendent of Public Instruction. According to the voluminous concluding report submitted to the legislature by the Department of Education, the Search for Consensus involved two major thrusts:

(1) the effort to develop an accountability model which assisted in improving instruction in Ohio schools; and (2) a procedure for gathering citizen input concerning their priorities for schools.9

The first phase of the "Search" involved the solicitation of opinions of more than 125,000 Ohio citizens regarding educational issues. Over six hundred local meetings were conducted centering around a questionnaire designed by the Department. Comments from respondents indicated that these meetings went very well and that the public seemed pleased to be asked their opinion.

Ten major concerns of the public toward education were derived from the local meetings. Included among them were the following:
1) Communication between the school and community must be improved.

2) The public should be kept informed about the schools through additional printed materials such as a school newsletter or the local paper.

3) Teacher performance should be evaluated on a regular basis.

4) Basic education -- the three R's -- should be emphasized to provide every student with the fundamental skills necessary to function in this technological age.  

Following the local meetings, a series of county meetings were held throughout the state's eighty-eight counties. A list of tentative state goals for education were used as a basis for discussion at these meetings. The county sessions, however, began to receive unfavorable newspaper coverage for the Department. According to one respondent, many of the participants had also attended the local meetings and became concerned when they could see little connection to the original meetings. There were also charges from all sides that teacher union (Ohio Education Association and/or Ohio Federation of Teachers) members were "packing" the meetings and, therefore, skewing the results to their own biases.

The Department reacted quickly to the controversy by highly structuring twelve regional conferences which were to be the next step in the Search process. The regional conferences provided more obvious linkage to the earlier meetings by offering participants a forced choice questionnaire containing many items from the first questionnaire given at the local meetings as well as items developed at the county meetings.
In further response to the legislative mandate, the Department requested (and subsequently funded) a proposal from the Ohio State University Evaluation Center for the design of a system of educational accountability for the state. The proposal submitted to the Department outlined a systematic engagement of recognized educators, curriculum specialists, and evaluation personnel in efforts to define accountability strategies. The contract between the Department and the Evaluation Center required:

1) The preparation of specifications for the design of an accountability system.

2) The selection and orientation of consultants.

3) The design of viable alternatives.

4) The evaluation of the alternative designs.

5) The orientation of department of education personnel concerning the accountability system.11

The Evaluation Center, in turn, established eight fundamental requirements for the yet to be designed accountability model. The model must:

1. Be based on a coherent and valid definition of accountability.

2. Have clearly defined purposes.

3. Have explicit operating policies.

4. Be based on a coherent, valid, and useful analysis of all existing efforts.

5. Be supported by a sound evaluation system.

6. Have functional procedures that are systematic, cycling, and dynamic.

7. Recognize the need for personnel proficient in implementing accountability procedures.
8. Project an appropriate budget.  

Finally, the Evaluation Center proposal called for the utilization of three separate teams, each charged with the responsibility of developing an accountability model. Simultaneous to the county and regional Search for Consensus meetings, therefore, a group of nationally recognized experts was called upon to develop three separate state accountability models.

In addition to the three models developed by the experts, three additional models were developed by the Department based on practices in other states.

In April of 1973, the final state meeting of the Search for Consensus was held in Columbus. This meeting attracted over 1500 participants from all areas of the state. The focus of the state meeting was educational redesign and accountability. Small groups interested in educational redesign considered issues in the areas of teacher education, educational governance, curriculum, student programming, and school-community relations. Other groups interested in accountability considered the six accountability models. Summaries of the models were provided to the participants and video-tape presentations were given on each of the models.

On June 30, 1973 the Ohio Department of Education responded to the legislative mandate in H.B. 475 with a report containing results of the Search for Consensus and
the Department's recommendations on accountability for Ohio.

A summary of the Department's response to each of the five points of the legislation follows:

I. "THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHALL...(1) DEFINE THOSE MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES FOR WHICH EACH FACET AND LEVEL OF PUBLIC EDUCATION IS TO BE HELD ACCOUNTABLE."

On June 11, 1973, the State Board of Education adopted a broad set of goals. Those goals were in the areas of: Basic Academic Skills; Capabilities of Aesthetic Experience; Career Education; Human Relations, Family Living and Personal Development; Learning to be a Learner; and Physical Fitness, Recreation and Mental Health.

It is RECOMMENDED that those goals serve as the broad framework in which further measurable objectives for all facets and levels of public education in Ohio be developed.

II. "THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHALL...(2) IDENTIFY PERTINENT DATA ELEMENTS AND DEVISE METHODS AND SYSTEMS FOR FAIRLY, ACCURATELY AND UNIFORMLY MEASURING AND REPORTING THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE DEFINED OBJECTIVES ARE MET."

Six accountability instruments have emerged through the Department's efforts to design accountability procedures in the past year. Each of the models is unique and they reflect the diversity of opinion and research in the areas of assessment and accountability. In addition, they reflect the lack of acceptable and proven accountability procedures as well as the limited development of effective testing and measuring processes.

The six proposed accountability procedures include the best thoughts of this nation's most knowledgeable scholars in measurement and evaluation, but there is no assurance that any of the models would effectively improve instruction in Ohio. Hence, it is RECOMMENDED that, due to the established principles of local school district decision-making authority and the varied characteristics of the more than 600 school districts in Ohio, each school district be provided with the option to use varied
accountability procedures. Such an arrangement would be in keeping with the ways in which American education has improved. Certain elements of the six models could be adopted or adapted in this process. Technical assistance for the adaptation could be provided by Department of Education staff members. (See Recommendation 5) This arrangement could maximize utilization of valuable data generated in the accountability procedures development. Such explorations, which have characterized American schools in the past could provide a setting in which conditions would be propitious for evolving efficient and practical applications or means of measurement and evaluation.

III. "THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHALL...(3) DEVELOP UNIFORM FILES, METHODS AND SYSTEMS FOR COLLECTING, PROCESSING, STORING AND ANALYZING DATA WHICH WILL PERMIT IDENTIFICATION OF THOSE FACTORS IN THE TEACHING LEARNING PROCESS WHICH HAVE THE GREATEST RELEVANCE TO STUDENT PERFORMANCE."

An extensive review of the Department of Education's 229 collection instruments has resulted in a proposed redesign of the Department data collection process. That redesign includes the development of six new forms which would replace many present collection instruments. The six new forms would collect 41% of all the data collected by the Department.

It is RECOMMENDED that the revised forms be field tested during the fall of 1973 to determine the feasibility of the new collection system. This date is recommended so that the revised forms may be used simultaneously with the original documents. This procedure would allow for a direct comparison of the advantages and difficulties of the new forms and would avoid possible problems of a lack of needed information if the new system did not function effectively. The purpose of the field testing would be to determine if the revised forms meet the objectives of eliminating duplication, reducing costs, minimizing clerical time and simplifying forms.

IV. "THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHALL...(4) DEVELOP UNIFORM ACCOUNTING METHODS AND SYSTEMS LEARNING OUTCOME."

In response to the need for uniform accounting methods, an Ohio Task Force for Evaluation of
Accounting Systems was appointed. The Task Force, which was chaired by Dr. Paul Spayde, Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction and was comprised of representatives from the State Auditor's Office and persons from various school districts throughout Ohio. A chart of accounts for an approved means of accounting for funding at four levels was recommended by the Task Force. It includes a recommended structure which would permit the identification, budgeting, and accounting of expenditures or determination of cost by: (1) source (local, state, federal or other); (2) type of instruction (regular, summer, basic, vocational or special); (3) grade level (pre-kindergarten, elementary, middle, junior high or senior high) and (4) subject matter (agriculture, art, business, etc.).

To test the Task Force suggestions, it is RECOMMENDED that during the 1973-74 school year, pilot Ohio school districts be identified for purposes of establishing the feasibility of the suggested chart of accounts.

V. "THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHALL... (5) DEVELOP UNIFORM SYSTEMS OF REPORTING THE FINDINGS OF THE PROGRAM TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS."

If the process of developing individual school district accountability is implemented, it would appear advisable to provide school districts with considerable technical assistance.

To provide for this technical assistance in the development of effective accountability instruments and to assist districts in reporting the effectiveness and utilization of funds to the persons associated with the management of schools, including boards of education and the citizenry at large, it is RECOMMENDED that state financial support for at least two full-time professional persons be provided during the initial stages of development of the accountability instruments. These persons could be new staff persons. To achieve this objective, additional personnel would probably need to be added in future years.13
As was evidenced in the preceding, of the five points identified in the legislation, actually, according to State Department sources, only one of them, the accounting system, was "recommended for action." One respondent indicated that when the Department's detailed and very thick report was sent to the legislature, it "just died." This same respondent also indicated that this lack of response could have been tied to the fact that there "was no great ground-swell" for accountability in the first place.

Also related to Ohio's lack of a strong push for more accountability at this point in time was State Superintendent Martin W. Essex' posture that Ohio should not be caught in the fold of what several respondents termed "the Michigan disaster." With its close proximity to Michigan, newspaper reports of the turmoil surrounding the release of testing data in Michigan, followed by a "ranking" of districts (based on normative referenced test scores) which left Detroit at the bottom, were scanned carefully by Ohio educators and legislators.

Dr. Essex, in fact, recalled taking the Michigan newspaper reports to legislators and asking, "Is this what you want?" The State Superintendent explained to the legislators that testing was already taking place in Ohio's schools, as mandated by state standards, for diagnostic and prescriptive purposes. According to Essex, he told legislators that if they wanted testing as a basis for comparison to publish a
ranking of school districts, they had better be prepared for the reaction of parents in the lower ranking districts. Perhaps, he said, parents who could afford to leave would be compelled to try; and "white flight" would probably be encouraged rather than attempting to get at the heart of some of the difficult problems affecting the state's urban centers. Dr. Essex acknowledged that the legislators apparently had listened both to him and to the citizenry through the Search for Consensus in that they did not prescribe and accepted the Department's recommendations.

Additional Legislation is Enacted

The Ohio General Assembly finally moved on accountability in a more precise manner in 1975, when it passed amended substitute Senate Bill 170. S.B. 170 contained a new "equal yield" formula for funding elementary and secondary schools as well as several accountability items. The formula was largely the result of the work of a legislatively appointed "Education Review Committee" working with a team from Syracuse University headed by Dr. Joel Burke.

Relevant sections of S.B. 170 are cited as follows:

I. UNIFORM ACCOUNTING SYSTEM

... adopt and require within each school district the use of a uniform cost accounting whereby the direct and indirect costs of all school district activities, including athletics and non-instructional activities, regardless of the source of funding, can be analyzed.
II. ASSESSMENT

The Department of Education shall administer annual educational assessment programs in accordance with rules and standards adopted by the state board of education . . . The program shall require studies to be conducted to provide data from samples of Ohio students for a variety of subjects and skill areas, which shall include reading and English composition at several age and grade levels. The standards used shall be objective and based on criteria established by the education profession for each grade and age level. Data referenced to state and national norms may also be collected and analyzed. Data collected shall be used to identify schooling needs according to socioeconomic, demographic, and other characteristics and shall be treated to preserve the anonymity of students, teachers, schools and school districts . . .

III. ASSESSMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

An advisory committee on educational assessment shall be appointed by the state board of education . . . the committee shall consult with representatives of the education profession and local boards of education and with other governmental officials and citizens in drawing up proposed plans and standards . . .

IV. DISTRICT ANNUAL REPORTS

The board of education of each school district shall issue an annual report of school progress for each school under its control and for the district according to guidelines established by the State Board of Education . . . The reports shall contain information about the achievements, problems, plans, and improvements in the school or school district . . . The reports shall be issued to the local community of each school and district and shall be made in formats useful for parents and residents of the district. The first reports shall be issued no later than November 1, 1976.
State Department officials indicated they had reacted negatively to the accountability components of the legislation, particularly the assessment mandate, but that they were unable to eliminate them. When State Department personnel realized that they would have to live with assessment, they determined the costs of running an adequate program through a survey of other states. While it was anticipated that the Department would need at least $300,000 to implement statewide assessment, the initial appropriation was only $25,000 (which was subsequently increased to $50,000 per year).

The twenty-four member Ohio Assessment and Annual Report Advisory Committee was formed, and it conducted six regional meetings in 1976 for the purpose of gathering ideas and opinions about what should be included in Ohio's assessment and annual reports. Much of the testimony received pointed to a sentiment against publishing test scores. As an example, a position paper submitted to the committee by the school administrator's association contained the following statement:

We believe that there should be no disagreement regarding the necessity to protect the anonymity of students, teachers, schools, and school districts. . . We are very concerned that some citizens would like to use data collected through assessment to rank buildings and districts accordingly. There are real damages in doing so! We can think of absolutely no justification for permitting a release of data which could ultimately lead to rankings . .
Several years after accountability originally surfaced in Ohio, the educational forces were still adamantly saying "no!" to the idea of releasing state assessment data to the public which could be used to rank school districts.

The committee drafted guidelines for assessment. It determined that the first annual state mandated assessment would include reading in grades 4, 8, and 12; English composition in grade 8; and mathematics in grade 8. The anonymity of students, teachers, schools, and school districts was totally preserved as only certain socio-economic and demographic data were to be collected. The committee built the annual report guidelines around the philosophy that districts should not be required to publish test scores. The guidelines indicated that districts should inform parents and community members what tests are administered and where and how parents can see the individual scores of their children. According to one Department official, the guidelines "gave us flexibility."

The first round of mandated assessment, utilizing a sampling procedure, took place in April of 1977. According to a report developed by the Ohio Department of Education, some of the major findings after the first year of testing included the following:
The overall test results and reporting group comparisons confirm previously documented conclusions about student performance in Ohio. Based on the results of the instructional areas measured in the 1977 assessment, Ohio schools are doing better than some critics believe, but there is room for improvement.

The comparatively lower scores of minority and low socioeconomic status students on all five tests may indicate a continuing need to focus resources on the education of minority students and those from low socioeconomic backgrounds.16

Respondents indicated that, in general, there was very little response to the accountability mandates in S.B. 170. One representative from the state superintendents' organization (Buckeye Association of School Administrators) indicated that while superintendents were generally opposed to the legislation mandating annual reports, they quickly began to have pride in the reports and now generally have positive attitudes toward them. The respondent's comment regarding assessment was "I haven't heard anything about the assessment portion." The respondent from the Ohio School Boards Association (OSBA) stated that in his opinion there was very little reaction to either the testing or the annual reports.

**Minimum Competency Becomes an Issue**

In August of 1977, Amended Substitute Senate Bill 221 was enacted, requiring that the Ohio Assessment and Annual Report Advisory Committee make recommendations to the State Board of Education regarding the implementation of a minimum competency examination as a prerequisite for promotion of all pupils to grades 5 and 9 and for graduation from high school. The legislation required that the
committee transmit the recommendations to the Chairpersons of the Senate and House Education Committees of the General Assembly by July 1, 1978. In April of 1977, Dr. Franklin B. Walter, then recently appointed State Superintendent of Public Instruction, had established an internal Ohio Department of Education Task Force on Minimum Competency Expectations. This committee worked in conjunction with the state committee.

The State Assessment Advisory Committee incorporated a variety of procedures in the collection of data on minimum competencies, including a survey of practices found in other states and a symposium of six state departments of education. Foremost in its data collection effort, however, were thirteen regional forums on educational competency designed to gather testimony from citizens and educators in Ohio.

The largest state teacher's association (OEA), according to a respondent from that group, became more involved in the accountability movement at this point in time than it had previously. The stand taken by the OEA was considered to be a large departure from that of other teacher associations because it was in support of testing. "We decided," said an OEA respondent, "we'd be better off taking a positive approach toward testing than being against it." The OEA stance, however, included several key qualifications:

(1) that the state provide funds to establish remedial programs at all levels to give pupils not meeting certain competencies a chance to gain the skills they lack,
(2) that the results of testing not be used as a criterion for teacher evaluation, employment status, or compensation, and

(3) that all costs for implementing a minimum competency program be paid by the state rather than by local districts.\textsuperscript{17}

In its final report on minimum competency submitted to the State Board of Education and General Assembly, the State Assessment Advisory Committee compiled a list of twenty-two items which were identified as "Concerns of Citizens and Educators." A sampling from that list follows:

(1) Will the test results be used unfairly to compare students, teachers, administrators, schools, or school districts?

(2) Will the state provide adequate funding?

(3) Will local control be further eroded?

(4) Will the test results be used unfairly to evaluate teachers?

(5) Will we end up with a state curriculum?\textsuperscript{18}

As seen from the list above, while accountability in Ohio kept resurfacing, the issues remained unchanged over the years. The force for accountability (in the framework of minimum competency) appeared to emanate again from the legislature, while, in general, the education arena continued to say, "Hold on -- and if anything is done at all it should be done slowly." An OEA respondent commented that S.B. 221 was looked upon by many as a legislative compromise to give people interested in accountability something to hold on to, but yet put the responsibility back into the hands of the department "where it could get buried again."
The final recommendation of the State Accountability Advisory Committee can be summarized as follows:

(1) Student minimum competencies can best be achieved by a thorough revision and rigid enforcement of the Minimum Standards for Ohio Schools.

(2) As a result of its review of the 1977 assessment results and the public testimony of citizens, parents, educators, and representatives of educational organizations gathered in thirteen regional public forums, no mandated minimum competency testing should be implemented as a prerequisite for promotion to grades 5 and 9 and for graduation, and further, the Committee is opposed to the use of any state mandated test as a final determination for promotion or graduation.19

The notion of minimum competency for Ohio's students did not die, however, with this committee's final recommendations. During the 1977-78 session of the Ohio General Assembly, House Bill 6 was introduced but died in committee. It would have required a state "achievement examination" for all students in grades 3, 6, 9, and 11 as a prerequisite to promotion to the next grade level. Failure would mean no promotion to the next grade.

In the Spring of 1979, the department's Task Force on Minimum Competency produced a Competency Handbook.20 This booklet was designed to aid educators in the development of local minimum competency programs. According to Dr. Walter, "This is not a prescriptive, lay down the law sort of book. It is flexible enough to be helpful in various different sorts of programs. Like a cookbook, it allows you to choose the sort of program you need and it provides different
recipes for different situations." The department competency handbook was formulated on the notion of local versus state level control over minimum competency programs.

Simultaneous to a series of Department workshops on the Competency Handbook, the Ohio General Assembly again renewed its interest in the area of minimum competency. House Bill 349 demanded that the State Board develop minimum achievement standards for various grade levels in the areas of reading, writing, and mathematics; and examinations to measure pupils' progress as a prerequisite to higher grades. It provided for four re-examinations until the standard is achieved and it demanded an examination for graduation. Pupils failing to pass tests, even after re-mediation efforts, would be given a certificate of completion but not a high school diploma.

Also introduced in the 1979-80 General Assembly was House Bill 491 which demanded that minimum achievement standards be adopted for each course at every grade level. Both of these pieces of legislation failed to be adopted by the Ohio General Assembly.

Finally, in June of 1979, Senate Bill 59 was enacted. One portion of this bill repealed the sections of Senate Bill 170 (1975) that had established a state assessment program and a state assessment committee. This interesting turn reflected a fundamental lack of concern about accountability on the part of the legislature and educators.
What future does educational accountability have in Ohio? While several respondents indicated that they wished that they had the answer to this somewhat nagging question, the OEA respondent did give a very firm response. "Accountability in Ohio," he said, "has been a game played between a few interested legislators and the Department of Education. Very little has resulted so far and I don't think anything actually ever will."

Analysis of Policy Development

As explained earlier, ten sub-parts to the first major research question were utilized in the development of the case study for accountability legislation in Ohio. The questions were used as general guidelines in the collection of data and in developing the unstructured interviews given to respondents. As a succinct review of the Ohio accountability legislation policy development, following are the research questions along with summary responses.

1) Who initiated the demand for accountability legislation or was most responsible for making it an issue?

In Ohio, it was the state legislature that initiated the demand for accountability legislation and made it an issue. The consensus of the respondents interviewed was that the accountability issue did not originate from a "groundswell" in Ohio, but, rather was propagated by just a few legislators.
2) What was the position taken by that individual or group?

The state legislature included within omnibus House Bill 475 a mandate directing the State Department of Education to develop a comprehensive system for providing educational management and accountability capabilities. The Department was given two years to develop a program and, then, to report back to the General Assembly with recommendations.

3) Which other individuals or groups, if any, were important participants? What role, if any, was played by the professional teachers' group(s)?

Actually, other than the role of the Department and interest groups explained in response to question #6, there were no other important participants. The major teachers' group played a minor role as explained in response to question six.

4) When did these activities take place? Did the early alignments and positions undergo major shifts over time? If so, how and why?

The Ohio General Assembly put the accountability mandate into effect in 1971.

Basically, the early positions remained stable over time. The legislature continued to try (but not very hard) to implement some type of educational accountability program, and the State Department of Education and State Superintendent continued to support the notion of local control versus state mandates while not actually opposing accountability.
The major state teachers' association (OEA) did shift from a rather inactive role regarding accountability (1971-1976) to a more active role in 1977 of actually supporting testing as long as additional state dollars for extensive remediation programs would be allocated by the legislature.

5) Was this state influenced by the legislation and related activity of the other two states? If so, in what ways?

It did appear that Michigan's assessment program with its prominent controversy possibly had some impact upon what happened in Ohio. Ohio's State Superintendent Essex indicated that he had attempted to influence legislators against following Michigan's lead.

It did not appear that the activity in Colorado affected Ohio.

6) What did the participants do to win support or neutralize opponents? Which participants seemed to be particularly effective? Why? What were their sources of influence and points of access?

The accountability mandate was a "trade-off" between a legislative conference committee and the Department and educational interest groups. The deal was that the income tax, designed to raise additional revenues for schools, would stay in the bill if the accountability mandate stayed in. This did neutralize the potential opponents (the educational groups).

Obviously, the primary participant, the General Assembly, was itself the decision-maker.
7) When did the matter come up for formal consideration by the state legislature and/or the state board of education? While it was being considered by the legislature and/or state board, what policy proposals were the main focus of attention?

a. What was the content of each proposal?

b. Who presented them? Who actually formulated them?

c. Which of the contending individuals and groups supported each one?

The accountability mandate was put before the legislature for formal consideration in 1971. There were no alternative policy proposals for accountability.

The accountability legislation mandated that the department develop a comprehensive system for providing educational management and accountability capabilities. Five areas specified for consideration were: (1) define measurable objectives for which public education is to be held accountable; (2) devise methods for uniform measuring and reporting; (3) develop uniform files for collecting and storing data; (4) develop uniform accounting methods; and (5) develop systems of reporting findings. The department was given two years to submit recommendations in the mandated areas to the General Assembly.

The accountability proposal was actually formulated by several legislators in conference committee; however, respondents indicated that there had been no legislative "groundswell" to initiate accountability. Due to the "trade-off" described earlier, the educational interest groups and
Department of Education supported the accountability mandate because they wanted the larger finance bill to be enacted.

8) Basically, how did the final decision get made? Who persuaded whom and how did they do it?

The final decision was made when several legislators inserted the accountability mandate into a larger finance bill in conference committee and initiated the "trade-off" described earlier. While the large omnibus finance bill was a major legislative issue, the accountability mandate drew little attention. Virtually the entire education community worked together in support of the finance bill.

9) Which individual or group was most responsible for the decision that was finally enacted? Which individual or group might be said to have 'won' by this decision? Who might have 'lost'?

The state legislature was most responsible for the decision that was finally enacted. The legislature could be termed the 'winner.' While the educational interest groups and State Department of Education were not opponents to the legislation, they could, in a sense, be termed 'losers' because they were essentially forced into a supportive role.

10) What events have taken place since the original decision? What do the present participants perceive as being the major results of the original decision? How have the professional teachers' group(s) related to the issue since the passage of the legislation?

The State Department of Education responded to the accountability mandate by initiating the "Search for
Consensus," a process which involved the solicitation of opinions of more than 125,000 Ohio citizens regarding educational issues. The Department also called upon a group of nationally recognized experts to develop a series of models for accountability. The end result, after this two year process, was that the Department returned to the legislature recommending that since no consensus could be reached on accountability, it should not be implemented in Ohio. According to respondents, the accountability issue just 'died' at that point.

Another piece of accountability legislation was passed by the Ohio General Assembly in 1975 with House Bill 170 (primarily a finance bill). This accountability mandate established a State Assessment Advisory Committee; directed the Department to conduct an assessment program designed to preserve the anonymity of students, teachers, and school districts; and directed school districts to report to the public with district annual reports.

In August of 1977, Amended Substitute Senate Bill 221 was enacted requiring that the Ohio Assessment and Annual Report Advisory Committee make recommendations to the State Board of Education regarding the implementation of minimum competency examinations. The committee met throughout the state to gather citizens' opinions and then recommended that minimum competency not be established.
During the 1979-80 session of the General Assembly, several additional pieces of legislation were introduced promoting minimum competency; however none of the bills were enacted.

The original accountability decision, according to present participants had little impact upon the state, although the Department maintains that the "Search for Consensus" had many positive benefits. Actually, several educational interest group respondents had difficulty remembering much about the original legislation as well as the 1975 accountability legislation. Respondents indicated that there was very little reaction when the initial mandate 'died' at the Department's recommendation and that the 1975 mandate caused very little response.

The major state teachers' group (OEA) has not been highly involved in accountability over the years. An OEA respondent indicated that the association became most involved in accountability in 1977 when the state assessment committee was charged with making recommendations on minimum competency to the State Board of Education. They considered the stand they took in favor of testing to be a large departure from the position taken by most other teacher groups. They did include in their position several key qualifications, such as state supported remedial instruction for students not able to meet minimum competencies and that the test results not be used for teacher evaluation.
Five Stage Framework Analysis

The five stage analytical framework shed some light on the accountability process as it occurred in Ohio. Following is a policy summary using this framework for the accountability legislation. The process will be viewed in greater depth in the comparative analysis employed in Chapter VII.

**Issue Definition — Stage I:** This is the process by which the preferences of individuals and groups become translated into political issues (i.e., a demand that members of the political system are prepared to deal with as a significant item). This initial stage is the origin of the issue, and it is the point where private preferences are made public or where we find out who it is that authorities take seriously. Questions asked at this stage are:

1. How is it that private conflicts are made public?
2. How do problems become issues?
3. How does the wider public become involved in the issue? Or, does it at all?

To some degree, the wider public probably impacted upon the accountability issue in Ohio in the sense that an "accountability movement" was sweeping across the nation. Accountability terminology was becoming fairly commonplace and, in general, the public was tightening the money allocated for schools while at the same time demanding more accountability.
The accountability problem became an issue in Ohio, however, through the state legislature alone. While it was raised through the legislature, the accountability notion never seemed to be much of an issue or to have aroused much attention in Ohio. It did not appear that the Ohio General Assembly had expressed much interest in accountability for education before the mandate surfaced in House Bill 475 (an omnibus school finance bill) from conference committee.

Proposal Formulation - Stage II: This is the process by which issues are formulated as specific proposals for a policy change or for maintaining the status quo. It is during this second stage that issues get translated into concrete proposals. This is a 'screening' point where certain actors are listened to, while others are not. It is also a 'combination' point where ideas are aggregated. Questions which are asked at this stage are:

1. Who developed the proposals?
2. Who was listened to and who was left out? Why?
3. What was combined?

In Ohio, the state legislature alone was responsible for developing the accountability proposal. The educational accountability proposal was a small portion of a major school funding bill. When the bill went to conference committee, several legislatures saw this as an opportune time to insert the accountability mandate. Respondents
indicated that the accountability mandate was not the result of a 'groundswell' movement from the legislative body. The next section will indicate why the legislature was alone in proposal formulation with only minimal involvement of the Department and educational interest groups.

Support Mobilization - Stage III: During this stage, individuals and groups are activated to support or oppose alternative policy proposals. This is the 'politics' stage, and it includes the tactics and strategies of securing allies and neutralizing opponents. Some questions asked at this stage are:

1. Who did important actors get to support them?

2. What techniques did they utilize in this effort?

3. Was there coalition formation? If so, who was involved?

4. How did the various actors attempt to influence each other?

The state legislature managed to get the support of the educational interest groups and the Department by instigating a "trade-off." When H.B. 475, a school finance bill, went to conference committee, it still included an income tax. The legislation and the income tax had been strongly supported by all of Ohio's major education groups. While in conference committee, several legislators inserted the accountability mandate and informed the education groups that the income tax would remain if the accountability section remained. The
education groups bought this, and as a result, did not oppose the accountability mandate.

**Decision Enactment - Stage IV:** The fourth stage is the process by which an authoritative (i.e., governmental) policy choice is made among alternative proposals. This is the stage at which bargains are made, arguments are evaluated, and a decision is reached. Questions asked at this stage are:

1. What were the trade-offs as a result of the bargaining?
2. Who were the winners? And who were the losers?

In Ohio, the education groups traded the accountability mandate for an added tax (income) designed to significantly increase revenue for education. The legislature was the 'winner' with regard to accountability. The educational interest groups and the Department could possibly be categorized as 'losers' because they were essentially placed in a no-choice position by the legislature.

The final decision gave the State Department of Education a two year period in which to examine various accountability programs and then return to the General Assembly with recommendations for implementation of an accountability system.

Ohio's legislation contained no specific funding with it, although it did empower the Department to contract with experts if necessary.
Implementation - Stage V: It is during this final stage that the enacted policy decision is carried out or implemented. Questions asked at this stage are:

1. With what degree of success has the enacted policy decision been carried out thus far?

2. Who are the proponents and opponents?

3. Have the positions of the various actors shifted from previous stages, and, if so, why?

Ohio's initial accountability legislation simply died when the Department, after conducting a state-wide "Search for Consensus" recommended to the legislature that, due to a lack of consensus, no accountability model should be implemented in Ohio. One substantive piece of accountability legislation was passed after the initial legislation. S.B. 175, passed in 1975, mandated the development and implementation of a limited state-wide assessment program, the distribution of annual district reports, and a state assessment advisory committee.

Also, the legislature has recently considered several minimum competency bills, however none of these bills has passed.

The proponents of accountability at this point in time seem to be a few legislators. The General Assembly as a whole still does not appear to be particularly interested in accountability. There actually have not appeared to be
any opponents of the assessment or annual reports -- but they have not appeared to have caused much impact in any case.

The positions of the various actors have remained fairly constant over the years. There have generally been a few legislators asking for accountability. The Department has not appeared supportive, although it has not publically opposed accountability. When the minimum competency issue came up, the Department developed a locally initiated competency program (in contrast to state initiated programs outlined in the proposed legislation). The major teachers' group (OEA) came out in support of testing in 1977 after having had only a low level involvement in accountability up to that point. Their qualifications, however (particularly state funded remedial programs) would probably not have been considered acceptable by the Ohio legislature, noted for its low level support of elementary and secondary schools and unwillingness to increase taxes.

Summary

The five stage framework analysis indicated that Ohio's accountability policy process followed an unexpected pattern: the initial accountability legislation did not result in the implementation of an accountability program.

In the first stage, Issue Definition, we saw that accountability was initiated by a conference committee of the
Ohio General Assembly.

In stage two, Proposal Formulation, it was noted that the accountability mandate was inserted into H.B. 475 (a major school finance bill) while it was in conference committee.

It was pointed out in stage three, Support Mobilization, that the legislature gathered the support of the Department and educational interest groups by instigating a "trade-off." The income tax, strongly desired by the educators, would remain in H.B. 475, as long as the accountability mandate was permitted to remain intact.

We saw in the Decision Enactment stage that the legislature 'won' with the enactment of its accountability proposal. The legislature mandated the Department to examine the various accountability programs and then return to the legislature with a plan for accountability.

Finally, we noted in the fifth stage, Implementation, that the Department did not recommend an accountability model to the legislature; and that subsequent accountability legislation was passed in 1975 mandating a limited assessment program, district annual reports, and the formation of a State Assessment Advisory Committee. All but the annual report section of the 1975 legislation was rescinded in 1979.
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CHAPTER VII

OVERVIEW, COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter provides a brief overview of the study, a comparative analysis of the data across the three states, and the findings, conclusions, and recommendations. First, the overview will include a review of the purpose of this study, the methodology used, and synopses of the three case studies. Second, the analytic framework will be applied to the data for a comparative analysis of the three case studies. This analysis will be followed by a presentation of the major findings. Finally, conclusions and recommendations will be given regarding the policy process.

Overview

The policy process at the state level was examined through an issue area approach. The issue of educational accountability was selected due to its rapid growth and impact across the nation. Three states, Colorado, Michigan, and Ohio, were selected as the population sample through which to examine the policy process as it related to educational accountability legislation. The primary purpose of
the research was to determine the policy process used to enact educational accountability legislation in the three states, and, through a comparative analysis, to determine and describe the educational policy process.

The two major research questions upon which the study was based were: (1) How can the policy process for educational accountability be described in the states of Colorado, Michigan, and Ohio? and (2) What differences in policy process were revealed upon comparing the states; and what factors possibly influenced those differences?

The first major research question (with ten sub-parts, pp. 4-5) was addressed in Chapters IV, V, and VI, in the form of case studies of the policy process for educational accountability legislation in each of the three states. The second major research question will be addressed in the sections on comparative policy development analysis and conclusions in this chapter.

The Colorado case study described a process where the legislature and State Education Agency worked together to initiate and develop the accountability legislation. The legislation (an accountability "package") was based upon the concept of local initiative. It was enacted with no visible opposition. The legislation has been fully implemented and, through-out its history, has been non-controversial.

Quite a different policy process and outcome was described in the Michigan case study. The legislation, an
assessment proposal, was initiated through the State Education Agency. Support of the Governor and legislature was easily acquired, and the assessment program was enacted as part of the State Department of Education annual budget. After the assessment program was implemented, it was developed into a full-scale accountability model. Michigan's assessment has been the focus of a great deal of controversy, particularly in regard to release of test results and test bias.

The Ohio case study, unlike the first two, described a policy process that did not result in an adopted accountability program. The Ohio accountability legislation was initiated solely by the legislature. The accountability mandate, inserted into an important school finance bill, was supported by the State Education Agency and educational interest groups as a trade-off for a new state income tax included in the funding bill. The mandate required the State Education Agency to examine various accountability models and then return to the legislature with a proposal. After a two year effort, however, the State Education Agency recommended that no accountability program be adopted for Ohio's schools. Several years later, a relatively minor piece of accountability legislation was enacted; most of it was recinded recently, however, by the Ohio Legislature.
A Comparative Analysis of Policy Development

The three previous chapters on educational accountability legislation in Colorado, Michigan, and Ohio provided the data for this comparative analysis. As was reported, the states differed extensively, not only in content and impact of the legislation, but in the political activity surrounding the issue. This comparative analysis was made to describe the similarities and differences that existed in the policy process in each of the states. This analysis also served as a test of the efficacy of the theoretical framework explained in Chapter III through the five stages of: Issue Definition, Proposal Formulation, Support Mobilization, Decision Enactment, and Implementation.

The specific pieces of legislation which served as the basis for the analysis were:

Colorado: The comprehensive accountability legislation enacted in 1971 by Senate Bill 33.


Ohio: The accountability mandate enacted as part of House Bill 475 in 1971.
The primary legislative activity occurred during a relatively short time span of two years. Therefore, external nationwide economic trends and prevailing social conditions were similar for each of the three states. However, political and economic conditions within each state were, in some cases, quite dissimilar. This dissimilarity will be examined. It was shown that each of the states had either one or a combination of the following: additional enacted accountability legislation, additional proposed accountability legislation, or actual or proposed addendums to the original legislation through some process other than legislation. All of these types of changes were considered to be part of the implementation stage as they occurred after the original accountability legislation was enacted.

Issue Definition

The examination of the origins of educational accountability legislation in the three states revealed that issue definition emanated from three distinct processes. Before examining these in detail, an overview of the comparisons and contrasts of the political and economic factors influencing the states will be given.

Political and Economic Factors

The data gathered, as well as the timing of the legisla-

nation during the late 1960's and early 1970's had an impact upon the initiation of the accountability legislation in each of the three states. The fact that the word "accountability" was becoming commonplace and generally understood at that particular time, aroused a certain degree of curiosity and interest in the issue on the part of educators, legislators, and the general public as well.

During the late 1960's and early 1970's, Michigan had been characterized as a state with strong interparty competition resulting at times in an unstable, bordering on volatile, political environment. Detroit was depicted during this period as a center of racial unrest and unemployment problems, and virtually incapable of providing the fiscal resources needed to tackle the enormous economic and social problems facing the city.

The Michigan educational arena appeared to be largely a reflection of the overall political nature of the state. The various professional organizations were competitive rather than inclined to work together to develop compromises. The teachers associations, national leaders in the field of collective bargaining, were generally considered to be militant as compared with teachers' associations in other states. While Michigan seemed to be innovative in many issue areas, the unstable political environment spawned an impotency within state and local government which precluded them finding solutions to critical problems.
From the competitive, labor-oriented atmosphere found in Michigan, it could be deduced that this state might be particularly vulnerable to the accountability movement. With the various political groups continually at odds with each other, accountability demands from all sides would be likely. The vulnerable Michigan education community, divisive among its own groups, was a likely target for accountability pressures within the competitive political structure of Michigan.

At the other end of the spectrum, however, was the state of Colorado with a moderate political culture and environment, particularly in comparison with Michigan's.⁴

While Colorado was described as a two-party state, and a "swing" state, the inter-party competitiveness which existed in Michigan during the late 1960's and early 1970's was not evident in its political activities. The general tendency of the state legislature was to maintain a low-key, conservative posture.⁵ The city of Denver was the state's population center; however, it did not exhibit anywhere near the degree of "urban blight" related problems that were evident in Detroit at that time.⁶

The over-all political theme in Colorado politics centered around the maintenance of local control in all areas of government - education included.⁷ This, again, contrasted with the growth of state-control in the labor-oriented environment of Michigan.
Another significant contrast between Colorado and Michigan was found in the relationships between the various educational organizations. In the early 1970's a viable education coalition existed in Colorado. This group, which had formed in 1967, included virtually all of the state education groups, including both state teachers' associations (CEA and CFT) and the State Department of Education. In addition, important agricultural and industrial groups were members of the coalition.

Ohio did not seem to have the conservative, low-level conflict brand of politics seen in Colorado at that time, neither did it have the innovative, competitive spirit of Michigan. Ohio's Governor of the 1960's James A. Rhodes, was a conservative-spending Republican whose claim-to-fame was the maintenance of low taxes for the state. In fact, by the late 1960's, Ohio stood out as forty-eighth among the states in its support of education; forty-third in health and hospitals; and thirty-eighth in public welfare.

According to Peirce's account of Ohio (1972):

Unlike Michigan's UAW, Ohio has no single dominant union; there are scores of unions across the state whose leaders prefer to make their own arrangements with political candidates rather than working in concert. Nor are Ohio labor leaders "issue-oriented" like those in Michigan; they have been described as a "bread and butter lot for whom politics is a secondary consideration."

Ohio's lack of extreme union demands in combination with its low financial support toward education and other
public services probably weakened the cries for accountability, particularly when compared to Michigan.

Some of the contrasting political factors found in the three states examined are depicted in Table 4.

**Participating Actors**

While the origins of accountability legislation from the "accountability movement" in the states examined were tentative at best; they did become more specific upon examination of the roles played by participating actors as seen in Table 5.

In Michigan, the accountability movement was initiated by the State Education Agency. In contrast, the accountability legislation in Colorado originated through activities initiated by the legislature in conjunction with the State Education Agency; while the accountability legislation in Ohio was initiated by the legislature alone.

In contrast with Michigan and Colorado, the Ohio State Education Agency had not become involved in accountability-related activities. Like Colorado, the general tenor of the Ohio State Education Agency was that of attempting to preserve the notion of local control of school districts. Unlike Colorado, however, where precipitating events over a period of time pointed toward legislative interest in accountability, accountability in Ohio had not been an apparent interest of the legislature until H.B. 475 (the major school finance bill with the accountability mandate) surfaced.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Party Relationships</th>
<th>EIG* Relationships</th>
<th>Political Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Two Party 'Swing' State</td>
<td>Viable Education Coalition</td>
<td>Conservative/Theme of Maintenance of Local Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Strong Inter-Party Competition</td>
<td>Disunited/competitive/Labor-oriented</td>
<td>Innovative but Unstable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Strong Republican Party Orientation</td>
<td>Disunited except on Rare Issues of Mutual Concern</td>
<td>Conservative/Noted for Weak Support of Public Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See List of Abbreviations
Table 5
COMPARISONS AMONG THE STATES ACROSS COMPONENTS
AT THE ISSUE DEFINITION STAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participating Actors</th>
<th>Task Forces and/or Studies</th>
<th>Parallel Finance Issues</th>
<th>EIG* Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>LEG/SEA*</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>SEA*</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>LEG*</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See List of Abbreviations
Task Forces and/or Studies

Task forces and/or studies relating to the accountability issue were present in Colorado and Michigan, but not in Ohio.

The accountability movement in Michigan was heavily influenced by the J. Alan Thomas study of the Missouri schools.12 This 1966 study included a testing recommendation that promoted interest within the Michigan Department of Education. The Michigan Department of Education's Bureau of Research subsequently prepared a paper suggesting a state-wide assessment plan.

Even more activity of this type was evident in Colorado. A State Department of Education task force, The Colorado Evaluation Project, began to deal with some accountability-related activities in the early 1960's. In the late 1960's the Joint Budget Committee of the Colorado General Assembly commissioned two separate studies of the Department by outside consultants.13 Both of these reports pointed to a need for the establishment of accountability procedures in the state. Finally, in 1969, the General Assembly established the Committee on Public Education, consisting of both legislators and citizens, to study the state's public school system and report findings and recommendations back to the legislature in a period of two years.
Parallel Issues

During the late 1960's and early 1970's, when the accountability issue surfaced in the three states examined, the issue of school finance was also prominent.

Ohio's accountability mandate was an insertion into a major piece of school finance legislation. Amended Substitute House Bill 475 provided for the most significant state increase in school funding in Ohio in more than four decades. It included a graduated income tax and a corporate income tax for the first time in Ohio's history. Contrary to their usual lack of unification, all of Ohio's major educational interest groups banded together with the state education agency to support this critical legislation.

Colorado's education coalition, COED, was instrumental in the formulation and passage of the Public School Foundation Act in 1969. Following this, a great deal of activity occurred in the area of school finance, including many alternative proposals, until, in 1973, new finance legislation was passed incorporating the concept of power equalization. The education coalition was very active during this time period, working with the Governor and legislature to gain support for the new legislation.

Michigan enacted major school finance reform legislation, known as the Bursley Act, in 1973. This decision spanned a number of years and issues. The legislation, a modified power equalization formula, was supported by the
Governor, Michigan Education Association, State Education Agency, Michigan Association of School Boards, and a bi-partisan group of twenty-one senators. It was opposed by the MFT and some administrators. 16

The fact that school finance was a foremost issue at or near the time the accountability issue surfaced in each of the states examined, confirms the notion expressed in the literature that interest in accountability was aroused largely due to the increased number of dollars requested for educational support. 17 While the assumption that legislators, in particular, wanted a tighter rein on where their dollars were going was true in Ohio and Colorado, it was not the case in Michigan where the impetus for accountability came from the State Department of Education itself.

Educational Interest Group Involvement

The educational interest groups were not involved in the Issue Definition stage in any of the states examined.

Proposal Formulation

Participating Actors

It was found in the analysis of the Proposal Formulation stage that no new significant actors entered the picture.

In Michigan, the State Education Agency was responsible for formulating the accountability proposal. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction developed the assessment
plan submitted to him by the Department into a specific proposal and submitted it to the State Board of Education for review.

In Colorado proposal formulation was done by the state legislature in conjunction with the State Department of Education. The Colorado General Assembly passed a resolution establishing a committee to study public education in the state. This committee was comprised of four members from the House of Representatives, four members from the Senate, and seven members from the general public appointed by the Governor, and worked closely with the State Department of Education. In 1971 the committee recommended the comprehensive accountability legislation to the legislature.

In Ohio, the legislature alone was responsible for the "proposal formulation" stage. The educational accountability proposal was but a small portion of a major school funding bill. Several Ohio legislators (respondents indicated there was no "groundswell") saw this bill as being an opportune time and place for accountability to be inserted.

Types of Proposals

As seen in Table 6, Colorado was the only state among the three examined to have the accountability proposal submitted to the legislature as a separate piece of legislation.

In both Michigan and Colorado, the accountability proposals were tied to larger pieces of legislation. In Michigan the assessment proposal was included as a line item addition
Table 6
COMPARISONS AMONG THE STATES ACROSS COMPONENTS
AT THE PROPOSAL FORMULATION STAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participating Actors</th>
<th>Types of Proposals</th>
<th>EIG* Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>LEG/SEA*</td>
<td>Separate legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>SEA*</td>
<td>Line-item addition to SDE budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>LEG*</td>
<td>Inserted in school finance bill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See List of Abbreviations
to the Department budget, while in Ohio it was inserted into a major school funding bill.

Educational Interest Group Involvement

Educational Interest Group involvement, as in the previous stage, was virtually non-existent.

Ira Polley, the Michigan State Superintendent, did inform the four major state-level educational interest groups about the assessment proposal. The groups, however, were not given an opportunity to have input into the plan. This strategy would concur with Educational Governance Project findings that the educational interest groups in Michigan during that particular time period were generally at odds with the State Superintendent and State Department of Education. The research indicated that while the groups felt they were consulted on main issues, they felt that the consultation attempts were not sincere and/or at times even after the fact.\textsuperscript{18} Due to their fragmented nature, the groups were found to have had less impact upon the state legislature than the State Department of Education.\textsuperscript{19}

As in Michigan, the educational interest groups appeared to be left out of the proposal formulation stage in Colorado. While the educational coalition was a major initiator in the area of school finance, it was not nearly as involved in other areas, such as accountability. It was mentioned earlier that a representative from the Colorado Education Association, when asked about the accountability
legislation, remarked that it, "caught us by surprise." It could have been that while the Committee on Public Education was discussing the issue of educational accountability, the coalition members, caught up in pressing school finance legislation efforts, may actually not have realized what was going on in the area of accountability.

Finally, the educational interest groups in Ohio did not take an active part in proposal formulation. The accountability proposal was formulated by a few legislators in conference committee and inserted into a school finance bill.

Support Mobilization

Competing Proposals

While alternative policy proposals occurred in the educational finance issue areas of each of the states examined during the early 1970's, this was not the case in the area of educational accountability. In each of the three states studied, only one accountability proposal surfaced. To a great extent, this limited the degree of "politics" that occurred in connection with the accountability legislation. The various education actors in Ohio, Colorado and Michigan were so caught up in promoting major education finance changes during that period in time that they realistically could not muster enough resources to tackle other types of education issues such as accountability.
Supporting Actors

The Michigan State Education Agency easily gained support for its assessment proposal from the Governor and legislature. Governor Milliken, a proponent of school finance reform was also an advocate of increased accountability for education. The educational interest groups in Michigan were involved in neither a support nor opposition role at this stage.

Similar to Michigan, the Colorado legislature and State Education Agency easily gained the support of Governor Love. Since the Governor had been involved in naming several members to the Committee on Public Education, he had actually been "built in" to the process. Like Michigan, Colorado educational interest groups were not involved in a support or opposition role.

In terms of the "wheeling and dealing" way in which many people would define politics, the support mobilization stage in Ohio was probably the most "political" of the three states.

Ohio's school finance problems have become legendary within the past decade. In 1971, an omnibus school finance bill was submitted to the state legislature which included a graduated income tax and a corporate income tax for the first time in Ohio's history. This bill was strongly supported by Ohio's new Governor, John Gilligan. All of the major education groups banded together to support this important legislation. When the accountability mandate was initiated in conference committee by a few legislators who
wanted to make certain educators would be accountable for their potential increase in revenue, the education groups had to permit it to remain as a "trade-off" to maintain the proposed income tax. In essence, the accountability mandate was actually supported by a small group of legislators. The other actors neither supported nor opposed it.

Table 7 depicts a summation of the involvement of Colorado, Michigan, and Ohio in the components highlighted in the support mobilization stage.

Decision Enactment

Winners and Losers

The "winners" in each of the states were the original proponents of the accountability proposals. The State Education Agency in Michigan, the State Education Agency and legislature in Colorado, and the legislature in Ohio could all be considered to be on the "winning" side.

As there were no visible opponents to the proposed legislation in Michigan and Colorado, no group could be classified a "loser." In Ohio, however, one could term the educational interest groups and State Education Agency as "losers" to some degree due to the fact that they accepted the accountability mandate as a trade-off for a new school finance program.
### Table 7
COMPARISONS AMONG THE STATES ACROSS COMPONENTS
AT THE SUPPORT MOBILIZATION STAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Competing Proposals</th>
<th>SEA* Support</th>
<th>LEG* Support</th>
<th>GOV* Support</th>
<th>EIG* Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes-as a &quot;tradeoff&quot;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes-as a &quot;tradeoff&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See List of Abbreviations
Legislation Content

The final decision enactments themselves contrasted sharply across the three states. As seen in Table 8, the Colorado accountability legislation was the only legislation which contained a complete "accountability package." This package, consisting of the Educational Accountability Act, the Comprehensive Educational Planning Act, and the Program Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation System Act, was based upon the concept of local control. It did not include a mandated state assessment program. An essential element of Colorado's legislation was the provision for local accountability advisory committees. These committees were designed to aid the district in planning, establishing objectives, and evaluating the districts' progress. While the Colorado accountability legislation was designed, to a certain extent, to give the State Board of Education additional authority and control over schools, the basic intent was to develop accountability in the public schools of Colorado through a process of local initiative, as compared to state mandate and monitoring. This concept apparently was a reflection of the general political emphasis placed upon local control evidenced in many phases of Colorado's state government.

In contrast to Colorado's notion of locally-developed accountability, Michigan's legislation was solely directed toward statewide assessment. The Michigan legislation mandated that the State Department of Education develop a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;Winners&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Losers&quot;</th>
<th>Content of Legislation</th>
<th>Funding Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>LEG/SEA*</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>Accountability Package/Advisory Committees</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>SEA*</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>State-wide Assessment</td>
<td>248,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>LEG*</td>
<td>EIG/SEA</td>
<td>Mandate for SEA to Conduct Study and Submit Accountability Proposal to Legislature</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See List of Abbreviations
program to assess the educational progress of students, and that the assessment begin immediately.

Ohio's legislation, although comprehensive in nature, did not outline a specific plan like Colorado's; rather, the legislation gave the State Department of Education a two year period to examine various programs and then return to the legislature with recommendations for the implementation of an accountability system.24

As has been indicated, Ohio was the only state among the three investigated in which the State Department of Education was given an allocated planning period to examine accountability. The Colorado State Department of Education had been closely involved in the legislative development process by working through a legislative committee before the legislation was enacted. Since Colorado's legislation outlined a process to be developed at the local level, with the State Department of Education offering direction and resources, and Ohio's State Department of Education was given a two-year planning period to develop accountability plans, it appeared that it was the Michigan Department of Education which was placed in the most difficult position in terms of immediate and difficult demands for implementation. In addition to having to deal with the anticipated controversial issue of a state-wide testing program, the Department had to develop and implement an assessment program in literally four months. Ironically,
when compared with the other two states, Michigan's Department of Education was by far the most active in initiating and proposing the accountability legislation in the first place.

The Colorado legislation was the only legislation in the three states examined to include a mandated on-going working relationship between the legislature and the State Department of Education when it established the State Accountability Committee. This committee was to work in an advisory capacity with the State Board of Education and was to consist of three persons named by the Speaker of the House, two named by the President of the Senate, five named by the Governor, and seven persons appointed by the State Board of Education. While this notion may be far-fetched, it is possible to extend this concept even further by suggesting a "co-optation" of government (i.e. legislature and Governor) into the accountability process. With representatives from these governmental branches on the State Accountability Committee, it would be difficult in future years for these entities to complain about a lack of leadership, a lack of input into the accountability process, or legislative oversight difficulties.
Funding Levels

The funding levels of the accountability legislation passed in Michigan ($248,854) and Colorado ($170,000) were of the same general magnitude. Ohio's accountability mandate included no specific monetary allocation, although it did include the ambiguous statement, "The department may employ additional personnel and may contract with such experts and consultants as it deems necessary to carry out the duties imposed by this section." While this may be moving ahead a bit, it is interesting to note that when Ohio did legislate a specific accountability program (i.e. limited assessment and district annual reports) in legislation passed in 1975, it carried a funding level of only $25,000 -- much lower than legislation passed in Colorado and Michigan several years earlier, and much less than the Department had requested after analyzing the dollars needed to develop and implement an adequate testing program.

Implementation

Degree of Success

Ohio's implementation stage stood out as being, in some ways, the most unusual among the three states. Actually, the State Department of Education implemented the accountability mandate by collecting the viewpoints of thousands of citizens and educators (i.e. Search for Consensus);
acquiring a group of recognized educators to develop alternative accountability models; using these opinions and models to formulate final recommendations; and returning to the legislature with, in essence, no plan for accountability, based on the opinions collected and a lack of consensus on any one accountability model. When the non-action recommendation was submitted there were apparently no protests, and, in fact, there was not much interest in the report.

It seemed that the developments in Ohio could be attributed to at least the following two factors: 1) the initiators of the legislation were only a few legislators who were apparently not reflecting an over-riding sentiment or concern of the legislature as a whole; and 2) the education community, particularly the State Department of Education, was extremely cautious about dealing with aspects of accountability as contrasted to the high involvement levels of the State Departments of Education in both Michigan and Colorado in developing their respective accountability legislation.

On the other hand, Colorado's accountability package passed in 1971 has been fully implemented over the years as prescribed in the legislation. Each year, as required by the legislation, the Department has reported to the Governor and legislature the extent of progress being made in implementing the accountability program.
In contrast to Colorado and Ohio, Michigan exhibited yet another implementation pattern. Michigan's original assessment legislation was expanded several years after enactment by the Department of Education into a full-blown accountability model. In accordance with the model and the Long Range Plan (also developed under the auspices of the Department) a time-table for expansion of the program was established. Due to financial and political constraints, the assessment program itself was substantially revised over the years in reaction to a variety of pressures.

For instance, the original normative tests were replaced with criterion-referenced tests; the socio-economic data section of questions was extensively revised; the first grade pilot testing program was abandoned; and the data, which were initially to be released only to educators in the local districts, were ultimately released to the public.

It is interesting to note that substantive controversy over accountability legislation occurred for the first time in the implementation stage of only one of the states examined - Michigan. Both Colorado, with its comprehensive accountability legislation, and Ohio, with its rather limited response to the accountability mandate, implemented accountability with minimal controversy. Perhaps this critical difference among the states can be attributed to a number of relevant factors.
First, Michigan's accountability mandate allowed for virtually no planning time on the part of the State Department of Education. The State Department of Education actually was given only four months to develop an assessment program in reading and math for fourth and seventh graders. Due to the criticism of the assessment program after it was implemented, regarding test questions and procedures, one can assume that the time-press placed on the State Department of Education probably aggravated what was already an extremely sensitive situation. This, of course, contrasted greatly with the two years the Ohio Department of Education was given to respond to its legislative accountability mandate, and the Colorado legislation which was based upon locally developed (as compared to state developed) planning.

Secondly, Michigan's accountability program was based on assessment; in fact, assessment preceded the development of the accountability model. Colorado's plan, on the other hand, did not include state-wide assessment, and Ohio's second piece of accountability legislation (1975) called for only a minimal assessment program which preserved anonymity of students and districts. Since the high degree of controversy in Michigan was centered directly upon the assessment portion of the accountability program, it could be that this significant difference among the states could have been a key to the existence of the controversy surrounding accountability in Michigan.
Additional Enacted or Proposed Legislation

Ohio was the only state among the three to pass an additional substantive piece of accountability legislation subsequent to the original legislation. In 1975, Senate Bill 175 mandated the development and implementation of a limited state-wide assessment program and the distribution of local district annual reports.

This piece of legislation (like the 1971 legislation) was initiated solely by the legislature. While the State Department of Education and other educational groups did not support the legislation, it was passed anyway as a part of another major school finance bill. (This bill established an "equal-yield" funding formula.) From all accounts, the accountability legislation actually received only minor attention from most participants.

In Colorado there was a recently proposed piece of legislation designed to combine the accountability process with the public school accreditation function; this legislation was not enacted. The original legislation will most likely be amended by the State Board of Education through modification of the state's accreditation rules. This modification will give the State Department of Education more clout when insisting that certain accountability procedures be developed and implemented correctly at the local district level.
In 1970, Michigan's Governor (Milliken) submitted a bill to the legislature designed to give the assessment effort its own basis in statute as well as to ensure that individually reliable pupil scores would be provided by the tests. The bill was signed into law as Act No. 38 of the Public Acts of 1970.

Although several pieces of proposed minimum competency legislation have surfaced in recent years, none of these were enacted. Finally, in the face of high-level controversy, no bills have been passed by the Michigan legislature to attempt to abolish or significantly "water-down" the assessment program.

**Minimum Competency**

The implementation stage did offer an alignment among the states in one area, that of minimum competency. The promotion of the idea to expand accountability through adoption of minimum competency standards was legislatively proposed and defeated in each of the three states. In Michigan, this could have been partially due to the fact that the basic assessment program itself had created so many problems and so much controversy over the years that not many people wanted to see more of the same. Colorado, generally conservative and with what was considered to be a successful accountability program, had no major political actors or groups pushing for this type of expansion.
Finally, Ohio, so slow to take hold of accountability in the first place, also had no major political actors or groups supporting the minimum competency legislation. The Ohio Department of Education, in fact, strongly supported the concept of locally developed minimum competency standards as opposed to the creation of state-adopted standards as proposed in the legislation.

**Advisory Committees**

Each of the three states examined established some type of state accountability advisory committee. Colorado was the only state to have had such a committee mandated in a stage other than implementation. (Colorado's state accountability committee was included in the decision-enactment stage.) In both Colorado and Michigan, these advisory committees were established after the legislation was enacted in order to ensure citizen input into decisions involving accountability. It could be that Colorado's earlier establishment of this concept aided the state in implementing accountability as easily as it has.

**Educational Interest Group Involvement**

During the implementation stage, the Michigan assessment program was opposed by the state level teacher and administrator groups. While the reaction of the administrators has subsided, the major state teachers' associations are still strongly opposed to assessment. In 1973 the Michigan
Education Association and the National Education Association contracted for an "assessment" of the Michigan accountability system. The highly critical report that resulted from this "assessment" received nationwide publicity.

The Colorado accountability program, in contrast to Michigan's program, never received educational interest group opposition. In fact, the major state teacher's association (CEA) has been somewhat supportive of accountability as it has been implemented in the state.

The involvement of educational interest groups in Ohio's accountability policy making process has been minimal. The most involvement during the implementation stage occurred in 1977 when the Ohio Education Association took a positive stand toward minimum competency. The teachers' stand was, however, predicated upon key qualifications, including state support of remedial programs for students at all levels who are not able to meet minimum competencies.

A summation of comparisons among Colorado, Michigan, and Ohio across components highlighted in the implementation stage is depicted in Table 9.

Findings

From the case studies and subsequent comparative analysis of policy development across the three states, a
Table 9
COMPARISONS AMONG THE STATES ACROSS COMPONENTS
AT THE IMPLEMENTATION STAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Degree of Success</th>
<th>Additional Proposed Legislation</th>
<th>Additional Enacted Legislation</th>
<th>Minimum Competency</th>
<th>Advisory Committees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Fully Implemented</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Proposed/Defeated</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Many Revisions/Controversy</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Proposed/Defeated</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Original Mandate Received No Recommendation</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Proposed/Defeated</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
number of findings emerged. The most significant findings were as follows:

**Issue Definition Findings**

1. The political factors impacting upon each state at the time the accountability issue emerged were varied. Michigan was characterized as having an unstable but innovative political environment; Colorado maintained a theme of local control in a moderate environment; and Ohio was noted for its conservatism and weak support of public services; particularly education.

2. The primary participants in issue definition across the three states were the State Education Agencies and the legislatures. They worked together, however, only in Colorado. The legislature was the primary participant in Ohio and the State Education Agency was the primary participant in Michigan.

3. Accountability-related studies were commissioned or task forces were established in two of the three states. These types of activities did not appear in Ohio during issue definition.
4. Educational interest groups were not involved in educational accountability issue definition in any of the three states.

Proposal Formulation Findings

1. The primary participants in proposal formulation across the three states were the State Education Agencies and the legislatures. The only state in which these two actors worked together was Colorado.

2. Colorado was the only state among the three examined to propose accountability legislation as a separate piece of legislation. The Ohio accountability mandate was inserted into a school finance bill and Michigan's was included in the Department of Education's budget.

3. There was no educational interest group involvement during this stage in Colorado and Ohio and only minimal educational interest group involvement in Michigan.

Support Mobilization Findings

1. There were no competing proposals during this stage in any of the three states.
2. The accountability proposals in each of the states had the support of the State Education Agencies, legislatures, and governors. The support of the State Education Agency in Ohio, however, was acquired through a trade-off with the legislature for a state income tax to help fund education.

3. The only state to have educational interest group support for its accountability proposal was Ohio. This support, however, was acquired through the trade-off described above.

Decision Enactment Findings

1. The legislatures and State Education Agencies could be viewed as the policy "winners" in each of the three states.

2. While there were no policy "losers" in Colorado and Michigan, the educational interest groups and State Education Agency were considered "losers" in Ohio because they had been forced into a trade-off.

3. The content of the enacted educational accountability legislation varied widely among the states.
The legislation in Michigan centered on state assessment; Colorado's accountability package was based upon local initiative; and Ohio's legislation was a mandate for the State Education Agency to study accountability and then report back to the legislature with a recommendation.

4. Ohio was the only state to have no funding attached to its accountability legislation. Michigan's legislation was funded at a level of $248,854 and Colorado's at $170,000.

**Implementation Findings**

1. Colorado was the only state among the three to implement fully its accountability legislation.

2. Controversy appeared at this stage only in Michigan. It evolved over the issues of test bias and release of test results.

3. The Ohio State Education Agency responded to the legislative mandate with the recommendation that no accountability model be adopted.

4. The only state in which additional accountability legislation was not enacted during this stage was Colorado.
5. Minimum competency legislation was proposed and defeated in each of the states during the implementation stage.

6. Some type of accountability advisory committee was utilized in each of the states during this stage.

General Findings

1. Ohio, the state that had historically given very weak support to education, had by far the weakest enactment and implementation results.

2. The educational interest groups in each of the states were virtually left out of the policy development process.

3. While the educational interest groups in Michigan were active in creating and prolonging the controversy during the implementation stage, the role played by the educational interest groups in Colorado and Ohio was low-key and somewhat supportive.

4. A close working relationship between the legislature and the State Education Agency throughout all stages of policy development occurred only in Colorado.
5. Political maneuvering during the policy development process was revealed only in Ohio in the form of a trade-off between the legislature with the State Education Agency and educational interest groups.

6. A high degree of controversy surrounding the accountability issue occurred only in Michigan; and even there it did not surface until the implementation stage.

7. The controversy surrounding the accountability issue in Michigan appeared to have influenced the educational accountability policy process in Ohio.

8. While the Ohio State Education Agency was given two years to examine accountability models and the Colorado program relied primarily upon the initiative of the local districts, the Michigan State Education Agency was given virtually no planning time to develop its state assessment program before it was to be implemented.

Conclusions

The policy process involved in initiating, enacting, and implementing educational accountability legislation was seen in the preceding chapters to be both complex and quite different among the three states: Colorado, Michigan, and Ohio.
While the initial accountability legislation was within a two year time span (1969-1971), the legislation was substantively different in each of the three states. Michigan's legislation was based on a state-wide assessment program; Colorado's was a comprehensive accountability program based on local initiative; and Ohio's mandate gave the State Department of Education two years to develop an accountability plan and then report back to the legislature.

As shown in Table 10, comparing the actors involved in the initial policy development (the first three stages), the educational interest groups were virtually left out of the process. In Ohio the process was left mainly to the legislature, and in Colorado and Michigan, the State Education Agency played an on-going role in the development of accountability legislation.

While one might have expected controversy regarding accountability to have surfaced in the early developmental stages, it only surfaced on a major scale in one of the states, Michigan, and even there not until the final implementation stage.

The role of the professional teachers' groups was looked at with particular interest as a part of this research. Rather surprisingly, it was found that the teachers' groups did not appear to have influenced the development of the accountability legislation in any of the
Table 10

ACTORS INVOLVED IN THE ACCOUNTABILITY POLICY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS ACROSS THE FIRST THREE STAGES OF THE FIVE STAGE ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Issue Definition</th>
<th>Proposal Formulation</th>
<th>Support Mobilization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>LEG</td>
<td>LEG</td>
<td>GOV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>LEG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>LEG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GOV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>LEG</td>
<td>LEG</td>
<td>LEG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EIG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GOV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For interpretation of abbreviations used, see List of Abbreviations
three states to any great degree. While in Michigan the major teachers' organization has opposed accountability (i.e. assessment) over the years, this has not had any significant impact upon the program. It is possible to say, however, that the Michigan teachers' groups definitely contributed to the controversy which resulted in the public release of assessment data and the subsequent ranking of the school districts.

Ohio educators appeared to have been influenced by the controversy caused by the Michigan assessment and used this as an argument to persuade the state legislators against accountability. Newspaper articles on Michigan's accountability problems were distributed to the legislature. While it is impossible to say exactly what degree of impact Michigan's accountability activities had over the events in Ohio, it appears that the impact was indeed significant.

The researcher, from a careful examination of the data collected, has formulated the following conclusions about the educational policy process at the state level. It should be restated that conclusions from this research are applicable only to the states included in this study. It is hoped, however, that the data, findings, and conclusions drawn may be helpful in the generation of hypotheses for future research on educational policy making.
The Analytic Framework

The analytic framework utilized for the comparative analysis of the policy process for accountability legislation in the three selected states proved to be a useful tool for examining the policy process. By superimposing the framework over the policy process employed in each of the states, the researcher was able to identify clusters of variables, particularly relating to policy participants.

One difficulty with this framework, when used to examine the accountability issue area, was the finite nature of the three pre-decisional stages. Overlap was difficult to avoid. It is not recommended, however, that any of these stages be eliminated or combined, because in issue areas where a greater degree of pre-decisional activity is found, it would be necessary to use the three stages to provide a clear picture and useful basis for comparison.

The functional stage framework used in this research could be helpful to policy makers as a type of self-analysis. It provides a methodical means of depicting clearly what actors actually did as compared to what they think they did or are thought to do. Viewing policy in this light appears a logical prerequisite to the consideration of recommendations for change in the process itself.
The Major Policy Participants

While the literature contends that the legislature and governor are key actors in enacting major educational policy decisions, this research revealed that roles played by additional actors may be crucial to successful policy implementation.

For many education issues, such as accountability, state legislators must rely upon the State Education Agency to provide detailed information concerning the issues so that workable policy proposals can be developed. In this research, this fact was highlighted in Ohio. Although the legislative conference committee wanted an accountability program, it mandated the State Education Agency to study the problem and present proposals, rather than doing so itself. It was also clear in both Michigan and Colorado that State Education Agency input into the early policy making stages provided the information base for the eventual policy decisions.

The major participants in the educational accountability process across the three states were the legislature and the State Education Agency. The working relationships between these actors were different, however, in each state, and this appeared to have a significant impact upon the success of the policy decisions and their implementation.

The pattern evidenced in Colorado was one of close collaboration. The legislature and State Education Agency worked together in each of the pre-decisional stages, as
well as during the decision enactment and implementation stages. The legislation was fully implemented with virtually no controversy.

In contrast, it seems likely that the relationship between the State Education Agency and legislature in Ohio was a prime factor in that state not enacting an accountability program. The legislature mandated that accountability be examined by forcing the State Education Agency (and educational interest groups) into a trade-off for a state income tax. While this may have been viewed by legislators at that time as a way to expedite the process, it may have accomplished just the opposite. The State Education Agency responded to the legislature that its study indicated that Ohioans did not want any type of accountability program. The legislature, upon receiving this recommendation from its primary information source on educational issues, backed down on its demand and did not renew the issue for several years.

Michigan's State Education Agency, quite the opposite from Ohio's, went off on its own to develop an assessment proposal. This strategy was a major factor in the controversy that was to develop shortly after the assessment plan was enacted. After the assessment decision was made and the first round of tests given, the legislature (as well as others) demanded that the resulting data be released to the public. Had the legislature and State Education Agency worked together in each of the pre-decisional stages, as
these actors did in Colorado, it is likely that the major question of distribution of test results would have been raised and resolved before legislative enactment occurred. The fact that this controversy between the legislature and the State Education Agency erupted shortly after the policy decision was made had a detrimental effect upon the policy outcome which continues to this day.

In sum, key actors working together throughout all stages of policy development appear to be an important element in successful policy implementation. Much as participative decision making theory maintains that those who are to implement decisions must be allowed to have some say in the development of those decisions, key actors in the policy process should be given the opportunity to "buy into" major policy concepts and to resolve questions and disagreements before policies are enacted. While political maneuvering (i.e. trade-offs) may seem to be a way to expedite difficult policy decisions, it may actually hamper or even thwart policy development in the long run.

The Educational Interest Groups

This research refuted the predictions in the literature that the teachers' groups would rise up, revolt, and possibly thwart prospective legislation that they viewed as threatening. In accordance with the National Education Association assertions, however, this research confirmed that
the educational interest groups, in particular the teachers, played a very minor role in policy development for educational accountability.²⁹

There appeared to be a number of reasons for the minor role played by the educational interest groups in this particular policy issue. One of the reasons was school finance. As was revealed in the literature, the emergence of educational accountability is closely linked with the requests for more dollars for education.³⁰ In each of the states examined, the school finance issue was of major interest to those in the education arena at the time of the accountability activities. The trade-off in Ohio was an overt display of the fact that the educational interest groups, including teachers, were not willing to risk an attempt to thwart accountability legislation if it at all endangered the school finance proposal.

It is not clear, however, that the educational interest groups would have been able to impact significantly upon the accountability legislation at its development level in each of the states even had they wanted to. The disUnited state of the educational interest groups in Michigan probably would have minimized any impact they could have had upon the legislation.

The most surprising element of the role of the educational interest groups revealed through this research was that the major teacher groups in Ohio and Colorado were
actually somewhat supportive of accountability. The major Colorado teachers' organization had never formally opposed the accountability program and appeared to be participating in its implementation in a supportive manner. The major Ohio teachers' group had endorsed minimum competency, although with several vital qualifications. In the three states examined, only the Michigan teachers' organization openly viewed accountability as a controversial issue and formally opposed it.

Economic and Political Factors

While certain aspects of the policy process may be somewhat controlled (i.e. actor participation), it does seem clear that certain identifiable economic and political factors within each state impacted upon the shaping of the policy.

Colorado's historical theme of local control was evidenced in its accountability program that was based upon local initiative. Ohio's notoriously weak support for education fell in line with the fact that its accountability mandate had no funds attached to it. Finally, Michigan's reputation for innovation in state government was depicted in its State Education Agency initiated state assessment program.
While many types of economic and political factors cannot be changed, at least quickly, it would behoove policy shapers to acknowledge their presence and probable impact upon the policy process.

Planning and Legislative Oversight

Two elements of policy formation that were highlighted as a result of this research (one in a negative way, the other in a positive way) were adequate planning time and legislative oversight.

It appeared that one of the primary causes for many of Michigan's implementation problems was lack of adequate planning time. (This issue is also addressed in a recent study of the Florida legislature. 31) Forced to develop a battery of assessment tests in only a few months, the Michigan State Department of Education ended up revising many aspects of the testing program after it was implemented. Had the Department had adequate planning time allowing for the opportunity to solicit input from others and to carefully analyze various options, it is likely that many of the subsequent revisions due to intense controversy would not have been necessary.

In Colorado, legislative oversight activities were built into the policy process. The involvement of the legislature in all stages of policy development, including implementation, provided a means of assurance
to legislators that legislative intentions were in reality being carried out.

Legislative oversight activities enabling legislators to clarify their intentions could have averted the problem in Michigan where legislative demands developed after the legislation was enacted. It is also possible that had Ohio's accountability mandate included a committee of legislators, State Education Agency officials, and other actors working together to carry out the legislative mandate, the results could have been much different.

Legislators and other policy makers need to take the responsibility of doing everything in their power to ensure optimum policy implementation by building proper safeguards into legislation, such as adequate planning time and legislative oversight capabilities. These safeguards are crucial in influencing the ultimate impact of the legislation itself.

Type of Legislation

Legislators and other policy participants have options in the type of legislation proposed, as was evidenced in the three states examined. While the Ohio and Michigan accountability proposals were inserted into larger pieces of legislation, Colorado's accountability program was enacted through its own, separate legislation.
The technique used in Ohio and Michigan was, one could maintain, a circumvention of the formal policy process. The issue itself became secondary to the larger pieces of legislation and the issue's own merits or demerits became submerged in the process.

Policy makers need to be cognizant of the fact that inserting major issues into other legislation may contort the most vital pre-decisional activities of the policy process. If an issue is not permitted to stand on its own, complete policy development may not be accomplished and, therefore, policy outcomes may be negatively affected. While separate pieces of legislation may involve more time and effort on the part of policy participants in building alliances needed to ensure passage, it may be well worth it in the long run.

Recommendations

Based upon the results of this study and in the interest of furthering the understanding of the policy development process, the following recommendations for educational policy making and additional research are made.

Recommendations for Educational Policy Making

1. Key actors in the policy process should be given the opportunity to help develop major policy
concepts and to resolve questions and potential disagreements before policies are enacted.

2. Policy shapers should be aware of political and economic factors within their states and their probable impact upon the policy process.

3. Policy makers should be willing to take the time and effort to submit major policy proposals in the form of separate legislation rather than inserting the proposals into larger pieces of legislation.

4. Legislators and other policy makers need to take the responsibility of doing everything in their power to ensure optimum policy development by building proper safeguards into legislation, such as adequate planning time and legislative oversight procedures.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

1. Additional comparative policy development analyses should be conducted on educational legislation in other policy issue areas. Future examinations of the processes used to develop educational legislation may provide additional insight into the types of activities that tend to result in a positive
implementation of legislation. Additional policy process examinations may also help educators to determine methods to aid them in attempting to initiate change through the legislative process.

2. The accountability issue area examined in this research should be examined again, in five or ten years, to determine what, if any, changes have occurred. It is important to determine how various types of legislation survive over time.

3. The analytic framework utilized in this research should be applied in a similar fashion to other issue areas. Only by testing the framework and adapting or changing it as the need occurs will it continue to be beneficial in helping researchers to extend extant knowledge of the policy process.

4. The broad area of state educational policy making, of which this research was only a small part, should continue to be closely examined by educational researchers. As a more accurate understanding of how educational policy decisions are made is developed, the better able educators will be to impact upon the legislative system in a positive way.
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APPENDIX A

Colorado's Accountability Legislation - 1971
CHAPTER 123, S. 41 (ARTICLE 41), 1971

123-41-1. Short title. This article shall be known and may be cited as the "Educational Accountability Act of 1971."

123-41-2. Legislative declaration. (1) The general assembly hereby declares that the purpose of this article is to institute an accountability program to define and measure quality in education, and thus to help the public schools of Colorado to achieve such quality and to expand the life opportunities and options of the students of this state; further, to provide to local school boards assistance in helping their school patrons to determine the relative value of their school program as compared to its cost.

(2) (a) The general assembly further declares that the educational accountability program developed under this article should be designed to measure objectively the adequacy and efficiency of the educational programs offered by the public schools. The program should begin by developing broad goals and specific performance objectives for the educational process and by identifying the activities of schools which can advance students toward these goals and objectives. The program should then develop a means for evaluating the achievements and performance of students. It is the belief of the general assembly that in developing the evaluation mechanism, the following approaches, as a minimum, should be explored:

(b) Means for determining whether decisions affecting the educational process are advancing or impeding student achievement;

(c) Appropriate testing procedures to provide relevant comparative data at least in the fields of reading, language skills and mathematical skills;

(d) The role of the department of education in assisting school districts to strengthen their educational programs;

(e) Reporting to students, parents, boards of education, educators, and the general public on the educational performance of the public schools and providing data for the appraisal of such performance; and

(f) Provision of information which could help school districts to increase their efficiency in using available financial resources.

123-41-3. State board of education duties. (1) (a) The state board of education shall develop a state accountability program, which:
(b) Describes and provides for implementation of a procedure for the continuous examination and improvement of the goals for education in this state.

(c) Identifies performance objectives which will lead directly to the achievement of the stated goals.

(d) Adopts a procedure for determining the extent to which local school districts accomplish their performance objectives. Evaluation instruments, including appropriate tests, shall be developed under the authority of this article to provide the evaluation required, but standardized tests shall not be the sole means developed to provide such evaluation.

(e) Recommends a procedure and timetable for the establishment of local accountability programs.

(2) The state board of education shall adopt rules and regulations for the implementation of this article.

(3) (a) There is hereby created an advisory committee to the state board of education, which shall consist of seventeen members to be selected in the manner and for the terms provided in this subsection (3). The advisory committee shall assist the state board of education in performing its duties under this article.

(b) (i) Three of the members of the advisory committee shall be appointed by the speaker of the house of representatives, of which no more than two shall be from each of the major political parties; and two of the members of the advisory committee shall be appointed by the president of the senate, one from each of the major political parties.

(ii) Five members of the advisory committee shall be appointed by the governor from among those persons who are currently serving or have served as members of boards of education in this state.

(iii) Seven members of the advisory committee shall be appointed by the state board of education, three of which shall be classroom teachers and three of which shall be public school administrators.

(4) The terms of office of members of the advisory committee shall be three years; except that of the members appointed under subsection (3) (b) (i) to take office on July 1, 1971, two members shall be appointed for one-year terms, two members shall be appointed for two-year terms, and one member shall be appointed for a three-year term; of the members appointed under subsection (3) (b) (ii) to take office on July 1, 1971, two members shall be appointed for one-year terms, one member shall be appointed for a two-year term, and two members shall be appointed for three-year terms; and of the members appointed under subsection (3) (b) (iii) to take office on July 1, 1971, two members shall be appointed for a one-year term, two members shall be appointed for two-year terms, and three members shall be
appointed for three-year terms. Vacancies shall be filled by appointment, in the same manner as original appointments, for the unexpired term.

(5) The advisory committee shall elect a chairman from among its members. The members of the advisory committee shall receive no compensation for their services on the committee but shall be reimbursed for their actual and necessary expenses incurred in the performance of their duties on the committee.

(6) The department of education shall make available to the advisory committee such data, facilities, and personnel as are necessary for it to perform its duties.

123-41-4. Local accountability programs. (1) The board of education of each school district in the state shall adopt a plan for a local accountability program designed to measure the adequacy and efficiency of educational programs offered by the district. The board shall appoint an advisory accountability committee which shall make recommendations to the board relative to the program of accountability but it shall be the responsibility of the board to implement the provisions of this section. The advisory accountability committee shall consist of at least one parent, one teacher, one school administrator, and a taxpayer from the district.

(2) The board of education of each district shall report not later than December 31 of each year to the residents of the district, and to the state board of education, on the extent to which the district has achieved its stated goals and objectives. The report shall also contain an evaluation of educational decisions made during the previous year which have affected school services and processes.

(3) The state board of education shall assist local boards of education in the preparation of the district goals and objectives and the procedures for measuring school district performance in reaching those goals and objectives.

123-41-5. Reports. Not later than March 1, 1972, and each year thereafter, the state board of education shall transmit to the general assembly a report of its activities in developing and administering the educational accountability program, including the progress of the state and local school districts toward the achievement of their respective goals and objectives. The state board of education shall also recommend any legislation which it deems necessary for the improvement of educational quality in this state.

Section 2. Effective date. This act shall take effect July 1, 1971.
Section 3. Appropriation. In addition to any other appropriation, there is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the state treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1971, to the department of education, the sum of forty thousand dollars ($40,000), or so much thereof as may be necessary for the administration and implementation of this act.

SENATE BILL NO. 42

CONCERNING A BUDGETING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM FOR THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS, AND MAKING AN APPROPRIATION THEREFOR.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Colorado:

Section 1, 123-34-5, Colorado Revised Statutes 1963 (1967 Supp.), is amended to read: 123-34-5. Financing budgeting, and accounting. (1) Financing of the services performed under the direction of the board of cooperative services shall be by contributions from available moneys in any funds which may be legally expended for such services, of the participating members and from the boards of cooperative services funds.

(2) A board of cooperative services shall adopt a budget and an appropriation resolution prior to the beginning of the calendar year for which adopted.

(3) A board of cooperative services shall follow the provisions of "The School District Budget Law," being Article 32 of this chapter, wherever such provisions are applicable, except that the provisions of sections 123-32-12 (3)(c), (4), and (6), and 123-32-15 (4) shall not apply to a board of cooperative services.

Section 2. Chapter 123, Colorado Revised Statutes 1963, as amended, is amended by the addition of a new article to read:

ARTICLE 42
Program Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluating System

123-42-1. Short title. This article shall be known and may be cited as the "Program Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluating System (PPBES) Act."

123-42-2. Legislative declaration. It is the purpose of this article to develop for the public schools a budget format which will present educational programs in terms of pupil achievement and relate these programs to expenditures.
123-42-3. Development of manual. (1) The department of
education shall contract with a nationally recognized firm
having experience and expertise in developing PPBES for
public schools for the preparation draft of a manual
containing definitions and directions necessary for estab-
lishing a state-wide program accounting system.
(2) The department of education, with expert assistance,
shall prepare a final draft of the manual and shall send at
least one copy thereof to each school district in the state
no later than July 1, 1972.

123-42-4. Establishment of system by school districts. No
later than July 1, 1973, each school district in this state
shall establish and maintain its program accounting system
pursuant to the manual prescribed in section 123-42-3.

123-42-5. Penalties. Any school district in this state
which does not establish and maintain its program accounting
system as required by section 123-42-4, shall forfeit and
shall not be paid an amount equal to ten percent of the
amount it otherwise would receive during the ensuing
calendar year pursuant to the "Public School Foundation Act
of 1969."

123-42-6. Reports. Each school district of this state shall
report to the state board of education no later than January
1 and July 1 of each year following the institution of such
system concerning its experience with such system during the
previous six months.

123-42-7. Administration. This article shall be administered
by the state board of education. The state board of education
shall have the authority to adopt reasonable rules and
regulations for the administration of the article.

Section 3. Appropriation. In addition to any other appro-
priation, there is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in
the state treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the depart-
ment of education, the sum of forty thousand dollars ($40,000)
for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1971, in order to carry
out the purposes of this act.

CHAPTER 123, S. 43 (ARTICLE 43) 1971
COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

AN ACT CONCERNING COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLANNING IN THE
PUBLIC SCHOOLS, AND MAKING AN APPROPRIATION THEREFOR.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of
Colorado:
Section 1. Chapter 123, Colorado Revised Statutes 1963, as amended, is amended by the addition of a new article to read:

123-43-1. Short title. This article shall be known and may be cited as "The Comprehensive Educational Planning Act."

123-43-2. Legislative declaration. It is the purpose of this article to assist school districts in comprehensive educational planning by providing financial support for the development of school improvement plans.

123-43-3. Definitions. (1) As used in this article, unless the context indicates otherwise:
   (2) "State board" means the state board of education.
   (3) "Department" means the department of education.
   (4) "District" means a Colorado school district organized and existing pursuant to law, but shall not include a junior college district.

123-43-4. Comprehensive educational planning. (1) (a) Comprehensive educational planning includes, but is not limited to, the following steps:
   (b) Evaluation of the present educational program and identification of the strengths and weaknesses of the district;
   (c) Delineation of the knowledge, skills, and attitudes which are the goals of the district's educational program;
   (d) Development of a plan for the district's educational program which will enable pupils in the district to meet the delineated goals.

123-43-5. Amount of grant. Districts shall be eligible to apply for grants of up to five thousand dollars per year from the state board for comprehensive educational planning.

123-43-6. Qualification. In order to qualify for a grant under this article, a district must submit to the department a letter of intent committing the district to the development of a comprehensive educational plan and committing funds for the planning program equal to or greater than the amount requested from the state.

123-43-7. Payment of grants. The district shall be entitled to receive the full amount of the grant when the initial planning, as required by section 123-41-8, is completed.

123-43-8. Initial planning. The district, with the assistance of the department, shall prepare a program for carrying out the initial evaluation, delineation of goals, and plan development for the district. The program shall provide for participation by community representatives, professional personnel, and students in all phases of the preparation of the comprehensive educational plan.
123-43-9. District report. Any district receiving a grant under the provisions of this article shall file with the state board, within one year of the submission of the letter of intent, a statement of costs and a report on the outcome of the completed phases of the comprehensive educational plan.

123-43-10. Allowable expenditures. (1) (a) Expenditures which may be financed through the grant are: (b) Salary for personnel, including expenditures for released time; (c) Consultation services; (d) Materials; (e) Travel, and other necessary services which are directly related to development of a comprehensive, long-range educational plan.

123-43-11. Administration. This article shall be administered by the state board. The state board shall have the authority to adopt reasonable rules and regulations for the administration of this article.

123-43-12. Special consulting services. The department may secure outside consulting services for the participating districts.

123-43-13. State board report. No later than February 1, 1972, December 1, 1972, and December 1 of each year thereafter, the state board shall transmit to the general assembly a report of the progress of school districts which are engaged in comprehensive educational planning under this article.

Section 2. Effective date. This act shall take effect July 1, 1971, and shall remain in effect until the general assembly determines that the purposes of the article have been satisfactorily met.

Section 3. Appropriation. (1) In addition to any other appropriation, there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the state treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the department of education, the sum of ninety thousand dollars ($90,000), for this fiscal year beginning July 1, 1971, for comprehensive educational planning by school districts.

(2) The department of education may expend not more than twenty-five percent of the amount appropriated in subsection (1) of this section for the purchase of consulting services for participating districts.

(3) Any amounts not allocated initially to districts shall remain available until June 30, 1972, and shall be allocated on the basis of need by the state board.
Section 4. Safety clause. The general assembly hereby finds, determines, and declares that this act is necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, and safety.
APPENDIX B

Michigan's Accountability Legislation - 1969
SECTION 14, PUBLIC ACT NO. 307
(Enacted in August, 1969)

Sec. 14. The department of education shall begin to
plan and develop a state program for the purpose of conduct-
ing a periodic and comprehensive assessment of educational
progress. Such plan shall include procedures for the
objective measurement of instructional outcomes among the
elementary and secondary school students pursuing the
various subjects and courses that commonly comprise school
curricula. Such plan shall be made statewide in application
among the elementary and secondary schools. Such plan shall
include procedures for the presentation of periodic evalua-
tion reports of educational progress for the state.

Also the department of education shall provide for an
annual test or tests of pupil achievements in the basic
skills. Such test or tests shall provide for the objective
measurement of pupil learning outcomes in reading, mathe-
matics, language arts and/or other general subject areas.
Such test or tests shall be undertaken at one or more grade
levels among elementary and/or secondary school pupils and
shall be made statewide in application insofar as is
necessary and possible.
APPENDIX C

Ohio's Accountability Legislation - 1971

270
HOUSE BILL NO. 475

Section 8. The state department of education shall develop a comprehensive system for providing educational management information and accountability capabilities. The system shall be designed for eventual implementation on a statewide basis and shall utilize the technology of the computer and related systems concepts. Developmental work by the department shall utilize pilot school districts and shall strive, with regard to all public and nonpublic elementary and secondary schools in the state, to (1) define those measurable objectives for which each facet and level of public education is to be held accountable; (2) identify pertinent data elements and devise methods and systems for fairly, accurately and uniformly measuring and reporting the extent to which the defined objectives are met; (3) develop uniform files, methods and systems for collecting, processing, sorting and analyzing data which will permit identification of those factors in the teaching-learning process which have the greatest relevance to student performance; (4) develop uniform accounting methods and systems which will relate the cost and the efficiency of those factors to the learning outcome; and (5) develop uniform systems of reporting the findings of the program to all interested persons.

The department may employ additional personnel and may contract with such experts and consultants as it deems necessary to carry out the duties imposed upon it by this section. The department shall submit to the general assembly on or before June 30, 1972, a report on its progress in meeting the goals of the accountability program as herein expressed. It shall submit a final, complete program and report to the general assembly on or before June 30, 1973 along with recommendations for complete implementation and maintenance of an ongoing educational management information and accountability system.
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