Approved February 28, 1984
Date

MINUTES OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION.

The Joint meeting was called to order by Senator Joe Harder, co-chaired with Representative Don Crumbaker at
Chairperson

1:30 ~~a.m.~~/p.m. on February 16, 1984 in room 313-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except: Representative W. Fuller

Committee staff present:

Aivs Swartzman, Revisor of Statutes' Office
Ben Barrett, Legislative Research
Dale Dennis, State Department of Education
Judy Crapser, Secretary to the Committee

Conferees appearing before the committee:

Ken Rogg, Schools for Quality Education
Karen Shadle, Schools for Quality Education
Mike Rooney, Superintendent at Copeland, USD #476
Nick Slechta, Ellsworth USD #327
John Koepke, Kansas Association of School Boards
Craig Grant, Kansas-National Education Association
John Shireman, Superintendent of Girard USD #248
Dr. James Rowland, Erie-St. Paul USD #101

Senator Joe Harder and Representative Don Crumbaker co-chaired this joint meeting of the House and Senate Committees on Education. This day's meeting was to hear alternatives for increasing efficiencies in school districts.

The Chair recognized Ben Barrett of staff who presented possible alternatives for USD reallocation of funds in order to enhance teacher's salaries. (ATTAHCMENT I)

Ken Rogg, Schools for Quality Education, presented their address to the subject. Karen Shadle, President of Schools for Quality Education, read Mr. Rogg's prepared statement. (ATTACHMENT II)

Mike Rooney, Superintendent at Copeland, USD #476, was next recognized by the Chair. He stated that such legislation as SB 601 provides the school districts options and to explore alternatives. Now Kansas school districts have two alternatives, to continue the kindergarten through twelve program whatever the cost, or consolidation. He stated that sharing is a viable alternative. As a result, there is less duplication of tasks and the teachers would be allowed to teach at the level of their choice. Sharing would eliminate closing of schools and allow more efficient running of the educational process. Results could be a return for the school boards in reductions in mill levies and number of salary expenses. Sharing could be on a contract basis between schools, rather than the form of consolidation. These contracts could be renewed at the local discretion. He stated his belief it is better to leave these decisions at the local level versus the legislative level.

Nick Slechta, Ellsworth USD #327, shared his thoughts with the joint committees. Large classes, especially at the lower elementary grade level, is not easy, but the use of more teachers aides to handle the more household duties would be a big boost. He suggested a need for flexibility at the local level, not mandates from the Legislature. Mr. Slechta added his support to the idea of sharing stated by Mr. Rooney. For further stretching of the budgets at a local level, there could be sharing of services, such as buses, kitchens, etc. He stated that SB 601 is an example of an excellent alternative.

John Koepke, Executive Director of Kansas Association of School Boards, presented testimony before the Joint Committees. (ATTACHMENT III)

Craig Grant, Kansas-National Education Association, presented the committee with statistics for 1982-83. (ATTACHMENT IV) He stated there was no correlation appearing between ranking of teachers salaries and PTR's. He added that the K-NEA is in full support of legislation such as SB 601.

John Shireman, Girard USD #248, stated that ways to economize seem an impossible dream. Each local school district should look closely within its own realm for those solutions that would be most responsive to their individual needs. He stated that history shows

that when the solutions come from the local areas, there is less conflict and the changes go much smoother with more lasting effects.

Dr. James Rowland, Board of Directors of Kansas Association of School Boards, cited his home district, Erie-St. Paul USD #101, as an example of consolidation. The South East Kansas districts now use a cooperative effort for purchasing as one example of how they have been cutting corners. He stated that they have a high PTR, but now is the only way to make money available for other budget item. Compromises must be made.

Representative Crumbaker, Chairman of the House Committee on Education, adjourned the meeting at 2:42 p.m.

The next meeting of the Committee will be February 20, 1984 at 3:30 p.m.

JOINT
HOUSE AND
SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEES

16

TIME: 1:30 p.m. PLACE: 313-S DATE: Thursday, Feb. ~~14~~, 1984

GUEST LIST

NAME	ADDRESS	ORGANIZATION
Mayrene Norris	RI Edgerton, Ks	USD 231 Schoolboard
Ted A. Parry	231 W. Main Gardner	USD 231 Supt
Shirley J. Brown	20085 S. Gardner Rd	USD 231 School Board
Lin Lewis	17 Lake Park Dr Winfield	USD 465 School Board
Jeanne Spurgeon	1016 Mound, Winfield	USD 465 Board
Joan Kaufman	1316 East 10th, Winfield	USD 465 BOE
Mary Ellen Diemer	Topeka	Lg. of Women Voters
Duane C. Chrisler	RR5, Box 10, Winfield Ks	USD 465 BOE
Alice Jo Lee Jones	1526 Apple Lane, Ottawa	USD 290 BOE
Almeda Edwards	R2, Ottawa	USD 290 Bd of Ed
Roger D. Nelson	1143 S. Maple, Ottawa	USD 290 Supt.
Kay Nies	6819 Garfield Dr. KCK	USD 500 Bd of Ed
Howard L. Shuler	7821 SW 29th Topeka	USD 437 —
Mike Koomy	Box 156 Copeland, 67837	# 476
Ellen K. Gambrano	Topeka	Ks Action for Children
Wayne Shaw	Wakefield, Ks	USD 379
Delmar L. McGraw	McFarland, Ks	USD 379
Mike Kuhlman	La Crosse, Ks	USD 395 Supt.
Ally A Herrman	La Crosse Ks	USD 395 Board Pres.
Earl Snavely	Perry Ks	ACCK
J. Leo Coffey	Vermillion Ks	USD 380
Lynn Wiet	Vermillion Ks	USD 380
Wayne A. Wray	Waterville, Ks.	USD 498
W. H. Fitzenmaier	Clay Center, Ks	USD 379
Jack Alexander	Ellsworth	#327

JOINT
HOUSE AND
SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEES

TIME: 1:30 p.m. PLACE: 313-S DATE: Thursday, Feb. 16, 1984

GUEST LIST

NAME	ADDRESS	ORGANIZATION
Glen R. Stoller	Sabetha, Ks.	USD 441
Doug Spillman	Rozel, KS	USD 496
Charles F. Doggett	Virgil, Ks.	USD 386
Leslie Church	Copeland	USD 476
Robert Nordyke	Hanover	CUSD 101
James A Rowlands	ERIE	CUSD 101
Jack Shireman	Girard	USD 248
W J Hart	Erie	C.U.S.D. 101
Mike Bailey	Burden	USD 462
Sheila Frahm	Colby	USD 315
Doug Gustinner	Colby	USD 315
Muriel Embree	McPherson	USD 418
Glean Schabel	alexander	USD 496
Dowen Myers	Lindsborg	USD 400
Marvyn Anderson	"	"
Richard R. Connell	Claflin	USD 354
Howard Doerksen	"	"
Charles F. Stuart	Clay Center	USD 379
Cindy Empson	Independence	USD 446
[illegible]	Coffeyville	USD #445
Bob Weller	Stockton	USD #271
Harold R. Honey	Emporia	USD 253
Harlen H. O'Brien	Emporia	USD 253
Mildred G. McMillen	Longmont	USD 464

JOINT
HOUSE AND
SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEES

TIME: 1:30 p.m. PLACE: 313-S DATE: Thursday, Feb. 16, 1984

GUEST LIST

NAME	ADDRESS	ORGANIZATION
Dallie Scheller	Linwood, Ks	
Lois Meadows	Longmont, Ks	
David Honeyman	Manhattan Ks	K-State Univ.
Bob Deck	Hiawatha, Ks	USD 415
Bob McDaniel	Hope, Ks	USD 481
Dale Gantenbein	Hope, Ks	USD 481
Nancy Kaldon	White City, Ks.	USD 481
Max E Seacat	Greensburg	
Steve Oetken	Pretty Prairie, Ks.	USD 311
William Clowney	Marysville, Ks	USD 364
Kathy Ann Hackler	Olsburg, Ks	KASB & USD 323
Doris Hope	Perry, Ks.	KASB & USD 343
Lorraine Ryan	McCracken, Ks.	U.SD-395 - La Crosse
Naomi Grady	Cimarron, Ks	
John Cundy	Cimarron K	USD-102
L. D. Curran	Box 188 Altamont Ks	USD 506
Dale A. Talbot	R.R. 2 Parsons, Ks	USD 506
BERNARD ALLEN	HILL CITY	USD-281
James H Hays	Topeka	Division of the Budget
Randy Cannon	Lawrence, Ks.	MPA graduate KU
Sharon Breeden	Topeka	Sen. Daniels aide
Orval C Burnett	Topeka	USD 501
Melvin K Ormiston	Cunningham, KS	USD #332
Albert Newton	Conway Springs, Ks	USD # 356
Diane Umbenhauer	Wakefield, KS	USD 498

JOINT
HOUSE AND
SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEES

TIME: 1:30 p.m. PLACE: 313-S DATE: Thursday, Feb. 16, 1984

GUEST LIST

NAME	ADDRESS	ORGANIZATION
Bill Curtis	Topeka	KASB
Bill Clarke	Wichita	USD 259
FRANK MEYER	Herington	USD 487
Keith Adams	Oberlin	USD 294
Ronald Bell	McDonald	USD 103
Robert Stranke	Linsley	USD 347
Keith Brack	Albert	USD 403
Frank Randel	Albert	U.S.D 403

M. D. McKenney	Topeka	USA
Dick McCall	Pratt	USA (USD 382)
JoAnn Pottorff	Wichita	USD 259
Jerry Webster	Neodesha	USD 461
James Koftan	Udall	USD 463
Wanda Reed	#44 Pratt	USD 438
John Koepke	Topeka	KASB
Dan Bloom	Eudora	USD 491
John Barnell	Copeland	USD 476
Jacque Oakes	Yates Center	KASB
Don Richardson	Seneca	USD 442
Henry Kellstadt	Garnett	USD 365
[illegible]	McPherson	USD 418
Larry McCully	El Dorado	USD 490
Lauren Y Gaddie	Bazine	USD 304

MEMORANDUM

February 16, 1984

TO: House and Senate Committees on Education

FROM: Kansas Legislative Research Department and Division of Financial Services, State Department of Education

RE: Discussion of Possible Alternatives for USD Reallocation of Funds in Order to Enhance Teachers' Salaries

The interim Special Committee on Education recommended that a joint meeting of the House and Senate Education Committees be held early in the 1984 Session for the purpose of considering matters pertaining to the organization of public elementary and secondary education with a view toward identifying changes that could be made so that additional funds within current budgetary activities could be directed toward improvement of teachers' salaries.

To accomplish this objective, some reordering of priorities would be needed to make a significant impact of teachers' salaries. A very large percentage of school district general fund budgeted expenditures is for personnel salaries and benefits. In 1982-83 this amount totaled about 75 percent of such budgets. Forty-five percent was for teachers' salaries (excluding benefits). Some 15 percent of school district general fund budgeted expenditures was for operation and maintenance of facilities and capital outlay. Approximately one-third of this amount was for personnel salaries. Another 8 percent was budgeted for transfers to the various special funds of the USD. (Much of the transferred amount also would be used for the salaries of personnel.) The remaining 7 percent was for items such as contractual services, textbooks, library and teaching supplies, and other miscellaneous items.

In summary, in 1982-83, about 85 percent of the amount included in school district general fund budgets was for salaries and for plant operations. If transfers were taken into account, this percentage would reach the 90 percent level. It seems obvious then that the most promising approaches for freeing up school district general fund amounts to be targeted for teachers' salaries are from proposals that reduce the total number of personnel employed by the district. These approaches must, of necessity, consider viable options for reducing the size of the physical plant operation.

A reduction in transfers from the general fund to the various special funds also would free up more general fund money that could be allocated for teachers' salaries; however, any such change would require some consideration of the capacity of the school districts to finance the programs operated out of the special funds — programs which normally involve substantial amounts for salaries. More than half of the amount budgeted for such transfers in 1982-83 was for special education.

Following is a list of some of the types of options that could be considered in order to make it possible to allocate more funds from current budgetary activities for the enhancement of teachers' salaries. This does not proport to be a complete listing of all alternatives.

1. School districts could be required to increase their pupil-teacher ratios up to some minimum level to be determined by the Legislature. Increased pupil-teacher ratios mean fewer personnel, resulting in more funds available to spread among those persons remaining. General state aid (or general state aid and income tax rebate) entitlements of districts that do not comply with these ratios could be reduced. Proration at the same percentage as the district's deficiency as compared with the state-prescribed minimum standard would be one possibility. (This is essentially the same concept as has been contained in pupil-professional personnel ratio penalty proposals that have been under consideration during the two preceding legislative sessions.)

2. Legislation could require school districts to close an attendance center when the enrollment could not be maintained at some specified level. For example, if the law currently required the closure of elementary schools with enrollments of fewer than 60 full-time equivalent pupils, some 90 schools would be affected. If a similar provision applied to high schools with fewer than 75 full-time equivalent pupils, as many as 55 schools might have to be closed.

3. Legislation could require the disorganization and attachment of any school district that could not maintain some minimum enrollment in grades 1 through 12. At the time of unification, a principal requirement for a unified district was an enrollment of 400. At the present time, 105, more than one-third of all school districts, have enrollments of less than 400 full-time equivalent pupils in grades K-12. There are some 272 school buildings being operated in these districts, or one building for every 98 pupils.

4. Legislation could permit cooperation among school districts for the joint use of elementary, junior high, or high schools. Such arrangements could contribute to a reduction in the number of facilities operated and to increased staffing ratios. (See 1984 S.B. 601.)

5. Legislation could establish a statewide minimum salary schedule for teachers. This could apply to beginning teachers only or to all teachers. It also could apply to administrators. In this way, the Legislature could effectively meet agreed upon teacher compensation objectives. Under existing finance laws, this approach would leave to each school district the latitude to arrange its priorities so that state-level teacher salary objectives are met. (This might mean adjustments such as higher pupil-teacher ratios, the operation of fewer facilities, reduction in nonteaching personnel, reduced services, etc.)

6. The statutory requirement for 30 units of instruction in grades 9-12 could be relaxed or eliminated. This could make possible some reduction of staff members in small enrollment districts. From a state perspective, a question that would need to be considered is what the state's interest would be in assuring some minimum academic offering for high school students.

7. The compulsory attendance requirement could be reduced or eliminated. To the extent that enrollments were reduced from such a change, some cost savings might result. (Legislation introduced during the 1984 Session generally has proposed increases in compulsory attendance requirements. See S.B. 498, H.B. 2618, and H.B. 2730.)

8. The number of units of credit or the number of specific courses (or both) required of high school students for graduation could be reduced. Presently, the state requirement is 17 units. Nine of these units are specified and eight are elective. The number of units of credit required is scheduled to increase to 20 in 1988, which includes one additional unit each of mathematics, science, and social studies. Already, more than 90 percent of Kansas school districts require 20 or more units of credit for graduation. (Proposals for reducing either the required number of units of credit or the number of specified courses would appear to be contrary to the thrust of the recommendations of recent blue ribbon groups studying the need for improvements in education.)

9. The state special education mandate for the gifted program could be eliminated. Such programs are not required by federal law. FY 1985 expenditures for this program are estimated at about $9.6 million. If such programs were reduced or eliminated, some amounts budgeted in the school district general fund could be made available for other purposes.

10. Pupil transportation requirements could be reduced or eliminated. The present 2.5 mile requirement could be changed to 3.5 miles (or more), or mandatory transportation of pupils could be eliminated. In 1982-83, $9.8 million was budgeted for transfer from the school district general fund to the transportation fund. In total, school districts spent $52.7 million in FY 1983 for transportation of pupils.

11. Accreditation requirements pertaining to the deployment of principals, or of superintendents could be relaxed. Presently, in most instances, a school district with an enrollment of less than 300 students may also assign the superintendent as an elementary or high school principal. High schools or junior highs enrolling 200 or more pupils must have a principal who spends at least five clock hours each day in administrative and supervisory responsibilities. In high schools or junior highs with fewer than 200 students, a principal must spend at least three hours per day in administrative and supervisory responsibilities. In elementary schools employing 16 or more teachers, a minimum of 80 percent of the school day must be allocated for administration; in elementary schools with 6 to 16 teachers, one-half of the school day must be allocated for administration; and in schools having fewer than six teachers, some time during the week must be allocated for administration.

12. Elimination of extracurricular activities would have the effect of reducing operating costs somewhat.

13. A resolution could be adopted urging school district boards to eliminate marginal programs and corresponding staff as well as noncritical administrative and support personnel and to direct any savings therefrom toward higher salaries for teachers.

Schools for Quality Education

PURPOSE - - -

To Pursue the quality of excellence in education.

To Give identity, voice and exposure to the peculiar quality of Rural Schools.

To Enhance the quality of life unique in the rural community.

Presentation to

Joint Committee on Education

regarding

School District Organization

by

Kenneth Rogg, Legislative Representative

Schools for Quality Education

February 16, 1984

"Rural is Quality"

The joint-hearing being held today is, as I am sure you are aware, an end result of a directive to the interim committee on Education to study PPPR. The original directive did not single out any particular classification of districts but was to apply to all schools in the state. During those hearings, no testimony was given by either staff nor interest groups. Nevertheless, the end result was a recommendation that a joint hearing be held early in the session to study "district organization". Therefore, we are here today not to study pupil-teacher ratio in the schools of Kansas, but to address the problems in our rural schools, and although we do not like to use the term publically - further consolidation and school closings.

Some 20 years ago, meetings were held throughout the state to deal with this basic problem. We were told at that time we were setting into motion a program which would insure a quality education for the children 10, 20, and even 50 years in the future and that we were dealing with this problem once and for all. There were to follow, however, certain economic and social changes that could not be predicted at the time.

The small family farm has become virtually non-existant until today we no longer speak in terms of acres but in quarters and sections. Consequently, agri-related jobs fell by the wayside. Opportunities for those completing high school to remain in their home community also diminished accelerating the movement from sparsely to densley populated areas.

A second unpredicted factor is often referred to by educators as the "year of the pill". With family planning now assured, we experienced a dramatic decline in the number of children entering school which further compounded the problems facing smaller, rural school districts.

Finally, dramatic increases in the cost of providing educational opportunities

coupled with unprecedented rises in local property taxes has brought the problem to crisis proportions in many communities. This can be noted in Jewell County where four districts will be two in the coming year and the turmoil being experienced at Ensign, McCrackin, Gorham and Dorrance.

We do believe that given ample opportunities rural districts will deal effectively with these problems at the local level. Assistance and support at the state level rather than mandates and directives will help to reduce the community turmoil that so often accompanies this decision making. We believe that the introduction of Senate Bill 601 is an an example of the rural community's willingness to address the issues and offer solutions to the existing problems. We, therefore, offer out first recommendation: Any legislation should be permissive, allowing rural districts to seek their own solutions.

The interim committees's recommendation states as a reason for addressing the question before you is to improve teacher's salaries. We have no quarrel with that goal. We do question, however, some of the national statistics that are being used as a data source for addressing the issue. In a recent study, Dr. Bruce O. Barker, Program Administrator, Division of Continuing Education, Brigham Young University, made a comparative study of Kansas school districts with enrollments under 900 with a national sampling of like districts accross the nation. A few of his findings are here included:

1. A greater percentage of Kansas districts provide instruction in Spanish, German, French, calculus, chemistry, and computor science. A slightly lower percentage offer Vocational agriculture, electronics and physics.
2. The average district geographical area was substantially above the national average while the district enrollment was lower.
3. The percentage of districts receiving state aid was dramatically lower (2.9 - 24.2)

4. The number of graduating seniors going on to college is higher (50.5% to 38.6%) while slightly fewer attend technical school (12.3% to 14.1%).

5. Teacher salaries in the Kansas sampling were above the mean for beginning, average and top salaries paid by schools in the national sampling.

These statistics are offered as an example and not as valid fact. In studying Dr. Barker's report, it appears that there may be discrepancies, probably due to a lack of a clear understanding of Kansas programs. An objective analysis of some of the reports we quote may prove the adage that statistics are much like beauty, they lie in the eye of the beholder. We tend to see what we want to see.

Our second recommendation is that before you rush headlong into making any decision regarding any mandate that would preclude local decision making authority, that you direct your own staff to prepare an objective and unbiased study of Kansas schools with their comparable counterparts in other states. Due the great diversity of size, pupil density, wealth, and other factors in Kansas school districts, they cannot be grouped together and be compared to other schools of the nation as a whole. This is especially true in the area of teacher salaries. Any such study should certainly contain a coorelation with a cost of living factor.

Finally, in the distance versus dollars setting of the rural community, we question the economy of forced consolidation or school closing. In past instances where those hard decisions were made by the people, the transition has been peaceful and cooperative. That is as it should be.

KANSAS ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL BOARDS

5401 S. W. 7th Avenue Topeka, Kansas 66606
913-273-3600

Testimony before the
Joint House and Senate Education Committees
February 16, 1984
by
John W. Koepke, Executive Director
Kansas Association of School Boards

Mr. Chairmen and Committee members, we appreciate the opportunity to appear before you to express the collective views of our 300 member district boards of education. The topic of your hearing today is one which has generated strong emotions in the past and caused considerable frustration, both to our members and to past sessions of the Kansas Legislature.

The cause of all our concern is found in several interrelated factors which affect school funding. The frustration is best expressed when we examine the ranking of the state of Kansas with regard to these factors. Kansas consistently ranks in the top third of the states in per capita income. Our expenditures per pupil generally parallel this ranking. How then to account for the ranking of Kansas teacher salaries around the ranking of 36th in the nation? The answer, of course, is our ranking in the bottom five of all the states in pupil-teacher ratio.

We have consistently pointed out to past legislatures that if we were somehow to raise our PTR to the national average, it would raise our average teachers salaries to a ranking consistent with our expenditures. This assumes, of course, that we would find it desirable to raise PTR by some legislative

mechanism. Other than some abortive attempts to write a penalty for low PTR into the school finance formula, no strong consensus for change has developed in recent years.

Our members have consistently proposed to the Legislature measures which would allow local boards of education to close attendance centers under their control without a patron vote. Such proposals have always fallen on deaf ears, although restrictions on school closing and change of use were considerably lessened by the 1982 session and, as a result, the pace of school closings has quickened.

The only other viable alternative open for consideration in the past has been another round of school district consolidation mandated by the state. Our position has been to oppose such a remedy. Although it has been nearly twenty years since the last major school consolidation in Kansas, the scars from that battle are still fresh in many communities. The spectre of another such measure would chill the long range planning activities of many boards of education. We do not believe the time is right, politically or emotionally, for serious consideration of such a measure.

There has emerged this legislative session, another alternative which bears serious consideration. S.B. 601, which has been reported favorably by the Senate Education Committee, seems to hold considerable promise for cooperative measures by small school districts to achieve efficiencies which would free funds for salary purposes. While our organization has not yet taken a formal position on this measure, we have been polling our members and have received an overwhelmingly favorable response. Our Board of Directors will be taking a formal position on this measure this weekend.

Our organization and its members will continue to search for ways to achieve economy in school district operation. We pledge our willingness to

work with the Kansas Legislature on reasonable means to achieve our common goal, the best possible education for the children of Kansas within the means available to us.

We thank you for the opportunity to express our views and would be happy to answer any questions.

KANSAS-NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION / 715 W. 10TH STREET / TOPEKA, KANSAS 66612

SELECTED STATISTICS FOR 1982-83

State	PTR (rank)	Salary (rank)	Per Capita Income* (rank)
Kansas	15.63 (45)	$18,231 (36)	$10,813 (16)
North Dakota	15.54 (46)	$18,390 (33)	$10,213 (26)
Nebraska	15.48 (47)	$17,412 (42)	$10,366 (23)
Connecticut	15.29 (48)	$20,795 (20)	$12,816 (3)
Wyoming	15.07 (49)	$23,690 (7)	$11,665 (6)
Alaska	14.11 (50)	$33,953 (1)	$13,763 (1)
Vermont	13.88 (51)	$15,338 (49)	$ 8,723 (40)

	Expenditures per pupil (rank)	Expenditures per pupil as a percentage of per capita income (rank)
Kansas	$2,251 (29)	19.1 (47)
North Dakota	$2,002 (40)	18.4 (48)
Nebraska	$2,445 (21)	22.9 (20)
Connecticut	$2,683 (17)	19.5 (45)
Wyoming	$2,997 (15)	24.2 (14)
Alaska	$5,369 (1)	33 (1)
Vermont	$2,365 (23)	24.9 (10)

*1981 Figures

ATTACHMENT IV (2-16-84) HOUSE EDUCATION

Telephone: (913) 232-8271