



**KANSAS ASSOCIATION  
OF SCHOOL BOARDS**

Serving Educational Leaders, Inspiring Student Success

[www.kasb.org](http://www.kasb.org)

Testimony before the  
**Committee on Taxation**  
on

**SB 270 - Tax credit for low income students scholarship program act; eligible students**

by

**Tom Krebs, Governmental Relations Specialist**

**May 6, 2015**

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

We rise in opposition to **SB 270**.

We opposed the bill last year when it appeared in the House, and given its expanse in scope, we stand even more opposed today.

Simply put, by supporting SB 270, the Legislature is buying a pig in a poke. Ten million of taxpayer dollars will go to a program where you, the folks writing the check, have no idea on your return on investment. No, you won't write checks for \$10 million but you will allow the state to forgo an additional \$10 million worth of revenue.

Yes, some of the money may go to a Catholic diocese that gives state tests in its efforts to earn state accreditation, but the fact is, the money, once directed to the SGO, can go to any school, accredited or not. The Legislature will have no way of telling how its investment of money is being used. Any sort of religious school, home school or anything else would be eligible.

The bill, as passed in HB 2506, limited scholarship recipients to students who attended a focus or priority school, as identified through the Title 1/ESEA process. (It should be noted the Senate version of the reauthorization of ESEA, which Senator Pat Roberts voted for in committee, has no federal dollars going anywhere but to public schools.)

This bill broadens the eligibility pool to any student regardless of the school they attend. They could be in a great school in Wichita, Topeka or Overland Park and be eligible to receive a scholarship.

KASB studies in past years have shown public school do just as well in state assessments when compared with diocese schools with similar free- and reduced-lunch eligible students.

We understand that under a current SB 7, a student leaving the district doesn't cost the district any BSAPP, but, simply put, the three-judge panel, could reimpose the old formula, which would cost the district money.

We have testified in this committee about the need for more revenue...tobacco, liquor, changes in tax rates. Not giving away \$10 million of revenue reduces the need for more tax increases.

The governor has cited the outcomes of our great public schools. Let's invest in them to the very best of our ability and help every kid that walks through their doors, not just the ones a private school had decided to accept.