

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANSThe meeting was called to order by Senator Paul Hess at _____
Chairperson11:00 a.m./p.m. on January 30, 1984 in room 123-S of the Capitol.All members were present except:
Senators Hein and Steineger

Committee staff present:

Research Department: Mary Galligan, Lynn Holt, Carolyn Rampey, Lyn Goering
Revisor's Office: Norman Furse
Committee Office: Mark Skinner, Doris Fager

Conferees appearing before the committee:

Dr. Harold Blackburn, Commissioner of Education
Dale Dennis, Department of Education
Joseph Snell, Executive Director, State Historical SocietySB 507 - Health Care Providers Liability Insurance

Senator Hess reminded the committee about the release of records as a result of the letter written to Judge Klein, Wichita, by Gerald Michaud, Attorney in Wichita. He stated that a decision had been made to have Robert Coldsnow, Legislative Counsel, receive the records. When they are received in his office, members of the Senate Ways and Means Committee may go there and view the records in Mr. Coldsnow's presence. When all members have seen the records, a decision will be made on SB 507.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion was made by Senator Doyen and seconded by Senator Werts to approve committee minutes through January 20. The motion carried by voice vote.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Dr. Blackburn distributed material stating the Kansas State Board of Education's position on various educational programs. (See Attachment A) He explained that the Board's position on a pre-admissions test for Juniors and Seniors for the field of Education is not on the attachment; however, the Board feels strongly that this should be continued.

Another item not listed on Attachment A is the problem of teacher quality. A suggestion is being considered to have an internship or fifth year program for teachers. He added that there is considerable dialogue about that possibility, since there are experiences that can be offered future teachers under a controlled situation.

The third item not listed is the possibility of devising more effective ways to work in Vocational Education with community colleges.

In answer to questions from Senator Hess, Dr. Blackburn said Items 1, 2, 3 and 4 of Attachment A are included in the Governor's recommendations, except for \$4,000 in Item 2; and that Items 5, 6, 7 and 8 are not in the Governor's budget.

There were questions from committee members concerning various items on Attachment A. During the discussion, Dr. Blackburn indicated that the Department of Education is being reorganized in order to more properly meet the needs of educators, etc. He specifically referred to the area of vocational education.

Dr. Blackburn said there are three divisions in the Board of Education office: (1) Educational Services; (2) Financial Assistance; and (3) Vocational Education and Community Colleges.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION - Continued

There followed a discussion regarding para-professionals and their responsibilities and pay scales; and the overlap of vocational education between Vocational Technical Schools and Community Colleges.

When asked if the State Board of Education should be appointed instead of elected, Dr. Blackburn said he could provide a list of advantages either way. He stressed that the bottom line is the people involved.

Mr. Dennis discussed the request for a supplemental appropriation in Item 5 of Attachment A. He indicated the amount of the request is not included in the Governor's budget.

During discussion of Item 6, Mr. Dennis indicated that the special education funding included \$9,530,000 in transportation costs. There were questions from committee members concerning the distribution of state aid for special education. Mr. Dennis explained that state aid is not being changed next year for para-professionals and teachers, but a proposal has been made to equalize that aid between the two groups, with more going to teachers.

SB 553 - State Historical Society fees and purchase of insurance

Mr. Snell stated that there was a suggestion two years ago to charge fees at two Historical Society properties--Fort Hays and John Brown's Cabin at Osawatomie--on a trial basis. In the FY 1984 appropriations bill, there was a proviso in the Fee Fund which would become part of general legislation. He indicated it is too early to tell what the results will be in charging fees at the two places indicated above.

Mr. Snell explained that the second part of SB 553 is a technical correction to allow purchase of insurance on artifacts.

There was some discussion about SB 553. No action was taken because of the need for a technical amendment to the bill.

The meeting was adjourned by the Chairman.

BRIEF REVIEW OF STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION--FISCAL YEAR 1985
MAJOR ISSUES

1. Teacher Competency Assessment for Initial Certification

The Kansas State Board of Education's position on teacher competency assessment for initial certification is reflected in the fact that since 1981, the Board has supported the general concept of assessing competency through a testing program which would provide an objective, standardized measure of the knowledge and skills developed in academic training programs for the preparation of teachers. The State Board is cognizant of the fact that such a system of testing for certification is one indicator and that presently there is no test that will adequately measure teaching effectiveness.

The State Board has recommended that a norm-reference test, such as the National Teacher Examination (NTE), developed by Educational Testing Service (ETS), be considered for testing applicants for initial certification. The Core Battery of the NTE which assesses general knowledge, professional knowledge, and communications skills would be required of all initial applicants for certification beginning May 1, 1986.

The Core Battery includes three separate two-hour tests in communication skills, general knowledge, and professional knowledge.

The estimated cost for the Core Battery of the NTE for initial certification includes:

Certification test validation (this amount would be a one-time cost)	\$ 115,000
(1) professional staff	
(1) support staff	57,319
Operating expenditures for staff	<u>5,000</u>
TOTAL	\$ 177,319

2. Inservice Education Aid Program

State Board of Education regulations and The State Plan for Fiscal Years 1983-84 for Inservice Education permit local education agencies the option of participating in the state inservice education plan. Certified employees in participating districts having state-approved inservice plans may use approved inservice credit for renewal of certification. During the 1983-84 school year, five local districts elected to participate in the state inservice plan. They are U.S.D. #102, Cimarron, U.S.D. #457, Garden City, U.S.D. #317, Herndon, U.S.D. #210, Hugoton, and U.S.D. #331, Kingman.

Implementation of an inservice education aid program would provide incentive funding to local districts to initiate approved inservice education programs and would assist districts participating in the state plan to strengthen the approved inservice programs that are currently in place. Under the inservice education aid program, local districts with approved plans would receive 50 percent of the amount expended for the approved inservice program up to one-fourth of one percent of the district's general fund budget. The proposed appropriation for the inservice education aid program for fiscal year 1985 is

\$2,500,000 (Gov. recommendation--\$1,000,000). If the amount of funding allocated is insufficient to provide 50 percent of the amount expended for the inservice program up to one-fourth of one percent of the district's general fund budget, the funding will be equitably prorated among all school districts with an approved inservice plan. It is anticipated that the majority of the school districts would elect to participate in the inservice state plan should the \$2,500,000 (Gov. recommendation--\$1,000,000) appropriation be forthcoming.

Effective inservice education programs contribute to the professional growth and enhanced effectiveness of teachers and assist teachers in keeping abreast of new developments and innovations in their teaching fields and in our changing society.

Implementation of the inservice education aid program would necessitate one additional professional staff person and a one-half time secretarial staff person. The chief responsibilities of the professional position would include reviewing local inservice education plans, monitoring the progress of state approved inservice education programs, and providing technical assistance to local school districts in developing and strengthening inservice education programs. The funding required for the 1.5 positions is as follows.

1.0 Professional	\$ 28,800
0.5 Secretarial	7,200
Operating Expenditures (support for staff above)	<u>4,000</u>
TOTAL	\$ 40,000

3. Improving Math and Computer Science

There is a growing awareness on the importance of improving math and science inservice for teachers currently employed by unified school districts. Currently there is one person serving math and science as a consultant for school districts. The State Board of Education is recommending that the responsibilities of the position be separated, and the person currently employed would work in the area of science and a new employee would provide assistance to the districts in the area of math curriculum.

The advances of technology are having a great influence on the public education system. To keep up, school districts are buying microcomputers and asking teachers to use a technology which is changing very rapidly. Therefore, the State Board of Education is recommending that one position be added to assist school districts in developing quality instructional programs in the area of computer science. The Governor has included both positions in his budget.

2.0 Professional	\$ 57,546
Operating Expenditures	<u>15,000</u>
TOTAL	\$ 72,546

4. Minimum Competency Assessment Program

The State Board of Education recommends that the minimum competency assessment program be continued for a minimum of five (5) additional years. This program would include the testing of grades two, four, six, eight, and eleven in the areas of mathematics and reading.

The cost for implementing the minimum competency assessment program was included in the Governor's budget and is recommended by the State Board of Education. (Since it required legislative action, it was not included in the fiscal year 1985 budget as submitted by the State Department of Education).

Estimated Cost for Fiscal Year 1985 \$230,000

5. Special Education Services Aid--Fiscal Year 1984

A supplemental appropriation has been requested for fiscal year 1984 for special education services aid. The original appropriation assumed the number of special education teaching units would be 5,175. The September 1983 count indicates there will be approximately 5,303.76 full-time special education teaching units. The original appropriation was \$53,503,101. The revised appropriation is estimated at \$54,833,400 (5,303.76 times \$10,339 less present overpayment of \$1,968.) Therefore, the supplemental request in special education is \$1,330,299 (\$54,833,400 minus \$53,503,101). (See Attachment #1)

Special Education Teacher Reimbursement
Fiscal Year 1984

Amount Requested at \$10,339	\$ 64,026,200*
Amount Appropriated	<u>62,695,901*</u>
Supplemental Request	\$ 1,330,299

*Includes special education transportation aid of \$9,192,800

The increase in teaching units was also provided to the Special Committee on Ways and Means.

6. Special Education Services Aid--Fiscal Year 1985

The State Board of Education supports the funding of excess cost for special education. Currently the Governor has included in his fiscal year 1985 budget \$64,844,000 for special education. This means that the Governor has provided for the increased teaching units but not for additional increase per special teacher.

If the Committee funds 95 percent of excess cost as recommended by the Ways and Means Committee, \$70,703,165 would be required. If the Legislature funds excess cost at 100 percent, as the State Board of Education has requested, \$74,624,385 would be needed.

<u>Governor's Recommendation 87 Percent</u>	<u>Ways and Means Recommendation 95 Percent</u>	<u>State Board of Education Recommendation 100 Percent</u>
\$ 64,843,650	\$ 70,703,165	\$ 74,624,385

7. Aid to Area Vocational-Technical Schools for Instructional Equipment

Currently Kansas statutes provide for distribution of capital outlay aid for area vocational schools/area vocational-technical schools. This program has not been funded for the past two (2) years. The request for state capital outlay aid by the area schools exceeded \$3,900,000 for fiscal year 1984. Based on a recent survey, the fiscal year 1985 cost for updating instructional equipment was \$3,490,342. Details of this survey are available upon request.

The State Board of Education requested in the fiscal year 1985 budget \$2,000,000 for such purposes. The Governor has not included any funds in his budget for updating instructional equipment.

Estimated Cost for Fiscal Year 1985 \$ 2,000,000

8. School District Equalization Aid

The major issue before the Legislature, the Governor, the State Board of Education, and the local boards of education is how much state aid should be provided to unified school districts under the School District Equalization Act. To increase aid would require an increase in taxes. However, if there is a major increase in property tax, it is doubtful that boards of education, on a statewide basis, will increase their budget to the maximum. The estimates on Attachment #2 should be questioned, because, if the property tax goes above two to three mills on a statewide average basis, the estimates are too high.

The State Board of Education has been concerned that if state aid is not increased to a reasonable level and the local property taxpayer has to bear a disproportionate share, the increase of teacher salaries would be minimal at best.

	<u>1982-83</u> <u>Actual</u>	<u>% of</u> <u>Inc.</u> <u>or</u> <u>Dec.</u>	<u>1983-84</u> <u>Original</u> <u>Appropriations</u>	<u>% of</u> <u>Inc.</u> <u>or</u> <u>Dec.</u>	<u>1983-84</u> <u>Revised</u> <u>Request*</u>	<u>% of</u> <u>Inc.</u> <u>or</u> <u>Dec.</u>	<u>1984-85</u> <u>Revised</u> <u>Level B</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>% of</u> <u>Inc.</u> <u>or</u> <u>Dec.</u>	<u>1984-85</u> <u>Revised</u> <u>Level C</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>% of</u> <u>Inc.</u> <u>or</u> <u>Dec.</u>
1. Number of Teachers:										
A. Regular	4,029.07	5.5	4,053.00	0.6	4,143.14	2.8	4,182.14	0.9	4,182.14	0.9
B. Non-public Equivalency	6.42	0.9	7.00	9.0	7.00	9.0	7.00	0	7.00	0
C. Hourly Homebound	32.47	21.2	35.00	7.2	35.00	7.2	35.00	0	35.00	0
D. Teacher Aides	1,081.40	10.1	1,080.00	-0.1	1,118.60	3.4	1,129.60	1.0	1,129.60	1.0
2. Total Number of Teachers	5,149.36	6.6	5,175.00	0.5	5,303.74	3.0	5,353.74	0.9	5,353.74	0.9
3. Entitlement Per Teacher	\$ 9,580.00	18.9	\$ 10,339.00	7.9	\$ 10,339.00	7.9	\$ 10,339.00	0	\$ 11,576.00	12.0
4. Teacher Entitlement (lines 2 x 3)	49,330,829.00	26.7	53,504,325.00	8.5	54,835,368.00	11.2	55,352,318.00	0.9	61,974,894.00	13.0
5. Total Transportation Expense	10,354,953.00	6.7	11,491,000.00	11.0	11,491,000.00	11.0	12,352,825.00	7.5	12,352,825.00	7.5
6. State Student Transportation Aid	7,057,087.00	7.0	7,831,328.00	11.0	7,831,328.00	11.0	8,418,678.00	7.5	8,418,678.00	7.5
7. State Teacher Transportation Aid	1,226,871.00	5.1	1,361,472.00	11.0	1,361,472.00	11.0	1,463,582.00	7.5	1,463,582.00	7.5
8. Total State Aid (lines 4+6+7)	57,614,787.00	23.4	62,697,125.00	8.8	64,028,168.00	11.1	65,234,578.00	1.9	71,857,154.00	12.2
Less Adjustments	174,873.00	--	1,224.00	--	1,968.00	--	none	--	none	--
Net State Aid	57,439,914.00	23.2	62,695,901.00	9.2	64,026,200.00	11.5	65,234,578.00	1.9	71,857,154.00	12.2

* Based on September Special Education Teacher Count

PROPOSED STATE AID PLANS
1984-85 School Year
(Amounts in Thousands)

	<u>1983-84</u>	<u>Gov. Plan 1984-85</u>	<u>1984-85</u>	<u>1984-85</u>	<u>1984-85</u>	<u>1984-85</u>	<u>1984-85</u>
General Fund Budget Limitations	5%-15%	4%-8%	4%-8%	6%-12%	6%-12%	5%-15%	6%-10%
Additional % of Prior Year's Budget for Teacher Salaries	NONE	2%	NONE	2%	NONE	NONE	NONE
Est. General Fund Budget	1,031,940	1,122,020	1,104,252	1,146,981	1,127,213	1,123,741	1,122,127
% Budget Increase	-----	8.7%	7.0%	11.1%	9.2%		8.7%
General State Aid	376,056	416,056	416,056	416,056	416,056	416,056	416,056
Income Tax Rebate	89,300	103,600	103,600	103,600	103,600	103,600	103,600
Ratio of General State Aid & Income Tax Rebate to Budget	45.1%	46.3%	47.1%	45.3%	46.1%	46.2%	46.3%
Est. Property Tax Increase	40,000	43,100	16,500	80,500	50,900	45,700	43,300
Est. Property Tax Rate Increase	4.0 mills	2.3 mills*	(.4 mills)*	6.0 mills*	3.0 mills*	2.5 mills*	2.3 mills*
Potential % Increase in Teacher Salaries**	-----	9.75%	6.50%	12.75%	9.50%	9.00%	9.00%

*Based on five percent growth in assessed valuation.

**Teacher salary increases will vary considerably from district to district. In many districts where the property tax exceeds two to three mills, such districts will not use their full budget authority. The estimates provided above, in those cases where the mill levy increases are substantial, are probably too high.

Prepared by: Legislative Research Department and
Division of Financial and Support Services
January 20, 1984