

M I N U T E S

LEGISLATIVE EDUCATIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE
(1202 Commission)

June 2 and 3, 1977

Room 532 - State House

Members Present

Representative Roger Robertson, Chairman
Senator Joseph Harder, Vice-Chairman
Senator Tom Rehorn
Representative Richard Brewster (June 3)
Representative Don Crumbaker
Representative Kalo Hineman
Representative Ruth Luzzati
Representative Fred Weaver

Other Legislators at Meeting

Representative Bill Reardon

Staff Present

Phill Jones, Director, Kansas Legislative Research Department
Carolyn Rampey, Kansas Legislative Research Department
Linda Tigges, Kansas Legislative Research Department
Deb Krajnak, Kansas Legislative Research Department
Avis Badke, Revisor of Statutes Office

Conferees Present

Mike Haight, Coordinator for Information Services, Board of Educational Finance, Santa Fe, New Mexico
Dr. Tom Rawson, Research Officer, Kansas State Board of Regents
Dr. Harold Finch, Vice-President, Johnson County Community College; Director of Research, Kansas Association of Community Colleges
Dr. Elaine Tatham, Director of Institutional Research, Johnson County Community College
Sam Newland, Education Specialist for Community Junior Colleges, Kansas State Department of Education
Dr. Gwen Nelson, President, Cowley County Community College; Chairman, Council of Post-Secondary Administrators
Ed Walbourn, Executive Director, Kansas Association of Community Colleges
Jim Maag, Legislative Liaison, Governor's Office
Dorothy G. Groesbeck, Chairperson, Kansas State Board of Education
Dr. Joe McFarland, Academic Officer, Kansas State Board of Regents
Jack McGlothlin, Chairman, Advisory Council for Community Junior Colleges
Dr. Robert Kelly, Executive Director, Associated Independent Colleges of Kansas
Harry Falgren, Director, Kansas City Area Vocational School; President, Kansas Association of Area Vocational-Technical Schools

June 2, 1977

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

NCHEMS Information Exchange Procedures (IEP)
in the Community Junior Colleges

Mr. Haight, who formerly worked for the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS), described both the broader concept of IEP as well as how the concept had been adopted in New Mexico. A copy of his presentation is in the Committee notebooks.

Mr. Haight said that, although NCHEMS products had been developed for use at the institutional level, they could produce information valuable to state-level policy makers. He pointed out that many funding formulas are based on credit hour aid -- a fact that causes institutional personnel to think in terms of producing as many credit hours as possible without thinking in terms of other educational goals. He said that better information about institutional costs would enable policy makers to evaluate institutional requests more rationally.

Dr. Rawson said that, in 1975, the Regents' Council of Presidents approved the implementation of IEP at the Regents' institutions in three phases to be completed by November, 1978. (The Kansas University Medical Center is on a slightly different program and the Kansas Technical Institute is not involved.)

Dr. Rawson said the plan, which was on schedule, involved the selection and training of campus personnel (Phase I), the initial implementation of IEP (Phase II), and a second run-through using actual FY 1977 data (Phase III).

He told the Committee that the Legislature had appropriated \$98,500 for the project for FY 1977.

Mr. Haight resumed his discussion of IEP by describing how the cost data obtained from IEP was used by the New Mexico Board of Educational Finance. (The Board is a lay group appointed by the governor which reviews the budget requests of institutions and makes recommendations to the legislature.)

He said that, using NCHEMS products, it was possible to determine the cost of each credit hour taught. Such information could be used to estimate institutional expenditures and to fund institutions on the basis of actual direct costs of each discipline. Although the New Mexico Legislature did not dictate to the institutions how state money should be allocated, theoretically, the Legislature could adjust its appropriation if an institution allocated its funds without considering the actual costs of disciplines.

He said that, by the end of the year, information on two-year schools in New Mexico would be available and that comparisons between direct costs of disciplines at two- and four-year schools would be possible.

June 3, 1977

Dr. Finch reported that several Kansas community colleges have already started working on IEP, although IEP was of limited value unless several institutions had implemented it. (One of the benefits of IEP is the ability to exchange information with other schools.)

He said implementing IEP required a strong commitment on the part of the institution and that some small community colleges would be burdened by a requirement that they implement IEP. He said it would be better for the Legislature to encourage and support schools rather than mandate IEP.

Dr. Finch said there were several advantages to state-level policy makers if the community colleges implemented IEP. He said legislators would have uniform data and a tool to use to evaluate the effects of policy decisions.

Dr. Tatham said Johnson County Community College had already begun to move into certain areas of IEP and that some community colleges did have the personnel and computers to implement IEP.

She said a prime advantage of IEP was the ability to spot trends and to evaluate the school on a several-year basis. In addition to trend analysis, Dr. Tatham said IEP permitted a full disclosure of data and a greater ability to analyze policy.

Dr. Finch said he doubted all the community colleges could implement IEP without some state financial support. He said he supported the idea of a pilot project whereby IEP would be implemented in several schools.

Mr. Newland said the Kansas State Department of Education began an NCHEMS project in February, 1976, which involved compiling a community college program inventory using the HEGIS (Higher Education Government Information Survey) taxonomy. He said one problem with the HEGIS data was that the taxonomy was not as applicable to community college vocational programs as it was to academic programs, but that the NCHEMS staff was presently trying to develop a more suitable taxonomy for two-year schools.

Mr. Newland said NCHEMS activities undertaken by the Kansas State Board of Education were compatible with those undertaken by the Kansas State Board of Regents.

He said it was unlikely that small community colleges could implement IEP without some state financial support.

Mr. Newland told the Committee there is presently no NCHEMS activity taking place in the State Department of Education (except to periodically update the inventory) and that there is no funding for NCHEMS in the State Department budget.

At the request of the Chairman, the staff summarized three options before the Committee regarding data collection at the community colleges:

1. Implement the complete NCHEMS IEP model at the community colleges using additional state money appropriated for that purpose.
2. Have the State Department of Education, assisted by the Committee staff, develop a plan to implement IEP at the community colleges.
3. Have the Committee staff, assisted by the State Department of Education, work on an adapted version of IEP and report back to the Committee with a proposal and alternatives.

The Committee agreed to the third option and instructed the staff to consult with staff in the State Department of Education to develop a proposal with alternatives to mail out to Committee members prior to the next meeting. The staff was instructed to address the question of the applicability of NCHEMS terminology to vocational-technical education programs.

It was noted that at a Committee meeting last fall (September 28, 1976), Dr. Merle Bolton, Commissioner of Education, Kansas State Department of Education, had recommended that data collection activities be centralized and coordinated, either by the Division of Planning and Research in the Department of Administration or by the Legislative Educational Planning Committee (1202 Commission).

Postsecondary Enrollment Projections

Prior to renewing its contract with Dr. Kenneth Anderson, Kansas University, to provide enrollment projections, the Committee discussed some areas of concern. Partly in response to a letter from the Associated Independent Colleges of Kansas detailing some problems the independent schools have with the projections (a copy is in the Committee notebooks), Committee members asked Dr. Anderson if he could make several changes in his methodology to make the projections more valid.

Dr. Anderson agreed that many changes had taken place in postsecondary education in recent years and that some changes in his method of making projections could and should be made.

Specifically, the Committee asked Dr. Anderson to consider showing the projections on the basis of full-time equivalent (FTE) students in addition to headcount, on the grounds that "full-time equivalency" was a standard unit which in some cases was more relevant to policy considerations than was "headcount."

Also, Dr. Anderson agreed that more weight could be given to recent enrollments, thus placing less emphasis upon past years and events that were unique and no longer of great influence upon enrollments.

Dr. Anderson said there was no reliable way to predict the number of adult and continuing education students who would be attending school in the next several years.

Upon a motion by Representative Crumbaker, seconded by Senator Harder, the Committee voted to approve a contract with Dr. Anderson to provide enrollment projections. The contract is for the amount of \$1,100, the same amount as for two of the three previous years Dr. Anderson has been under contract to the Committee.

Dr. Anderson's report will be presented to the Legislative Coordinating Council prior to January 1, 1978.

Concept of Regionalization

Dr. Nelson said he supported regionalization because it would ensure the proper coordination and control of postsecondary education. (A copy of his presentation is in the notebooks.) He said he favored regional taxing units and state aid at the 50 percent level (as opposed to the current level of approximately 37 percent). He said state aid should be distributed to the community colleges on the basis of an equalization formula in order to reduce existing inequities.

Mr. Walbourn pointed out that community colleges have always viewed themselves as regional institutions and that increases in community college enrollments indicated that community colleges were meeting demands and offering necessary services.

He said he strongly supported the idea of a local regional board having control of all postsecondary education in a region. He said he did not support the idea of all postsecondary institutions, including the Regents' institutions, being under one state-level governing board.

Mr. Walbourn told the Committee he could see no reason why any institutions would be threatened by regionalization.

In response to a question, Mr. Walbourn said a state school probably would not contract with a private school to offer a program if it could be offered for less money at the state school.

Dr. Nelson said his school (Cowley County Community College) had contracted with a private school (St. John's College, Winfield) to offer a nursing program because it was cheaper for the community college to pay the higher tuition for its students to enroll in the nursing program at St. John's College than it was to start a nursing program of its own.

Mr. Maag said it was difficult to separate the concept of regionalization from such matters as funding and the authority of local regional boards. He indicated that the increased cost to the state of regionalization could be sizable.

Mr. Maag said one benefit of regionalization might be that competition among postsecondary institutions would be minimized.

Mr. Maag said one of the Governor's main concerns with regionalization was the impact a regional tax levy could have on counties where there is no community college. Citing 1975 county tax rates for 1976, Mr. Maag presented the following information on the 101 counties for which reports were available:

1. Thirty-three counties made no levy for out-district tuition. (Six of the 33 counties were community college districts.)
2. Nineteen counties levied less than .25 mills for out-district tuition.
3. Twenty-one counties levied between .25 and .50 mills for out-district tuition.
4. Nine counties levied more than 1 mill for out-district tuition.

Mr. Maag said the fact that 73 counties were levying less than .5 mills for out-district tuition at the present time had to be taken into consideration when contemplating a region-wide tax base for community colleges.

In response to a question, Mr. Maag said the Governor favored putting the community colleges under the Kansas State Board of Regents.

Dr. McFarland said the Kansas State Board of Regents had not really considered regionalization except in terms of academic service areas.

Mrs. Groesbeck said the Kansas State Board of Education supported the concept of regionalization and referred the Committee to the 1974 report from the State Board of Education which recommended dividing the state into no more than ten postsecondary regions. (A copy of Mrs. Groesbeck's presentation is in the Committee notebooks.) She noted that the task force that reported to the State Board of Education had recommended 20 postsecondary regions.

Mr. McGlothlin, who served on the task force, said he thought 20 regions was more practical and that, if regionalization could not be implemented state-wide, he supported the idea of implementing the concept region-by-region.

He said he opposed the idea of putting the community colleges under the Kansas State Board of Regents, but said if that did happen, the community colleges should get full state funding.

Dr. Kelly said he was not opposed to regionalization, particularly not if schools could contract with each other and develop more cooperation among themselves.

He raised several questions about regionalization, such as whether there could be constitutional problems regarding funding and the independent schools. He also pointed out that many independent schools did not think of their constituency on a regional basis.

Mr. Falgren said that in 1969 the area vocational schools supported the concept of regionalization for area vocational schools. He said some schools still supported the idea, although it was less talked about now.

He said that, generally, developments in recent years had been favorable to vocational education and area vocational schools. He said there was concern that changes in postsecondary education could bring about some negative results. He told the Committee he saw very little duplication between area vocational schools and community colleges.

Regarding the regionalization concept specifically, Mr. Falgren reminded the Committee that area vocational schools served both secondary and postsecondary students. He said the aspect of the regionalization plan that provided for contracts might make it difficult to administer a school since there would be no way an administrator could know from year to year what services might be contracted for.

Mr. Falgren said that speaking as a taxpayer who lived in a community college district, he liked the idea of spreading the community college levy over a several-county area. But he said if he lived in the next county he might reconsider his position.

The Committee indicated that as it pursued the matter of regionalization at later meetings and began to hold hearings on 1977 H.B. 2567, the Kansas Regional Education Act, it wanted input from a wide variety of sources including county commissions.

Other Matters

The staff informed the Committee that the members of the Technical Advisory Committee on Data Collection had been selected and would meet twice before the next 1202 Commission meeting to consider the facilities study and postsecondary enrollments.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be July 12 and 13 (Tuesday and Wednesday). Among items that will likely be considered at that meeting are a report on planning activities taking

place at Kansas community colleges, proposals relating to the implementation of IEP at the community colleges, a report from the Kansas State Board of Regents concerning nursing education, and a continuation of the hearings on regionalization.

The meeting was adjourned.

Prepared by Carolyn Rampey

Approved by Committee on:

(Date)