

M I N U T E S

LEGISLATIVE EDUCATIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE
(1202 Commission)

July 12 and 13, 1977

Room 528 - State House

Members Present

Representative Ruth Luzzati, Chairperson
Senator Joseph Harder, Vice-Chairperson
Senator Ross Doyen
Senator Billy McCray
Senator Jan Meyers
Senator Tom Rehorn (July 13)
Representative Don Crumbaker
Representative Kalo Hineman (July 13)
Representative Bill Reardon

Staff Present

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

Conferees Present

Dr. Gwen Nelson, President, Cowley County Community College; Chairman, Council of Postsecondary Administrators
Dr. James Tangeman, President, Colby Community College
Dr. Kathleen Rice, Dean of Community Services and Coordinator of Occupational Programs, Labette County Community Junior College
Mr. Charles Barnes, President, Dodge City Community College
Dr. Elaine Tatham, Director of Institutional Research, Johnson County Community College
Dr. James Ihrig, President, Cloud County Community College
Dr. Jack Flint, President Emeritus, Kansas City Kansas Community College
Dr. Wee Rumbaugh, Director, Postsecondary Administration, State Department of Education
Jack McGlothlin, Chairman, Advisory Council for Community Junior Colleges
Dr. Carl Heinrich, President, Butler County Community College
Dr. Lloyd J. Schurr, Superintendent, U.S.D. 305 (Salina)
Stan Lind, Legal Counsel for the Kansas Association of Community Colleges
Dr. Leon Hazen, President, Kansas Association of Community Colleges
Fred Allen, Executive Secretary, Kansas Association of Counties
Harry Falgren, Director, Kansas City Area Vocational School; President, Kansas Association of Area Vocational-Technical Schools
Paul Fleener, Kansas Farm Bureau
Byron Smith, Superintendent, U.S.D. 361 (Anthony)
Dr. Joe McFarland, Academic Officer, Kansas State Board of Regents
Ed Walbourn

July 12, 1977

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

Planning Efforts in the Community Colleges

The staff presented material relating to community colleges obtained from responses to a questionnaire sent to all postsecondary institutions in March, 1977. (At later meetings, material will be presented for Regents' institutions, area vocational schools, and private and proprietary schools.)

The main components of the planning process were identified as: (1) the identification and assessment of problems and needs, (2) the determination of policies and priorities to address these problems, (3) the definition of goals, (4) the delineation of quantifiable objectives to accomplish the goals, (5) the formulation of programs in terms of people, activities, and time, (6) the allocation of fiscal resources through budgeting, and (7) the evaluation of how well objectives and goals are being met.

The staff told the Committee that, on the basis of information received from community colleges, all community colleges were engaged to some degree in planning, although mission statements were so general that in some cases it was difficult to make comparisons among schools.

Dr. Nelson told the Committee Cowley County Community College had a fairly sophisticated planning process involving a steering committee and the Board of Trustees. He said that objectives were identified in the institution's plan and evaluated periodically.

Dr. Tangeman said planning kept everyone informed about where the school was going and helped administrators anticipate problems. He said the main steps in planning were to: (1) determine where the school was, (2) decide where the school should be, and (3) decide how to get there.

He told the Committee it was very important to have community input into the planning process.

Both he and Dr. Nelson said they viewed their schools' budgets as separate from their schools' plans. They said they did not attach budget figures to the objectives in the planning documents.

Dr. Rice told the Committee that it was not surprising to find great similarity in the community colleges' mission statements since the missions of the schools were similar — to serve all of the clients in their area.

Dr. Rice said it was important that plans be flexible since conditions affecting community colleges were seldom stable. She cited as an example the declining enrollment at Labette Community College and the schools' need to adjust to the changing student body.

She told the Committee a big problem for schools was the lack of coordination among agencies that made funds available to the schools for various programs. She said it was difficult to know how much money a school might have available from such sources.

Mr. Barnes told the Committee it was important that administrators, faculty, and students have a role in the planning process since a plan had to be understood if it was to be implemented. He said the North Central Association, which accredits community colleges, had emphasized the importance of planning.

Dr. Tatham said that planning and budget preparation were closely tied. She said plans should be flexible enough to take into account new developments in postsecondary education and noted that there were definite trends toward older students, women, and working students attending school.

She said planning for two-year schools needed to take into account what was offered by four-year institutions. She cited the cooperation that existed between Johnson County Community College, Kansas City Community College, and Kansas University as an example of institutions coordinating their activities.

Dr. Ihrig told the Committee that the planning process had to be cyclical and dependable. He said he viewed planning basically as a management tool that had an impact on the daily activities of an institution.

Dr. Flint described the planning process as a "road map" that identified a school's destination and detailed the routes by which the destination could be reached. He said the needs of the community, enrollment projections, and resources were all elements that had to be taken into account in planning. He said the desire of community colleges to become accredited by the North Central Association had had an impact on community college planning.

Mr. McGlothlin described the role of the Community Junior College Advisory Council in community college planning. He said the duty of the Council had been to recommend a state plan to the State Board of Education and that a revision of the plan was almost ready to be presented to the Board. (An earlier revision submitted to the Board was returned to the Advisory Council for further work.)

Mr. McGlothlin said the Advisory Council represented all educational interests and had been active in developing the original community college plan and in promoting cooperation among the various institutions.

Dr. Rumbaugh told the Committee that the State Department of Education made revisions and recommendations concerning the state plan for community colleges after receiving input from the Advisory Council and other groups. He said the responsibility of the State Department of Education to plan and provide services in other areas tended to ensure that community colleges were coordinated with other educational activities.

Dr. Rumbaugh said he considered the mission of community colleges to be to provide post-high school education within a reasonable commuting distance to students. He said community colleges offered services in the broad areas of: (1) general academic programs, (2) vocational-technical programs, (3) continuing education programs, (4) adult education, and (5) community service programs. He noted the great need for adult education programs due to the large number of adults in Kansas who did not have high school educations.

Mr. Walbourn discussed the role of the Kansas Association of Community Colleges in the planning process and noted that he had been a member of the committee that had developed a statement of role for community colleges in 1974. As a result of that committee's work, the Kansas Association of Community Colleges had adopted a mission statement that identified the following areas of service:

1. College transfer and general education programs.
2. Vocational and technical education.
3. Continuing education.
4. Community services.
5. Counseling and guidance services.
6. Developmental education (adult and remedial education programs).

At the conclusion of the hearings, the Committee decided to devote some time at a future meeting to a review of the State Plan for Community Colleges when the plan has been adopted by the Kansas State Board of Education.

Background and Activities of the Legislative Educational Planning Committee (1202 Commission)

Mr. Jones noted that the Committee derived its authority from three sources: The Kansas Constitution, which authorized the legislature to provide for the education of the citizenry, Kansas statutes that established the Legislative Educational Planning Committee, and federal law that established the state 1202 Commissions.

He said the activities of the Committee had fallen into the broad categories of legislative-type activities, planning activities, data collection activities, and coordination activities.

He said the Kansas 1202 Commission, because it was composed entirely of legislators, was unique in the sense that the persons responsible for planning were also responsible for policy enactment.

July 13, 1977

Nursing Education

Dr. McFarland told the Committee that the Kansas State Board of Regents was in the process of responding to the Committee's recommendation that the Board evaluate the nursing education programs offered by the Regents' institutions.

Dr. McFarland said a subcommittee had been meeting to consider the Board's response and that a question had been raised concerning the validity of the data contained in the nursing education report. He said the subcommittee wished to verify the data, especially projections of supply and demand, before it made its recommendations to the Board.

Postsecondary Data Collection

The staff reported to the Committee that the Statewide Technical Advisory Committee had held two meetings to discuss the facilities study, the enrollment report, and the enrollment projections.

It was the Technical Advisory Committee's recommendation that utilization data for the facilities study be collected every other year and that the report be published on a periodic basis and not every year. The Advisory Committee recommended that all other facilities data be collected every year and be made available in Xeroxed form, including a printout for each institution.

Regarding the enrollment projections done for the Committee by Dr. Kenneth Anderson, Kansas University, the Technical Advisory Committee recommended that more weight be given recent historical data by using eight years of historical data instead of 13, that the projections show full-time equivalent enrollments in addition to headcount, and that projections be shown for individual institutions only when the correlation ratio for the regression formula was statistically significant.

The staff also presented a proposal for the implementation of the National Center for Higher Education Management System's (NCHEMS) Information Exchange Procedures (IEP) at the community colleges. Under the proposal, an adapted form of IEP would be implemented which would provide the direct cost per credit hour for instructional disciplines. The adapted form of IEP would be comparable to the traditional IEP model being implemented by the Regents' institutions, except that the data for the Regents' institutions would be provided for upper and lower division students and for student majors in addition to instructional disciplines. When implemented, IEP will provide cost data that can be used for budgetary purposes as well as a basis for comparisons among schools.

It was proposed by the staff that one or two pilot institutions be selected from among the community colleges in order to test the adapted IEP model. Implementing IEP in these pilot institutions, Phase I, would be completed by July 1, 1978. Phase II, to be completed by July 1, 1979, would involve implementing IEP in all community colleges.

Upon a motion by Senator Harder, seconded by Representative Crumbaker, the Committee voted to approve the proposal and proceed with the pilot project.

The staff was directed to develop the criteria by which the pilot institutions will be selected, which will include willingness of the institution to participate, size of the institution, automation of data, and proximity to Topeka. The pilot institutions will be selected by the staff in cooperation with the State Department of Education, subject to final approval by the Legislative Educational Planning Committee (1202 Commission).

Kansas Regional Education Act (1977 H.B. 2567)

The staff presented a background memorandum describing regionalization activities in states other than Kansas. In addition, the memorandum contained information on voluntary and ad hoc regional arrangements as well as attempts to implement regionalization in Kansas on a more formal basis.

Dr. Heinrich cited previous proposals and studies going back to 1963 that had directly or indirectly recommended regionalization. They included the Master Planning Commission Report (1972), the Report of the Ozarks Regional Planning Commission (1973), and the Report of the State Board of Education (1974).

Mr. Lind reviewed 1977 H.B. 2567, which contained the following major features:

1. Division of the state into between 20 and 22 postsecondary regions.
2. Creation of a regional governing board for each postsecondary region.
3. Creation of a Board of Control, which would be the State Board of Education, to act as the state board for postsecondary education.

Mr. Lind explained that the local regional boards would have authority to contract for postsecondary services within each region and that one of the main advantages of the proposed system would be better coordination of all postsecondary programs.

Mr. Schurr said he supported the concept of regionalization because it would involve all areas of the state in postsecondary education, not just those areas where there was an area vocational school or a community college.

Dr. Flint said the concept of regionalization was not new and that it was time to implement a regionalization proposal. He said he believed the creation of a third board for postsecondary education was desirable but not very realistic. Therefore, he was supportive of the provision in 1977 H.B. 2567 which would make the State Board of Education the State Board of Control for the postsecondary regions.

Mr. Walbourn explained that a funding section had been left out of the 1977 version of the bill in order to focus attention on the merits of regionalization itself and not its financing. As envisioned by the proponents of the bill, the regions would be funded 50 percent by the state, 35 percent by local resources, and 15 percent by student tuition. (The percentages were averages for the state as a whole.) Local resources would be derived from a regionwide mill levy of one mill and the state aid would be distributed on the basis of an equalization formula.

Several Committee members observed that counties where there was presently no levy for community colleges (or only a low levy for out-district tuition) might oppose a regionwide mill levy.

Mr. Walbourn made a statement in behalf of Dr. John Cleek, President, Johnson County Community College, who wanted to be on record as endorsing regionalization, provided it was a step forward and did not require community colleges to give up gains they had made.

Dr. Hazen told the Committee he supported the regionalization plan because he believed it would bring an element of rationality to postsecondary education.

Mr. Allen spoke in opposition to the bill, saying that the use of property taxes for services such as those proposed in the bill was becoming more and more unacceptable to taxpayers and tax experts alike.

He pointed out that inequities in assessments and problems with the Kansas Assessment/Sales Ratio Study should be corrected before a regionwide tax levy was contemplated.

Mr. Falgren spoke in behalf of 12 of the 14 area vocational schools that had met to take a position on the bill. He said the Kansas Association of Area Vocational-Technical Schools opposed 1977 H.B. 2567 because it would disturb a system that was presently providing good service. A main concern was that the regional plan would fragment vocational education since it would tend to separate secondary and postsecondary vocational programs. He also noted that contractual arrangements were often unsatisfactory since an institution usually did not know from year to year what the contractual arrangements would be.

Mr. Fleener endorsed the remarks made by Mr. Allen and agreed that the Kansas Assessment/Sales Ratio Study needed to be improved.

Mr. Fleener called the Committee's attention to a minority report he and two other members of the Action Task Force on Postsecondary Education had submitted to the State Board of Education. The minority report recommended that: (1) all postsecondary education be under a 17-member State Board of Regents (or Curators), (2) the state be divided into seven postsecondary regions governed locally by an appointed board, (3) the State Board of Education be responsible for only elementary and secondary programs, and (4) the financing of postsecondary education be primarily a state responsibility.

Mr. Smith spoke in opposition to the bill and said he believed it had only limited support. He said Kansas already had too many schools and pointed out that very few schools had been closed as a result of school district unification, even though unification had been touted as a means of consolidating programs and reducing costs.

Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Committee will be August 8 and 9 (Monday and Tuesday).

Prepared by Carolyn Rampey

Approved by Committee on:

(Date)