

Approved March 19, 1986
Date

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

The meeting was called to order by VICE-CHAIRPERSON ALICIA SALISBURY at
Chairperson

1:30 ~~xxx~~/p.m. on TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 25,, 1986 in room 254-E of the Capitol.

All members were present except:
Senator Harder, excused

Committee staff present:

Mr. Ben Barrett, Legislative Research Department
Ms. Avis Swartzman, Legislative Revisor's Office
Mrs. Millie Randell, Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee:

SB 637 - School districts; relating to the adoption of prime time programs; requiring the state board of education to prescribe a pilot program thereon (Parrish)

Proponents:

Senator Nancy Parrish, sponsor of SB 637
Mr. Craig Grant, Director of Political Action, Kansas-National Education Association

SB 620 - An act concerning vocational education; requiring the adoption of student tuition refund policies by schools and imposing penalties for failure of compliance (Education)

Proponents:

J. Tuckness, student, Kaw Area Vocational-Technical School, Topeka

Opponents:

Mr. Bill Berry, President-elect of the Kansas Association of Area Vocational-Technical Schools
Mr. Harry Falgren, Director, Kansas City Area Vocational-Technical School
Dr. Merle Hill, Executive Director, Kansas Association of Community Colleges

Vice-chairperson Alicia Salisbury called the meeting to order in the absence of Chairman Harder and then recognized Senator Parrish, sponsor of SB 637, who explained the bill to the Committee. Senator Parrish said that the purpose of SB 637 is to provide smaller classes in grades one through three so that students will receive more individualized instruction in order to give them the opportunity of mastering the basic skills in the beginning grades. She said the bill also provides an opportunity to evaluate whether small classes in the primary grades truly will benefit students and enhance their ability to master the basic skills. The bill, she continued, would initiate a pilot program in five school districts for a three-year period. (Attachment 1) In reply to a question, Mr. Dale Dennis of the State Department of Education responded that the initial cost per year would be approximately \$200,000.

Mr. Craig Grant of the Kansas-National Education Association, a supporter of SB 637, emphasized that although one goal of his organization has always been to reduce the class size the argument against this concept has always been "the money isn't there". He stated that the eighteen-to-one classroom ratio is just a starting point from which to gather data to evaluate the effectiveness of a reduced pupil-teacher ratio. In response to a question, Mr. Grant predicted from statistics that a teacher shortage would occur about 1990-91, and he emphasized that the smaller pupil-teacher ratio would be one deterrent to that happening in Kansas. Another deterrent, he added, is to raise teachers' salaries.

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION,

room 254-E Statehouse, at 1:30 ~~xxx~~ p.m. on TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1986

Following testimony by Mr. Grant, the Vice-chair announced that the hearing on SB 637 was concluded and that the bill would be considered by the Committee at a later date.

SB 620 - The Vice-chair called upon Senator Montgomery to explain the background for SB 620. Senator Montgomery responded by saying that he had requested SB 620 to be drafted after he had received concerns from several of his constituents regarding the refund policies at area vocational-technical schools. He then shared a letter of concern he had received from one of his constituents whose son had attended the Manhattan Area Vocational-Technical School.

In response to a question, Mr. Ben Barrett of the Legislative Research Department, replied that the refund policies at area vocational-technical schools are set by the local governing boards and vary throughout the state. He also explained that usually the refund is based upon the amount of the program that has been completed by the student.

Mr. J. Tuckness, a student at the Kaw Area Vocational-Technical School, testified in support of SB 620 and, also, offered some amendments for the Committee to consider (Attachment 2). Mr. Tuckness explained that his amendments were written to address a problem he had encountered at the school and said the amendments should help to prevent similar occurrences in the future.

Mr. Bill Berry, representing the Kansas Association of Area Vocational-Technical Schools, testified against SB 620 and said that if problems arise regarding refunds, a review and possible change of local policy, as necessary, would best be accomplished by the local governing board without any need for legislative action. Mr. Berry cited an example of how costs incurred by the school could actually precipitate a negative balance should Senate Bill 620 be passed. He also called the Committee's attention to other problems that could arise when a student drops out of school. (Attachment 3)

Mr. Harry Falgren of the Kansas City Area Vocational-Technical School, also opposed to SB 620, stressed the need for fiscal responsibility by students who have made application and are accepted to fill openings in a vocational-educational program. (Attachment 4)

Dr. Merle Hill of the Kansas Association of Community Colleges expressed concern regarding SB 620 and informed the Committee members that the community colleges of Kansas do have tuition refund policies.

Senator Langworthy moved that the Committee minutes of the 1:30 p.m. meeting on February 17 be approved. Senator Allen seconded the motion, and the motion carried.

The Vice-chair adjourned the meeting.

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

TIME: 1:30 p.m. PLACE: 254-E DATE: Tuesday, February 25, 1986

GUEST LIST

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ADDRESS</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>
Mary Ellen Simon	Topeka	Lg. of German Voters
Charles Sponberg	McPherson	K-NEA
Richard Bushy	McPherson	K-NEA
Georgette James	Raini Village	PTA
Ann Burns	" "	" "
J. Tuckness	1032 Kellam	UNDETERMINED
Sheald Wadsworth	Topeka	USA
Craig Grant	Lawrence	K-NEA
Bill Berry	Manhattan	Ks Assoc. of AVTS
Harry Falgren	Kansas City	Kansas City Avts
Don Strait	Topeka	Dept. of Educ.
Fred Givous	Topeka	Dept. of Education
Chris Graves	Topeka	ASK
Henry Schwab	Lawrence	Sen Joe Rowell's office
Merle Heye	Topeka	KACC
Jay Cales	Topeka	K-NEA
M.D. Redeker	Salina	K-NEA
Edna W. Skuit	Salina	K-NEA
Jim Yonally	Shawnee Mission	USD #512
Ken Rogg	Paola	S Q E
Dana Horst	Salina	K-NEA
Hildy Larsen	Salina	K-NEA
Jean Bauer	Topeka	Ks. Vocational Assn.



TOPEKA

SENATE CHAMBER

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

February 25, 1986

S.B. 637

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

CHAIRMAN: ADVISORY COMMISSION ON JUVENILE
OFFENDER PROGRAMS
MEMBER: ASSESSMENT AND TAXATION
JUDICIARY
EDUCATION
JOINT COMMITTEE ON SPECIAL CLAIMS
AGAINST THE STATE

ATTACHMENT 1

NANCY PARRISH
STATE SENATOR, NINETEENTH DISTRICT
SHAWNEE COUNTY
3632 S E TOMAHAWK DR
TOPEKA, KANSAS 66605
913-379-0702 HOME
913-296-7373 BUSINESS

The Nation at Risk Report precipitated a host of educational reforms across the nation. Many states acted to increase requirements for high school graduation; to raise college admission standards; to revise curriculums; to improve programs for teacher preparation and professional development; to revise teacher certification standards; to increase salaries; and to improve career opportunities for teachers. Of all the reforms and innovations that I read about as I reviewed what other states had implemented, I was particularly excited about the Prime Time program that was implemented in Indiana. S.B. 637 is a Kansas version of a pilot of the Prime Time program.

The purpose of the Prime Time program is to provide smaller classes in grades one through three so that students will receive more individualized instruction, therefore, giving students the opportunity of mastering the basic skills in the beginning grades.

When I was a teacher, I dreamed of a fantasy in which students who entered the upper elementary grades already knew basic reading and math skills at a level comparable to that particular grade. But for that to realistically occur, I knew that classes needed to be much smaller in the primary grades so that teachers could identify those students having difficulties and provide individualized instruction to remediate those difficulties. Ideally, I thought that even some special education students could be served within the regular classes if the classes were smaller. S.B. 637 provides an opportunity to evaluate whether small classes in the primary grades truly will benefit students and enhance their ability to master basic skills.

Research shows that smaller classes are cost-effective. One study in Philadelphia found that "Low ability students benefited the most from smaller classes." In addition, a Baltimore study showed that reduced class size is emphasized as a factor in the education of low achieving students and those with special needs. It is difficult to measure the benefit of preventative programming. We will never really know how many low ability students in small classes were kept in the regular class rather than referred to special education. If class sizes are kept small, teachers can better provide for individual differences and maintain an exceptional child in a regular class setting.

In addition, smaller classes improve the quality of education. Based on data showing academic progress of nearly 900,000 students, a research team from the University of Colorado headed by Dr. Gene Glass concluded that as class size increases student achievement declines.

"The difference in being taught in a class of 20 versus a class of 40 is an advantage of 6 percentile ranks." A score of 56 on the Nationalized Achievement test in a class of 20 as compared to a score of 50 in a class of 40. From 20 pupils to 10 pupils there is a difference of 10 percentile ranks.

Generally, research has shown that smaller classes evoke new practices and individualized concern. Teachers show greater:

- 1) understanding of children
- 2) use of children's aptitudes and needs
- 3) discovery and development of individual talents
- 4) encouragement of individual exploration
- 5) more time to prepare and evaluate for effective instruction.

The research also shows that the following are positive outcomes provided to students in smaller classes:

- 1) students commit fewer aggressive acts
- 2) students are more involved in school, both physically and mentally
- 3) students are more favorable to their teachers and to instruction
- 4) students learn to work better in groups, become skilled in decision-making, develop group goals, and resolving conflict within groups
- 5) students volunteer more, show greater initiative and are more eager to participate in learning activities.

(Taken from IPD Tips from "Instruction and Professional Developmental Department of the California Teachers Association," Vol. 6, No. 5.)

Although the Prime Time Program in Indiana is still in its infant stages, the program appears to be successful. The results of pre and post achievement testing indicate that the scores of students are improving.

The administrator of the program in Indiana's State Dept. of Education lists the following as the most positive aspects of the program:

- 1) individualized attention for students
- 2) more immediate feedback on performance of students
- 3) discipline problems were reduced
- 4) considerable parent enthusiasm
- 5) teacher morale up
- 6) enhanced teacher performance

The difficulties with the program were related to the cost of the program and the problem of providing extra classrooms for the additional teachers.

S.B. 637 provides for a three year Prime Time pilot program and an evaluation of that program by the State Department of Education. If the pilot programs are as successful as I think they will be, the program will provide a new direction in teacher staffing patterns within the state of Kansas and will dramatically enhance the quality of education for students in the state of Kansas. I ask for your favorable recommendation of S.B. 637.

AMENDMENTS TO SB 620

(Submitted by J. Tuckness)

February 25, 1986

School Policy

I am in favor of Senate Bill 620 but would like to amend it as follows:
(New Section 6.)

1. Whenever there is a condition of limited enrollment in the school curriculum and enrollment on all curriculum, it will be a matter of policy that the schools will implement the following guidelines:
 - A) The school will put all the guidelines in writing for all to see at the start of the school term as to the qualifications for the various courses. The qualifications should be concerned with soundings of the individual's true ability on his own merit primarily, and be fair.
 - B) The school will follow its own guidelines once they are established for that year.
 - C) The school will inform the students in writing as to his or her progress in the courses on a regular basis (including explanatory reasons for such progress) at least three times in a nine-week quator.
 - D) The school will make all surveys that have to do with school policy and curriculum direction available to public view or furnish copies upon request.
 - E) The school will publish all of the school's rules and regulations and make them available to the public and students upon request, so they will know what to expect and what is going on.

Penalty

- F) This act shall require the State Board of Education to conform with such policies as is necessary to fulfill this mandate. The State Board shall, upon receiving any complaints as to failure of any school board of the various school systems to comply with this act, take immediate action and initiate a complete and thorough investigation and ruling within thirty days and supply all concerned with copies in writing.
- G) Should the State Board of Education find merit in the complaints lodged against any school board concerning this act, it shall certify to the school that it has one week in which to comply. If the school board in question refuses, the State Board of Education shall certify to the director of accounts and reports that they should withhold 5% of the 87% of matching state funds and shall remit this money to the state treasurer; and the state treasurer shall deposit this money to the credit of the state General Fund, and the school shall forfeit this money.

SENATE BILL NO. 620

Presenter: Bill Berry, Director,
Manhattan Area Vocational-Technical School

Representing: Kansas Association of Area Vocational-Technical
Schools

Date: February 25, 1986

Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you regarding Senate Bill No. 620. The Kansas Association of Area Vocational-Technical Schools opposes Senate Bill No. 620 for three (3) reasons.

First, setting policy for a local institution should be the responsibility of the local governing board. The refund of dollars paid into a local school and the policies governing such refunds are local board functions.

Local boards approve the local schools' refund policies, as well as actual refund transactions. This system of checks and balances is as it should be.

Attachment "A" is a composite of all of the area vo-tech schools' refund policies. As you can see, there is not a great deal of difference between them. Each policy has been approved by the local governing board, is advertised publicly, and is presently in force and working at the local level.

It seems that if problems arise regarding refunds, a review and possible change of local policy, as necessary, would be accomplished without any need for legislative action (SB 620).

Second, Senate Bill No. 620 places all responsibility on the

area vo-tech schools. Attachment "B" is a compilation of the effect of Senate Bill No. 620 on a typical school with programs ranging in length from 1080 hours to 1488 hours.

As you are probably aware, tuition rate (cost per clock hour) is determined by dividing the vo-tech school operating budget by the total number of clock hours. Assuming a typical cost per clock hour of \$3.33, the student's share (15%) is \$.50 per clock hour. Attachment "B" assumes this figure. If a student attends up to 10% of the course length and then drops, Senate Bill No. 620 provides for a full refund. As shown, the school suffers an actual loss in revenue.

In addition, when a student drops out at the 10% point in a nine (9) month program, 18 days (108 hours) of instruction have occurred. Costs such as enrollment procedures, salaries, supplies, etc. have accumulated, with no income.

Also, waiting lists of applicants tend to disappear after school starts, eliminating the possibility of bringing in another student. In most cases, after 18 days of class have occurred, it is impossible to bring in new students, due to the amount of material that has already been covered.

In either event, the seat remains empty for the remainder of program time with no income.

This brings up the third reason for opposition. The student assumes no responsibility under Senate Bill No. 620. The student can "test the waters" for up to 10% of program length and then drop with no financial responsibility at all.

Refund policies not only explain refund procedures, they also

indicate the importance of the applicant giving serious thought and consideration to costs, placement possibilities, goals for the future, etc. A vo-tech school in Kansas is a business that trains people as it's product. These people are aware of existing policies regarding costs and refunds and, in my opinion, there has been little in the way of problems.

I hope that you will react favorably to the information presented here and I thank you for your time.

SUMMARY OF 1985-86 AREA VOCATIONAL SCHOOL STUDENT TUITION REFUND POLICIES

Area Vocational School	Tuition Refund Policy
Central Kansas Area Vocational-Technical-School (Newton)	100 percent during first two weeks. No refund after first two weeks. (No refund after one week in an open entry/open exit program.)
Flint Hills Area Vocational-Technical School (Emporia)	80 percent after the first day of class. Reduced by 4 percent for each day of class through September 15. No refund after September 15.
Johnson County Area Vocational-Technical School (Olathe)	New school — no policy adopted at this time.
Kansas City Area Vocational-Technical School	100 percent before class begins. 50 percent during first month. No refunds after first month.
Kaw Area Vocational-Technical School (Topeka)	100 percent, less \$1.20 for each hour in attendance. (No refund after 30 days.)
Liberal Area Vocational-Technical School	First semester — tuition is collected at the third week. First three weeks, there is no tuition charge. After third week until completion of one-half of semester, refund is the amount of tuition less 53 cents* times the number of hours enrolled. No refund for first semester after one-half completed. Second semester — tuition is due on the first day of classes. Refund of second semester tuition is the amount of tuition less 53 cents times the number of hours enrolled until completion of one-half of the semester. No refund after one-half of the semester is completed.
Manhattan Area Vocational-Technical School	80 percent after first day. Reduced by 4 percent per day until the end of 20 days. No refund after 20 days.
North Central Kansas Area Vocational-Technical School (Beloit)	75 percent during first five days. 50 percent during the sixth to tenth day. No refund after tenth day.
Northeast Kansas Area Vocational-Technical School (Atchison)	100 percent during first two weeks. 50 percent during third and fourth week. (Out-of-state student tuition is refunded by subtracting the hourly charge times the number of hours enrolled.)
Northwest Kansas Area Vocational-Technical School (Goodland)	100 percent during first two weeks. 50 percent during third and fourth week. No refund after fourth week.
Pratt Community College/Area Vocational School	75 percent during the first week. 50 percent during second week. No refund after second week. (After classes are begun, no fees are refunded.) For programs of less than 12 credit hours — 100 percent of tuition and fees prior to second class. 100 percent of tuition only prior to third class. No refund thereafter. For short classes of less than five weeks — no refund.
Salina Area Vocational-Technical School	80 percent during first week. 65 percent during second and third week. 50 percent during fourth through sixth week. No refund after sixth week.
Southeast Kansas Area Vocational-Technical School (Coffeyville)	100 percent prior to first day. 50 percent during first two weeks. No refund after second week. (If tuition was paid for the entire year, the second semester tuition is refunded.)
Southwest Kansas Area Vocational-Technical School (Dodge City)	100 percent prior to first day. 50 percent during first six weeks. No refund after sixth week. (Truck driving students' tuition can be refunded 50 percent during the first three weeks. No refund after the third week.)
Wichita Area Vocational-Technical School	For programs of more than 90 clock hours — 100 percent less a \$4.00 processing fee prior to the second class meeting. Not more than 50 percent during the first two weeks. No refund after second week. For programs of 90 clock hours or less — 100 percent less a \$4.00 processing fee prior to second class meeting. No refund after second class meeting.
Woolley County Community College (Arkansas City)	100 percent during the first five days. 50 percent during the sixth to tenth day. No refund after tenth day.

53 cents is 15 percent of the local cost per hour for the prior year — the same as the rate charged for postsecondary tuition.

ATTACHMENT "B"

SB 520 TUITION REFUND POLICY

	1088 HRS	1200 HRS	1322 HRS	1352 HRS	1488 HRS
DAYS PER PROGRAM	180	200	220	232	248
STUDENT TUITION	540	600	660	696	744
10% OF PROGRAM AMOUNT OF REFUND	54 FULL	60 FULL	66 FULL	70 FULL	74 FULL
20% OF PROGRAM AMOUNT OF REFUND (85%)	108 459	120 510	132 561	139 592	149 632
30% OF PROGRAM AMOUNT OF REFUND (70%)	162 378	180 420	198 462	207 487	221 521
40% OF PROGRAM AMOUNT OF REFUND (55%)	216 297	240 330	264 363	278 383	298 409
40+% OF PROGRAM AMOUNT OF REFUND	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE
TUITION USED AT 10%	54	60	66	70	74
FULL REFUND	540	600	660	696	744
TOTAL DOLLARS AT 10%	594	660	726	766	818
DOLLARS TO SCHOOL	-54	-60	-66	-70	-74
TUITION USED AT 20%	108	120	132	139	149
85% REFUND	459	510	561	592	632
TOTAL DOLLARS AT 20%	567	630	693	731	781
DOLLARS TO SCHOOL	-27	-30	-32	-35	-37
TUITION USED AT 30%	162	180	198	207	221
70% REFUND	378	420	462	487	521
TOTAL DOLLARS AT 30%	540	600	660	696	744
DOLLARS TO SCHOOL	0	0	0	0	0
TUITION USED AT 40%	216	240	264	278	298
55% REFUND	297	330	363	383	409
TOTAL DOLLARS AT 40%	513	570	627	661	707
DOLLARS TO SCHOOL	27	30	33	35	37

*176
DAYS*

PRESENTATION BY
HARRY L. FALGREN, DIRECTOR
KANSAS CITY AREA VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL SCHOOL

I am appearing today in opposition to Senate Bill 620 which establishes a refund policy for tuition paid by students attending an Area Vocational Technical School in Kansas. This would include two Community Colleges, 5 schools that have composite boards and 9 schools governed by local boards of education.

All schools that charge tuition are faced with the problem of refunds. It is important to realize that part of the cost of operating a post secondary school, either public or private, comes from tuition. There is no substitute for the money derived from tuition. There is no local tax base for post secondary students in secondary districts. Type II Area Vocational Technical Schools have no taxing authority. Community Colleges receive credit hour aid even if the student drops, by not area schools. When an area school students drops, the hours in attendance stops and the money for those hours stops.

Students make application to enroll in post secondary educational programs. When they are accepted, this fills one of the openings in the program. That space is not available to any other person. If the student who begins the class does not have to fulfill any of his responsibility either by attending or the payment of money, then there is no deterrent. The student must be responsible for the fact that he or she applied and was accepted.

The schools cannot guarantee success in programs. They can guarantee the opportunity for success if the student fulfills the enrollment commitment.

Each school has a policy on refunds to protect the student consumer. The school must be able to protect itself at the same time.

I urge you to vote "No" on Senate bill 620.