

Legislative Research Department

November 3, 1975

M I N U T E S

LEGISLATIVE EDUCATIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE
(1202 COMMISSION)

October 13 and 14, 1975

Room 519 - State House

Members Present

Senator Joseph Harder, Chairman
Representative Jim Maag, Vice-Chairman
Senator Billy McCray (October 13)
Senator Jan Meyers
Senator Jack Steineger
Representative John Bower
Representative John Carlin
Representative Don Crumbaker
Representative Roger Robertson

Staff Present

Dr. James Drury, Legislative Research Department
Carolyn Rampey, Legislative Research Department
Ben Barrett, Legislative Research Department
Bruce Beecher, Legislative Research Department
Avis Badke, Revisor of Statutes Office

Conferees

Dale Brooks, Kansas Association of Area Vocational Technical
Schools
Nathan Butcher, representing Salina business community
Dr. Harold Ellis, Director of Personnel Development, Black and
Veatch
Eddie Estes, Director, Southwest Kansas AVTS
John Frazier, Chairman, Kansas State Board of Education
Dr. Kenneth Gowdy, Head of Engineering Technology, Kansas State
University
Dr. Leon Hazen, President, Kansas Association of Community
Colleges

Conferees (Cont'd.)

Paul Miller, Kansas Engineering Society
W. A. Rumbaugh, Acting Executive Director, Advisory Council
for Vocational Education
Vic Salem, Executive Secretary, Kansas Higher Education
Association
Dr. William Spence, Dean, School of Technology and Applied
Science, Kansas State College of Pittsburg
Jess Stewart, Member, Kansas State Board of Regents
Doug Sundblom, President, Student Government Association, KTI
James O. Thompson, President, KTI
Kermit K. Thompson, Kansas Engineering Society

October 13, 1975

9:00 a.m.

Revision and Restructuring of
Postsecondary Education

John Frazier, speaking for the State Board of Education, described the history of the State Board's involvement with community colleges and discussed the nature of the State Board's supervision. (A copy of his presentation is in the Committee notebooks.) Mr. Frazier emphasized the extent to which the State Board promotes cooperation and coordination among institutions under its governance as well as with other segments of postsecondary education.

Mr. Frazier said the State Board has taken the position (most recently at a meeting October 7, 1975) that the community colleges are rightfully the responsibility of the State Board of Education since that Board's mission is basically to govern institutions that are local, not statewide, in character. He expressed concern at the fate of vocational programs (particularly for secondary students) if the governance for community colleges were to change.

He suggested that working to improve the present system of governance is a better alternative than changing it.

In response to questions, Mr. Frazier said the State Board presently has the statutory authority it needs to supervise the community colleges. He cited the activity of the Council of Deans and Directors of Instruction (CODDI) and the Council of Chief Academic Officers of the Board of Regents (COCAO) as an example of inter-agency cooperative efforts within the existing governance structure.

John Synder, Deputy Commissioner, Division of Vocational Education State Department of Education, said there would be a duplication of staff if community colleges went under the Board

of Regents since both the Regents and the Department of Education would have to have staff to work with vocational programs.

Dr. Merle Bolton, Commissioner of Education, informed the Committee that the State Department is presently studying KTI and would make a recommendation.

L. C. Crouch, Deputy Commissioner, Division of Continuing Education, described the process by which a new community college program is approved: upon receipt of a proposal for a new program, the State Department staff evaluates it. If it is approved by the Director of the Community Junior College section, the State Department begins working with the community college to implement and coordinate the program.

If the State Department rejects the proposal, the community college may appeal first to the head of the Division of Continuing Education (Mr. Crouch), then to the Commissioner, (Dr. Bolton), then finally to the State Department of Education. (The approval procedure described above applies mainly to vocational programs. Because of a lack of staff, the State Department is unable to devote a great deal of time to programs other than vocational. In cases where no state funds are involved such as community service programs, State Department activity is very limited.)

Dale Brooks addressed the Committee and said he hopes the AVT schools remain under the State Board of Education since there is more of a tie between AVTS' and USD's than with Regents institutions.

Dr. W. A. Rumbaugh and Dr. Russell Graham, President, Coffeyville Community Junior College, expressed concern about the status of vocational education were the community colleges to go under the Board of Regents. Dr. Graham said he believes the State Board of Education places a higher priority on vocational education programs than does the Board of Regents.

Eddie Estes, Director of the Dodge City AVTS, stressed the importance of career education and described the mechanisms that have been established in Dodge City among USD's, the Dodge City Community College, and the AVTS in order to coordinate vocational programs. It is Mr. Estes' opinion that the present governing structure is adequate and that coordination and cooperation are taking place all over the state.

Dr. Leon Hazen reviewed the proposal made by the Kansas Association of Community Colleges. He said that if a third state board for community colleges is not possible, remaining under the State Board of education is the Association's second choice. Dr. Hazen said major concerns if the community colleges went under the Board of Regents would be the delivery of vocational education services and the powers and duties of local boards of trustees.

In response to questions, he said he does not believe there is an overlap between community colleges and AVT schools, particularly since AVT schools do not offer community service programs.

Dr. Hazen acknowledged that, among some community college people, there is a feeling if the community colleges went under the Board of Regents, they would receive more state money.

Jess Stewart, speaking as an individual member of the Board of Regents, reiterated the Board's position that all postsecondary academic programs should be under a board of regents. He said he does not believe program coordination is possible under our present system of governance and that there needs to be one constitutional board with authority over all academic postsecondary education.

When asked whether the 1202 Commission could perform the overall coordinating function, Mr. Stewart said institutions would not be as responsive to the 1202 Commission as they would be to a governing board.

Mr. Stewart told the Committee he envisions a board of regents staff devoted to various areas of postsecondary education -- vocational, academic, and community service. He said he does not believe the board itself should be composed of persons representing particular areas of postsecondary education, but should be broadly oriented toward education in general. He said he believes the present Board of Regents is characterized by a broad view of education and quite possibly would not have to be reconstituted to become the governing board for all postsecondary education.

He told the Committee he is opposed to the idea of a third board for community colleges and believes the Board of Regents could supervise the community colleges, retaining local boards of trustees. He said he is opposed to the idea of one board over all education (elementary, secondary, and postsecondary) because of the workload, and also opposed to a coordinating board superimposed over existing governing boards.

Vic Salem, Executive Secretary, Kansas Higher Education Association, gave the Committee the results of a poll he had taken among community college faculty. Of the faculty who responded (at Seward, Hutchinson, Garden City, Butler, and Cloud community colleges), 110 believed community colleges should not go under the Board of Regents, five believed they should, 110 believed the community colleges should stay under the Board of Education, 84 favored a third board for community colleges, and six favored other alternatives.

Kansas Technical Institute

James Thompson, President, KTI, addressed the Committee and asked them to consider the qualities that make KTI unique.

(A copy of his presentation is in the Committee notebooks.) He focused primarily on the KTI faculty and said that an emphasis is placed upon getting faculty members who have practical technical experience so that graduates of KTI are better prepared for actual job placement. He said the faculty at four-year institutions is research oriented and more interested in developing students to do graduate work than in placing them on jobs.

In response to questions from Committee members, Mr. Thompson expressed some concern at placing KTI under the Board of Regents on the grounds that there might be an attempt made to make four-year programs out of KTI offerings. He said he feared a basic lack of sympathy on the part of the Regents to the type of technical education offered at KTI and feared a loss of identity if the governance were to change.

Doug Sundblom, President of the Student Government Association at KTI, told the Committee students at KTI are proud of their school, like the idea of a two-year, no nonsense program leading to a degree, and want KTI to continue as a separate institution. (A copy of Mr. Sundblom's presentation is in the notebooks.)

Kermit Thompson, representing the Kansas Engineering Society, reported on the results of a study undertaken by an ad hoc committee of the Society in 1970. He said the primary findings were that: (1) there is a need for engineering technology in Kansas and (2) KTI is doing a good job. The ad hoc committee made no recommendation concerning the location of KTI.

Mr. Thompson said the Committee devoted some time comparing KTI offerings with community college technical programs and concluded that there is a distinct difference between the two types of offerings, namely that KTI programs prepare a graduate to step directly into the job of assisting an engineer, while community college training is of a more limited vocational nature.

Mr. Thompson told the Committee the need for KTI graduates will increase as the Kansas economy grows.

Dr. Gowdy addressed the Committee concerning the new four program in engineering technology begun at Kansas State last year. He said the program, which presently enrolls 40 students, differs from KTI programs in that the four-year program places an emphasis on liberal arts courses as well as technical courses and graduates students with more depth and breadth.

Dr. Gowdy said there is a demand from industry for four-year year technologists and that students like the program because the core courses can be applied to other majors if the student changes his mind.

Dr. Gowdy told the Committee he believes there is a need for two-year programs and is not opposed to the idea of Kansas State offering some.

He said the program at Kansas State was designed to accept KTI graduates and students may transfer 60 hours from KTI to apply toward a BS degree in technology at Kansas State. He told the Committee no new faculty had been added for the four-year program. (A copy of Dr. Gowdy's presentation is in the notebooks.)

Dr. Spence told the Committee Kansas State College of Pittsburg would be able to offer the programs presently offered at KTI if the institution in Salina were phased out. He said the advantages of relocating all two-year programs at Pittsburg is that the programs would have the higher status of being associated with an engineering school but could still retain a separate identity.

He told the Committee he believes community colleges are unable to offer much technical training because the programs are too expensive. Much of what they call "technical" training is really vocational, he said.

In response to questions, Dr. Spence said Pittsburg would need to hire eleven new faculty members plus support staff to handle new programs were KTI to be relocated there. It would also be necessary to rent a building to house KTI's aeronautical program.

Dr. Spence said the only area of possible duplication between Pittsburg and KTI is in the field of electronics.

Mr. Butcher addressed the Committee and discussed the need for KTI graduates, who, he said, differ from graduates of community colleges, AVTS', and four-year institutions. (A copy of his presentation is in the notebooks.) He told the Committee he could understand why KTI might be placed under the Board of Regents, but he hoped the institution would remain in Salina and be permitted to develop its programs without constant threats to close or move it.

Dr. Ellis told the Committee there is a need for more KTI-type graduates. He disagreed that there is a need for four-year technology programs. The "demand", he said, is created by parents who want their children to obtain a degree.

He told the Committee four-year graduates are misfits because they are not able to function as engineers but do not like to accept jobs they consider beneath them because they can be filled by graduates of two-year programs.

Tuesday, October 14, 1975

10:00 a.m.

Senator Harder asked Committee members to sum up their reactions to issues the Committee has dealt with and indicate their opinions as to the proper response the 1202 Commission should make.

Most Committee members stressed the importance of taking deliberate, well thought-out action on any matters concerning education instead of making radical changes just for the sake of change. A general feeling expressed was that the educational system in Kansas is working reasonably well and some problems that do exist could be solved within the present governance system.

Among aspects of the present system that received specific endorsement by some Committee members were local control for AVT schools and community colleges, the local tax levy for community colleges, and continued support and possible expansion of vocational offerings.

Problem areas that still need to be dealt with identified by Committee members included declining enrollments, lack of a clearly defined role for each postsecondary segment, the need for better coordination, the need to control state spending for education, and the need to make the educational system responsive to manpower demands.

Senator Steineger expressed his disagreement with some of the concepts expressed by other Committee members. It is his opinion that community colleges should not offer programs in the technical area because that puts them in competition with KTI and the Regents institutions. He said he believes the community colleges have more in common with the four-year colleges and universities and belong under the Board of Regents. He also said the original concept behind community colleges was that they were local institutions, locally funded. He expressed concern that these local institutions are making ever increasing financial demands upon the state treasury.

Senator Steineger questioned the policy which promotes the delivery of vocational programs by 19 different community junior colleges, 14 area vocational schools, approximately 185 univied school districts, two regents institutions and KTI operating under three or more different governing structures and receiving different levels of state funding.

Senator Steineger told the Committee he believes the problems in education are best left to professional educators because the legislature has neither the time nor the expertise to solve them. He said the role of the 1202 Commission is to make policy regarding governance and let the governing boards manage the institutions.

Following the discussion, Representative Carlin (seconded by Representative Bower) moved to reject "Possibility A" as a package to be recommended by the Committee. [Possibility A would have, among other things, transferred the community colleges to the Board of Regents and would have placed postsecondary programs in the AVT schools under the Regents.]

Senator Steineger offered a substitute motion to transfer the community colleges to the Board of Regents, restructured to reflect community college interests. The substitute motion failed for want of a second.

The original motion was voted on and carried.

Following the vote, the Committee considered a list of powers and duties to be performed by the 1202 Commission. There was discussion of some of the items with the understanding that a decision would be made later. Upon a motion by Representative Robertson (seconded by Representative Carlin) it was moved that the Commission, by Resolution, officially recognize the advisory board made up of members of the State Board of Education and the State Board of Regents to advise the 1202 Commission on specific charges given to it by the Commission.

There was general consensus that the Committee should work with the various segments of postsecondary education in order to develop a clearer definition of role for each segment. Some concern was expressed as to the extent to which the 1202 Commission should become involved in reviewing and coordinating post-secondary education.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be November 13 and 14 (Thursday and Friday). Among items on the agenda will be further consideration of the powers and duties of the 1202 Commission and KTI.

The meeting was adjourned.

Prepared by Carolyn Rampey

Approved by Committee on:

(Date)