

Approved 3-24-89
Date

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

The meeting was called to order by SENATOR AUGUST "GUS" BOGINA at
Chairperson

11:10 a.m. ~~PM~~ on MARCH 3, 1989 in room 123-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except:

All present

Committee staff present:

Research Department: Diane Duffy, Kathy Porter, Alan Conroy
Revisor: Norm Furse
Committee Staff: Judy Bromich, Pam Parker

Conferees appearing before the committee:

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman announced that copies of Denise Apt's testimony had been distributed. (Attachment 1)

SB 210 - Postsecondary education, establishment of state educational institution, finance assistance for community colleges.

The hearings for SB 210 continued with Stanley Koplik, Executive Director, as the first conferee of the day. Mr. Koplik was asked to submit his comments to staff. In answer to questions, Mr. Koplik stated that Kansas University is not filled to capacity. It would probably have the capacity for about 1,000 more students and Kansas State University probably has the capacity for about 2,000 more students. Emporia State University (ESU) has the most capacity of the three regional schools. He does not foresee any significant damage to ESU in terms of enrollment and no significant impact on the other schools should Washburn University come into the Regents system. He stated that with the governance question aside, he felt the state can benefit from Washburn University whether it is attached to the Regents system or not.

Mr. Koplik stated that in December, 1988 the Board said that any consideration by the legislature of Washburn should address the following principle concerns of the Board: (1) the financial implications for the future of the current regents institutions, i.e., 100 percent funding of the Margin of Excellence in years two and three before adding another institution to the system, acknowledgement that erosion should not take place and the state is ready to provide the continuing investment necessary beyond the Margin of Excellence; (2) Washburn should come into the state with its debt retired or a mechanism for retiring that debt. This is addressed in SB 210; (3) there should be no intrusion on the Educational Building Fund which is already stretched to its limit; the last major concern was that there would be no strings attached, i.e., law schools, programatic concerns, under which it is supposed to govern, manage and control Washburn which would make it different than what it can do with regard to any other institution. He noted the Board may have a problem with Section 13 of the bill which calls for the freezing on Washburn's tuition in that the Board is empowered by legislation to set tuition levels at the institutions under its control. He stated that the Board is not satisfied with the name determined for Washburn in the Bill. The Board's position would be for the name to be simply Washburn University.

Mr. Koplik stated that there is not a provision in SB 210 which guarantees the third year funding of the Margin of Excellence and the Board would have to trust the Governor implicitly on that issue. The Board is concerned, first and foremost, about its institutions. No study has been attempted to see what programs might be eliminated or modified at Washburn should it become a member of the Board of Regents and if directed, and if SB 210

Unless specifically noted, the individual remarks recorded herein have not been transcribed verbatim. Individual remarks as reported herein have not been submitted to the individuals appearing before the committee for editing or corrections.

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
room 123-S, Statehouse, at 11:10 a.m./~~PM~~ on MARCH 3, 1989

passes, the Board would conduct such a study. He does not foresee any major change at Washburn, only some possible fine tuning.

Mrs. Ann B. Garvin, Vice-Chairperson, Washburn University Board of Regents, was the next conferee. (Attachment 2) In response to questions, Mrs. Garvin stated that should Washburn not be taken into the Regents system they will continue to plan for the future as best they can for the University. She had no idea that Washburn would close. Since she has been on the Board, it has increased tuition, one of their major sources of funding, every year except for one.

Appearing next was Robert L. Burns, President, Washburn University. (Attachment 3) In answer to questions, Dr. Burns stated that stability of funding and coordination of academic offerings is the bottom line to the purpose for Washburn coming into the Regents system. At present they serve the state of Kansas so they do not see themselves as changing their policies. The average age on the campus is 27 and the average load carried by the students is nine credit hours. The major portion of the population at Washburn is women with responsibilities of families and job. Their population at Washburn is not a mobile population. Presently the tuition at Washburn is \$70 per credit hour and should the University not become a part of the Regents system the rate will have to be raised to \$75 per credit hour. The school will not close and they will continue preparing for the next year as they are at this time. He stated that if they were to extend the current mill levy to all of Shawnee County and therefore eliminate all out-district tuition, they estimate only an additional \$200,000. He stated that he feels it is clear in this state and in this nation that property tax is not an efficient or appropriate way to support a university. He stated that as a part of the state system of universities, they would work day and night to get the third year funded of the Margin of Excellence of which they would be part funded and would have no problem with the suggestion of completing the linkage of Washburn to the Regents system with the completion of the three-year Margin of Excellence.

Merle Hill, Executive Director, Kansas Association of Community Colleges, presented his testimony. (Attachment 4)

Dr. Robert Kelly, Executive Director, Kansas Independent College Association, stated that their Association is very willing to support the entire package as outlined in SB 210. He said that the problems that the small independent colleges have is trying to enable students to be able to afford to attend their colleges and through the years, the main way this has been done is by increasing student assistance. This is why the tuition grants came into being however, this became a problem because the maximum grants were not being raised with inflation. They came up with "half the gap" which SB 210 has.

The last conferee of the day was Bev Bradley, Legislative Coordinator, Kansas Association of Counties. (Attachment 5)

The meeting was adjourned.

GUEST LIST

COMMITTEE: SENATE WAYS AND MEANS

DATE: 3-3-89

NAME (PLEASE PRINT)	ADDRESS	COMPANY/ORGANIZATION
<i>Jamnie Hofer</i>	<i>Topeka</i>	<i>Washburn</i>
<i>Don Larkin</i>	<i>Topeka</i>	<i>Washburn U.</i>
<i>Keith Weber</i>	<i>Topeka</i>	<i>AAUP</i>
<i>John P. Milburn</i>	<i>Lawrence</i>	<i>University Daily Kansan</i>
<i>Mark Kephis</i>	<i>Topeka</i>	<i>RIGHTS</i>
<i>Walter Weber</i>	<i>Topeka</i>	<i>Webber</i>
<i>Merle Hee</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>KACC</i>
<i>KEVIN J. CARRICO</i>	<i>TOPEKA KS</i>	<i>INTERN.</i>
<i>Robert Burns</i>	<i>Topeka</i>	<i>Washburn U.</i>
<i>Bob Kelly</i>	<i>Topeka</i>	<i>KICA</i>
<i>Ed Walhara</i>	<i>Topeka</i>	<i>Washburn U.</i>
<i>Mary Estrup</i>	<i>Topeka</i>	<i>DOB</i>
<i>Warren Cornman</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>BD. OF REG.</i>
<i>BEU BRADLEY</i>	<i>Topeka</i>	<i>KS Assoc of Counties</i>
<i>Pat Mel</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>DOB</i>
<i>Kip L. Stegman</i>	<i>Merietta</i>	<i>Div. of Budget</i>
<i>Michael Horak</i>	<i>Topeka</i>	<i>AP</i>
<i>Chris Graves</i>	<i>Topeka</i>	<i>ASK</i>
<i>Mark Ed</i>	<i>Topeka</i>	<i>ASK</i>
<i>Jon Jossand</i>	<i>Lawrence</i>	<i>KU</i>
<i>Gloria Timmer</i>	<i>Topeka</i>	<i>DOB</i>
<i>Janice West</i>	<i>Topeka</i>	<i>Gov's Office</i>
<i>Sue Peterson</i>	<i>Topeka</i>	<i>Treasurer's Office</i>
<i>Silvanna</i>	<i>Wichita</i>	<i>WSE</i>
<i>David Monical</i>	<i>Topeka</i>	<i>Washburn</i>
<i>Jan Colles</i>	<i>Topeka</i>	<i>K-NA</i>
<i>Patrick Hurley</i>	<i>Topeka</i>	<i>Washburn ^{County} College</i>
<i>WALT DARCUS</i>	<i>TOPEKA</i>	<i>Director of BUDGET</i>
<i>Melissa Vogel</i>	<i>Topeka</i>	<i>INTERN OLEEN</i>

TESTIMONY ON SB 210 and 281
SENATE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE
DENISE APT, GOVERNOR'S REPRESENTATIVE
March 2, 1989

MARGIN OF EXCELLENCE PARTNERSHIP ACT

THE GOVERNOR SAID IN HIS STATE OF THE STATE MESSAGE,
"THE BEST POSSIBLE KANSAS FOR ALL KANSANS DEPENDS ON MANY
PARTNERSHIPS. PARTNERSHIPS BETWEEN GOVERNMENT, BUSINESS,
INDUSTRY AND AGRICULTURE ARE IMPORTANT, BUT A PARTNERSHIP THAT
MUST BE INCLUDED AND ENCOURAGED IS THE PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN
GOVERNMENT, EDUCATION AND THE PRIVATE SECTOR.

NEITHER ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT NOR QUALITY OF LIFE CAN OCCUR
WITHOUT THE BEST EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM POSSIBLE". TO THIS END,
THE GOVERNOR PROPOSED THE MARGIN OF EXCELLENCE PARTNERSHIP ACT.

THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM I SPEAK OF TODAY, SPECIFICALLY OUR
HIGHER EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM, IS ONE OF KANSAS GREATEST
STRENGTHS. IT NURTURES OUR GREATEST ASSET --- OUR YOUTH. IT
RETRAINS OUR EXCELLENT WORK FORCE, PROVIDES RESEARCH TO FURTHER
EXPAND THE GROWTH OF OUR INDUSTRIES AND BUSINESSES, AND IT IS
OUR STRONGEST ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT TOOL, AS IT HELPS THE FORMER
AND BY ITS STRENGTH ATTRACTS BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY TO OUR
BORDERS.

ATTACHMENT 1
SWAM 3-3-89

THINK IF YOU WILL OF KANSAS AS A TAPESTRY. IN ORDER TO BE BEAUTIFUL AND LASTING, THE PATTERN MUST BE WELL THOUGHT OUT AND THE FIBERS MUST BE STRONG AND INTERWOVEN IN A PROPER MANNER.

THERE ARE SEVERAL FIBERS OR THEMES THAT ARE OVERRIDING IN THE MARGIN OF EXCELLENCE PARTNERSHIP ACT:

THE FIRST IS EXCELLENCE. FIRST INTRODUCED BY THE REGENTS, IT HAS BEEN EMBRACED AND EXPANDED TO OTHER SECTORS OF HIGHER EDUCATION BY THE GOVERNOR. MEDIOCRITY IS EASY AND CALLS FOR VERY LITTLE EFFORT ON THE PART OF ANY OF US. EXCELLENCE CALLS FOR GREAT EFFORT NOT ONLY THROUGH SACRIFICE FOR DOLLARS EXPENDED, BUT FOR TIME AND EFFORT TO ACHIEVE AND MAINTAIN THAT EXCELLENCE.

GROWTH IS ANOTHER FIBER THAT EXCELLENCE PROMOTES AND WHICH IS ESSENTIAL TO THE WELL-BEING OF ALL KANSANS.

ONE OF THE STRONGEST FIBERS OR COMPONENTS IS PARTNERSHIP. THIS PARTNERSHIP ACT HAS BROUGHT THE SEGMENTS OF HIGHER EDUCATION TOGETHER AS NOTHING HAS BEFORE. FOR YEARS, THE

LEGISLATURE HAS CRIED FOR COOPERATION AND COMMUNICATION BETWEEN ALL OF HIGHER EDUCATION -- IT HAS HAPPENED. RATHER THAN COMPETITION BEING THE FACTOR AS HAS HAPPENED IN THE PAST. COOPERATION IS WHAT WE SEE -- IT HAS HAPPENED ON A VOLUNTARY BASIS NOT AS A MANDATE. THIS ALONE WOULD MAKE THE PARTNERSHIP ACT WORTH PURSUING.

AS WE WEAVE THIS TAPESTRY, THE INTEGRATING FIBERS ARE REPRESENTED BY THE OVERRIDING THEMES OF ACCESS AND CHOICE. THE ACT INSURES ACCESS FOR EVERYONE AND PRESENTS CHOICES AS NEEDED.

THE COMPREHENSIVE SEVEN-POINT PLAN THE GOVERNOR PROPOSED HAS ALL THE COMPONENTS THAT WILL WEAVE TOGETHER BEAUTIFULLY.

THE SECOND YEAR OF THE MARGIN OF EXCELLENCE ENCOMPASSES SALARY INCREASES TO PUT US IN THE COMPETITIVE MAINSTREAM FOR RECRUITING AND RETRAINING OUTSTANDING FACULTY AND PROGRAM ENHANCEMENTS TO FULFILL INSTITUTIONAL MISSIONS. THIS INSURES EXCELLENCE AND GROWTH FOR REGENTS INSTITUTIONS.

THE FIVE YEAR FUNDING PLAN FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES SPEAKS TO TWO ISSUES. ONE IS ACCESS, THE OTHER IS RELIEF FOR THOSE COUNTIES NOW PAYING OUT-DISTRICT TUITION. BRIEFLY, THE PLAN ASSURES DEPENDABLE FUNDING FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES WHICH ALLOWS FOR LONG TERM PLANNING. THOSE OUT-DISTRICT COUNTIES WILL HAVE RESOURCES RELEASED WHICH CAN BE USED FOR NEEDED PROJECTS.

COMMUNITY COLLEGES PROVIDE ACCESS FOR FOUR DIFFERENT POPULATIONS. THE FIRST IS OUR YOUTH GRADUATING FROM HIGH SCHOOL BENT ON A COLLEGE DEGREE BUT NOT READY FOR A FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTION FOR FINANCIAL, SOCIAL, OR ACADEMIC REASONS. THE SECOND IS OUR ADULT POPULATION WHICH DESIRES OR NEEDS CONTINUING EDUCATION. THE THIRD IS THE WORKER WHO NEEDS SPECIFIC SKILL TRAINING TO COMPETE IN THE JOB MARKET. THE FOURTH IS THE BUSINESS AND INDUSTRIES WHO NEED RETRAINING FOR A SEGMENT OF THEIR WORK FORCE IN AN EXPEDIENT MANNER.

THE NEXT OF THE SEVEN PARTS IS WASHBURN UNIVERSITY. WASHBURN HAS A GREAT MANY ATTRIBUTES WHICH CAN ENHANCE THE STATE SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

WASHBURN UNIVERSITY IS LOCATED IN THE CAPITOL CITY, AND CAN BRING BENEFITS TO STATE GOVERNMENT, SPECIFICALLY EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF ELEMENTS WITHIN THE STATE'S WORK FORCE.

WASHBURN IS THE ONLY MUNICIPAL UNIVERSITY LEFT IN THE UNITED STATES. WICHITA UNIVERSITY WAS ONE OF THE LAST REMAINING ONES AND HAS BROUGHT GREAT STRENGTH TO OUR REGENTS SYSTEM SINCE ITS INCLUSION IN 1964. WASHBURN WILL DO THE SAME.

ITS CAPABILITIES IN PUBLIC TELEVISION GIVE A SIGNIFICANT

OPPORTUNITY TO REACH OUT ACROSS KANSAS IN BOTH INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMMING AND CULTURAL ENRICHMENT. NURSING PROGRAMS CAN ASSIST IN MEETING OUR CRITICAL HEALTH CARE MANPOWER SHORTAGES.

THE ACTUAL PLANT IS A DEFINITE ASSET. TWO OBVIOUS EXAMPLES WOULD BE THE PLANETARIUM AND THE MULVANE ART CENTER. QUICKLY COMES TO MIND THE ASSET OF WASHBURN AS A MULTI-FACTED COMPLEX. SERVING ALL THE REGENTS IN OUR CAPITOL CITY. THE CITY OF TOPEKA WILL CONTINUE TO MAINTAIN THE PHYSICAL PLANT SO IT WILL NOT BE A BURDEN TO THE STATE.

THE QUESTION OF TWO LAW SCHOOLS IS NOT RELEVANT. KU AND WASHBURN LAW SCHOOL HAVE LIVED IN HARMONY FOR 80 YEARS TRAINING FINE LAWYERS WHO HAVE PURSUED VARIED CAREERS INCLUDING THAT OF LEGISLATORS AND JUDGES.

WASHBURN BRINGS A UNIQUE QUALITY TO THE REGENTS AND SERVES WELL A MORE ADULT POPULATION OR DRIVE-IN STUDENT.

FINALLY IT ONLY MAKES SENSE FOR THERE TO BE SUPERVISION OF THE ALREADY EXISTING STATE FUNDS EXPENDED AND THAT THE SUPERVISION OF A FOUR YEAR INSTITUTION BE UNDER THE BOARD MOST SUITED FOR THAT SUPERVISION.

THE REGENTS CENTER IN JOHNSON COUNTY AGAIN SPEAKS TO ACCESS AND RESPONDS TO THE GROWING NEEDS OF KANSAS IN A GROWING METROPOLITAN AREA. IT ALSO ADDRESSES THE PARTNERSHIP THEME AS BUSINESS AND INDUSTRIES CRY FOR GRADUATE OPPORTUNITIES FOR THEIR UPPER MANAGEMENT AND WHO ARE CONTRIBUTING SUBSTANTIAL MONIES TO ASSIST THE CENTER.

FUNDING FOR THE INSTITUTE OF AVIATION RESEARCH SPEAKS TO BOTH THE NEEDS FOR INCREASED SUPPORT FOR ALL OUR INDUSTRIES, AND AGAIN TO THAT PARTNERSHIP OF COOPERATION BETWEEN THE STATE, LOCAL GOVERNMENT, EDUCATION AND BUSINESS.

THE THEME OR FIBER OF CHOICE IS DRAMATIZED BY FUNDING OF HALF THE GAP FOR THE TUITION GRANT PROGRAM. OUR STATE'S PRIVATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES CONTINUE TO PROVIDE AN EXCELLENT ALTERNATIVE TO THE STATE INSTITUTIONS. AGAIN THE PARTNERSHIP ACT HAS PROVIDED COOPERATION RATHER THAN COMPETITION AND GIVES KANSANS CHOICE AND ACCESS TO POST SECONDARY EDUCATION WHICH IS SUITED TO THEM.

THE LAST PIECE IS QUALIFIED ADMISSIONS FOR WHICH A BETTER NAME IS ENHANCED PREPARATION BECAUSE PREPARATION IS THE KEY. PREPARATION SO THAT OUR STUDENTS HAVE THE CHOICE OR ACCESS TO ANY CAREER WHICH THEY CHOOSE. HERE IS A QUOTE FROM LAST YEAR'S K-STATE STUDENTS:

"WE FEEL THAT STUDENTS NEED TO BE BETTER PREPARED TO FACE THE CHALLENGES THAT TODAY'S CHANGING AND MORE COMPLEX SOCIETY WILL PUT FORTH AND ALSO BE ABLE TO SUCCEED WHEN FACED WITH THESE CHALLENGES. WITH A PROPOSAL OF A QUALIFIED ADMISSIONS POLICY, WE ARE TRYING TO ENCOURAGE STUDENTS TO MEET THE STATED REQUIREMENTS. THIS WILL ENABLE THEM TO ENROLL IN STRONGER ACADEMIC PROGRAMS WHILE ATTENDING COLLEGE AND, THEREFORE, BE MORE COMPETITIVE IN THE CAREERS THEY CHOOSE." THIS IS FROM THE STUDENTS WHO WOULD HAVE BEEN AFFECTED.

IN OTHER WORDS, DOORS ARE NOT CLOSED BUT OPENED INSTEAD, AND THE CHOICES ARE INFINITE.

IN CONCLUSION, IN ORDER TO WEAVE THAT TAPESTRY SIGNIFYING KANSAS, EACH OF THOSE PARTNERS MUST BE PRESENT TO INSURE THAT HIGHER EDUCATION IN KANSAS MAY GROW, BE DURABLE AND PROVIDE EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION FOR ALL OUR CITIZENS.

GOVERNOR HAYDEN ASKS YOUR SUPPORT OF SB 210 and SB 281.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION.



WASHBURN UNIVERSITY OF TOPEKA

Board of Regents
Topeka, Kansas 66621
Phone 913-295-6625

**TESTIMONY BY MRS. ANN B. GARVIN
VICE CHAIRPERSON, WASHBURN UNIVERSITY BOARD OF REGENTS
ON THE MARGIN OF EXCELLENCE PARTNERSHIP ACT
(SB 210 AND SB 281)
SENATE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS
March 2, 1989**

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

It is my pleasure to appear before you today to express support of the Higher Education Margin of Excellence Partnership Act. The provisions of SB 210 and SB 281 were recommended to the Legislature by the Governor in his State of the State Address on January 9, 1989.

The Washburn University Board of Regents wholeheartedly endorse the provisions of these two bills. We feel that they constitute the most far-reaching recommendations for Kansas higher education in decades. The proposals contained in these two bills represent concepts which have been developed over the years by members of both parties and have been presented in a comprehensive form for the first time.

I will briefly speak with you regarding the provisions of these recommendations which affect Washburn University.

I have served on the Washburn Board of Regents since 1981, the longest tenure of any current member. Although there have been many recent appointments, the Board of Regents remains unanimously committed to the goal of state affiliation.

ATTACHMENT 2
SWAM 3-3-89

Some of you will recall that in the winter of 1981 the Washburn Board of Regents requested an interim study on the part of the Legislature to consider state affiliation for the University. Later that year the new president requested that committee deliberations be delayed until Washburn had sufficient time to plan for its future and to determine if state affiliation was in the best interest of the University and the state. I served as chairman of the Board in 1985 when, following our deliberation, we concluded that state affiliation was in the best interest of the University and the state, and requested an interim study.

You granted our request for an interim study and a special, select committee was appointed. That committee recommended state affiliation for Washburn University although there was no consensus as to a specific plan to accomplish this goal. The Washburn University Board of Regents adopted resolutions on September 11, 1985 and again on March 12, 1986 reaffirming our desire for state affiliation and our willingness to continue some level of local financial support.

We are pleased that state affiliation for Washburn University is embodied in substantive legislation to which you are giving serious consideration. On behalf of the Washburn University Board of Regents I urge you to give favorable consideration to Senate Bills 210 and 281 and all of their components. Your support of these measures will result in substantial improvements in the state system of higher education, both public and private, community colleges and universities.



WASHBURN UNIVERSITY OF TOPEKA

Office of the President
Topeka, Kansas 66621
Phone 913-295-6556

TESTIMONY BY ROBERT L. BURNS, PRESIDENT
WASHBURN UNIVERSITY
ON THE MARGIN OF EXCELLENCE PARTNERSHIP ACT
(SB 210 AND SB 281)
SENATE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS
MARCH 3, 1989

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

The Higher Education Margin of Excellence Partnership Act represents a major step for Kansas higher education. Senate Bill 210, Senate Bill 281 and other legislation point the way to meeting the real needs of higher education in this state in a comprehensive approach rather than bit by bit. We have stopped pretending that our state's education elements operate in isolation one from the other--and that our investments in this centrally important element of Kansas can be managed while wearing blinders. Washburn University supports the provisions contained in these two bills and in the Partnership Act.

The elements of the two bills before you implement the logical, rational, non-emotional next steps in the evolution of Washburn University as a statewide asset--a process of service to Kansas over a period of 125 years from private college to public, urban university.

I ask that you continue to function as leaders and send these bills from this committee to the Senate because that is the logical, rational, consistent thing to do.

ATTACHMENT 3
SWAM 3-3-89

These bills bring Washburn University under the administration of the Kansas State Board of Regents as of July 1, 1989. Take this step --because it is consistent. It is consistent to administer this public university just as you administer every other public university in Kansas. Once Washburn is in the state system, expect that our programs will be held accountable just as are those of every other system university--because that is consistent.

These bills provide for a five-year fiscal phase-in for Washburn. Take this step--because it is consistent. It is consistent to move Washburn's funding characteristics gradually into alignment with those which are common to every other public university in the state. Our healthy fund balances will make that process easier now. And this can be done using an amount which is only 2 percent of the current state general fund appropriation for the regents universities. That's correct, all of the funds you are asked to provide for the regents schools, the Washburn part is only 2 percent.

These bills eliminate out-district tuition as a source of funding for Washburn University. Take this step--because it is consistent. It is consistent to eliminate this unusual source of funds, replacing it with the sources which are common to every other public university in the state. At the same time you will remove a significant burden from the counties across Kansas. It is consistent that support come from across the state, just as it is necessary that Kansans in Shawnee County provide tax support for a portion of the needs at Emporia State and Fort Hays State, for example. It is consistent that support be

from the state just as benefits are to the state. Kansans educated at Washburn contribute as residents in all 105 counties, seventy-five counties are represented by the new freshmen who enrolled last fall. Washburn scholarship funding was provided to students from 94 counties. Washburn is a public university which serves the entire state of Kansas. Fund us that way, because it is consistent.

These bills freeze tuition at its current level--\$70 per credit. Take this step--because it is consistent. It is consistent to provide access to education for six thousand five hundred students in a major population center of the state at a tuition which is equitable to that of every other public university in the state. This is especially important to students who are place-bound by their jobs, families, and other circumstances, and, like those to be served by the regents center east of the University of Kansas, cannot commute or relocate to study. It is consistent also since you rightly provide tuition help to students at our private colleges. Provide help to Washburn students because it is consistent.

Finally, these bills provide up to 3.5 mills in local tax levy to tend to debt service and capital needs and maintenance. Take this step--because it too is consistent. It is consistent with the on-going willingness of the area to do its part and more--beyond what other university cities do in this state.

Washburn University comes to you for support of these bills at a time when we are academically and fiscally strong. Every one of our academic programs has just been reviewed by the regional accrediting

agency which examines every other university in the state (and surrounding states), and we have been fully accredited for the maximum period of ten years. Every individual program which requires separate accreditation has that accreditation (nursing, law, social work, music, allied health programs, to name a few). We maintain a sound student/faculty ratio and emphasize quality undergraduate teaching by a highly qualified professional faculty. We will enter the system with strength and will use our strengths to keep the system healthy.

The bills I am asking you to send to the Senate and others which provide for the Partnership Act are consistent. They take logical steps to continue the tradition of Kansas to provide quality education with equity of access and equity of cost. They have been studied and strongly endorsed by the Kansas Board of Education and the Kansas Board of Regents. I encourage you to be consistent with these boards.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your patience and attention.



KANSAS ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Columbian Title Bldg., 820 Quincy • Topeka 66612 • Phone 913-357-5156

W. Merle Hill
Executive Director

To: Senate Ways and Means Committee

From: Merle Hill, Executive Director
Kansas Association of Community Colleges

Date: March 2, 1989

Subj: Senate Bills Nos. 210 and 281

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee. I am Merle Hill, Executive Director of the Kansas Association of Community Colleges. The Kansas Association of Community Colleges supports both Senate Bill No. 210 and Senate Bill No. 281, two bills which represent the Governor's Margin of Excellence Higher Education Act.

Senate Bill No. 210 contains the five-year funding plan for the community colleges introduced last year by the State Board of Education. The genesis of this five-year financial plan was the work done in 1986 by a Community College Alternate Funding Task Force appointed by the State Board of Education. Senator Johnston and Representative Crumbaker and two county commissioners were members of that 1986 16-member task force.

The Task Force's recommendations for funding the state's community colleges were reworked in 1987 into this five-year funding plan and introduced into bill form in 1988 by the House Committee on Education at the request of the State Board of Education. No action was taken on the bill last year because the funding associated with its implementation exceeded the funding recommendations of the Governor.

The five-year financial plan introduced last year and this was based on the recognition of four facts:

1. No state community college system received as small a percentage of operating

ATTACHMENT 4
SWAM 3-3-89

revenues from the state as Kansas (then 25 percent).

2. No state community college system received as large a percentage of operating revenues from the local taxing districts (then 51 percent).

3. Under the current funding formula the "rich get richer and the poor get poorer." That is, the colleges with significant assessed valuations behind them and large enrollments continue to garner the lion's share of distributions, while those with smaller assessed valuations and small enrollments divide up what money is left. The "gap" increases each year.

4. Out-district tuition from counties in 1986-87 was a far greater cost to the counties than it was when the concept was introduced in 1965.

In 1965, only about 5 percent of community college enrollment statewide was from the 87 counties which did not have a community college. In 1987, 44 percent of the enrollment came from those 87 counties, 53 percent came from the 18 counties with community colleges, and only 3 percent came from outside the state (mainly at those colleges located in counties adjacent to the state's borders).

The proposed five-year plan in Senate Bill No. 210 moves the community colleges from a "credit-hour distribution mode" to an "allocations mode." Its goal is for the community colleges to receive 40 percent of statewide operating revenues from state sources - credit hour aid, state out-district aid, and general state aid - by 1993-94.

Out-district tuition, which is actually an in-lieu-of tax, is the only "tax" which county commissioners must levy against property valuation but over which they have no control. In 1973, in partial recognition of this fact, the Legislature created a new aid category, state out-district aid, and assumed half of the counties' out-district tuition liabilities.

Under the provisions of Senate Bill No. 210, the state would assume the remaining out-district liabilities of the counties and, in so doing, complete the action it initiated in 1973. Out-district tuition would be phased out over a five-year period.

Because of the extreme importance of out-district tuition to certain colleges,

the bill provides for each "phased-out, out-district tuition dollar" to be picked up by the state as increased ancillary state out-district aid. There is, consequently, no loss of revenue for those colleges with extensive out-district enrollments, as ancillary state out-district aid is to be "paid off the top" of "new" dollars allocated each year.

In recognition of the fact that the current credit-hour distribution method favors the larger colleges, the community college trustees and presidents have agreed on a different formula, recommended by the State Board of Education, for the distribution of the dollars remaining after ancillary state out-district aid has been distributed - 67 percent via a credit-hour formula and 33 percent through a general-state-aid formula.

This general-state-aid formula provides larger percentages of revenue to colleges with smaller enrollments and lesser assessed valuation. The formula is not, however, a true equalization formula, since all colleges will receive funds from this distribution.

In five years the result of the 67/33-percent distribution formula will be hardly discernible. The largest gain for any college in percentage of total revenues from the state will be only 1.25 percent and the largest decrease will be less than 1.00 percent. In 10 years, 20, 30 years, the funding distribution will have changed a bit more, of course, and it is hoped that the smaller colleges with relatively low assessed valuations behind their educational programs will not have to depend on the property tax as much as they do today.

Senate Bill No. 281 contains the second half of the Governor's (and the State Board of Education's) funding recommendations to implement the first year of the five-year financial plan. It is anticipated that total state aid to the community colleges' statewide operating revenues will increase from an anticipated 30 percent in 1988-89 to 32 percent in the first year of the five-year funding plan, the level last attained a decade ago.

The Kansas Association of Community Colleges supports both parts of the Governor's Margin of Excellence Higher Education Act, Senate Bills Nos. 210 and 281, and urges the Committee to recommend the two bills favorably for passage.

I shall attempt to answer any questions Committee members may have about the

community college portions of the two bills.

Thank you.

Attachments:

- o February 17, 1989 release from the State Board of Regents
- o Estimated 1987-88 and 1988-89 out-district tuition billings, by county, for community colleges and Washburn University of Topeka
- o Community college operating funds by source, 1985-86



KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS

SUITE 609 • CAPITOL TOWER • 400 SW EIGHTH • TOPEKA, KANSAS 66603-3911 • (913) 296-3421

February 17, 1989

NEWS RELEASE

Kansas Board of Regents
Stanley Z. Koplik, Executive Director

The Kansas Board of Regents unanimously reaffirmed its endorsement of the Margin of Excellence Partnership Act proposed by Governor Mike Hayden. At its regular monthly meeting on February 16, 1989, the Board discussed reports detailing the status of appropriations requests for the Margin of Excellence. "The Board expressed pleasure with progress in the 1989 Legislature and is looking forward with cautious optimism to a successful session," according to Dr. Stanley Z. Koplik, Executive Director.

The Margin of Excellence Partnership Act is a program which includes: funding for the Second year of the Margin of Excellence for the Regents Institutions; support for Qualified Admissions; inclusion of Washburn University in the Regents system; a five-year phase-in of state funding for Community Colleges; and, funding to "halve the gap" for Independent Colleges through the Tuition Grant Program.

The Kansas Board of Regents by this action will continue the discussions and pledges to work to secure approval of the Margin of Excellence Partnership Act in the 1989 Legislature.

1987-88
Estimated Dollar Amount of County Out-District Billings

County	--Community Colleges--		--Washburn University--		-- Combined --		Estimated* 1988-89 Billings
	Billings	Millage Equiv.	Billings	Millage Equiv.	Billings	Millage Equiv.	
Allen	\$21,091.00	0.37	\$0.00	0.00	\$21,091.00	0.37	\$22,008.00
Anderson	\$58,949.00	1.59	\$0.00	0.00	\$58,949.00	1.59	\$61,512.00
Atchison	\$64,204.50	1.31	\$5,497.00	0.11	\$69,701.50	1.42	\$72,732.00
Barber	\$44,447.50	0.76	\$230.00	0.00	\$44,677.50	0.76	\$46,620.00
Barton	\$5,727.00	0.04	\$0.00	0.00	\$5,727.00	0.04	\$5,976.00
Bourbon	\$4,692.00	0.10	\$0.00	0.00	\$4,692.00	0.10	\$4,896.00
Brown	\$74,853.50	1.68	\$10,028.00	0.02	\$84,881.50	1.70	\$88,572.00
Butler	\$4,071.00	0.02	\$0.00	0.00	\$4,071.00	0.02	\$4,248.00
Chase	\$6,992.00	0.28	\$23.00	0.00	\$7,015.00	0.28	\$7,320.00
Chautauqua	\$32,395.50	1.70	\$0.00	0.00	\$32,395.50	1.70	\$33,804.00
Cherokee	\$178,066.00	2.94	\$161.00	0.00	\$178,227.00	2.94	\$185,976.00
Cheyenne	\$20,286.00	0.86	\$322.00	0.01	\$20,608.00	0.87	\$21,504.00
Clark	\$23,667.00	0.58	\$299.00	0.01	\$23,966.00	0.59	\$25,008.00
Clay	\$53,337.00	1.38	\$644.00	0.02	\$53,981.00	1.40	\$56,328.00
Cloud	\$1,610.00	0.03	\$0.00	0.00	\$1,610.00	0.03	\$1,680.00
Coffey	\$65,205.00	0.13	\$3,369.50	0.01	\$68,574.50	0.14	\$71,556.00
Comanche	\$21,298.00	0.79	\$46.00	0.00	\$21,344.00	0.79	\$22,272.00
Cowley	\$2,323.00	0.02	\$0.00	0.00	\$2,323.00	0.02	\$2,424.00
Crawford	\$128,811.50	1.58	\$1,219.00	0.01	\$130,030.50	1.59	\$135,684.00
Decatur	\$23,230.00	0.85	\$483.00	0.02	\$23,713.00	0.87	\$24,744.00
Dickinson	\$77,245.50	1.08	\$3,438.50	0.05	\$80,684.00	1.13	\$84,192.00
Doniphan	\$46.00	0.00	\$0.00	0.00	\$46.00	0.00	\$48.00
Douglas	\$139,437.50	0.63	\$23,816.50	0.11	\$163,254.00	0.74	\$170,352.00
Edwards	\$33,867.50	0.98	\$1,311.00	0.04	\$35,178.50	1.02	\$36,708.00
Elk	\$23,356.50	1.21	\$69.00	0.00	\$23,425.50	1.21	\$24,444.00
Ellis	\$79,603.00	0.65	\$1,978.00	0.02	\$81,581.00	0.67	\$85,128.00
Ellsworth	\$55,717.50	1.09	\$667.00	0.01	\$56,384.50	1.10	\$58,836.00
Finney	\$4,163.00	0.02	\$0.00	0.00	\$4,163.00	0.02	\$4,344.00
Ford	\$2,392.00	0.02	\$0.00	0.00	\$2,392.00	0.02	\$2,496.00
Franklin	\$89,562.00	1.42	\$5,301.50	0.08	\$94,863.50	1.50	\$98,988.00
Geary	\$47,518.00	0.71	\$3,335.00	0.05	\$50,853.00	0.76	\$53,064.00
Gove	\$35,167.00	0.99	\$552.00	0.02	\$35,719.00	1.01	\$37,272.00
Graham	\$28,186.50	0.75	\$552.00	0.01	\$28,738.50	0.76	\$29,988.00
Grant	\$53,555.50	0.31	\$1,437.50	0.01	\$54,993.00	0.32	\$57,384.00
Gray	\$63,411.00	1.48	\$0.00	0.00	\$63,411.00	1.48	\$66,168.00
Greeley	\$12,753.50	0.42	\$1,955.00	0.06	\$14,708.50	0.48	\$15,348.00
Greenwood	\$46,000.00	1.07	\$0.00	0.00	\$46,000.00	1.07	\$48,000.00
Hamilton	\$21,091.00	0.58	\$759.00	0.02	\$21,850.00	0.60	\$22,800.00
Harper	\$63,491.50	1.13	\$1,863.00	0.03	\$65,354.50	1.16	\$68,196.00
Harvey	\$132,369.60	1.23	\$2,116.00	0.02	\$134,485.60	1.25	\$140,332.80
Haskell	\$32,706.00	0.34	\$0.00	0.00	\$32,706.00	0.34	\$34,128.00
Hodgeman	\$34,155.00	1.17	\$0.00	0.00	\$34,155.00	1.17	\$35,640.00
Jackson	\$49,588.00	1.55	\$35,374.00	1.10	\$84,962.00	2.65	\$88,656.00
Jefferson	\$66,562.00	1.45	\$40,192.50	0.88	\$106,754.50	2.33	\$111,396.00
Jewell	\$34,500.00	1.32	\$69.00	0.00	\$34,569.00	1.32	\$36,072.00
Johnson	\$40,112.00	0.03	\$0.00	0.00	\$40,112.00	0.03	\$41,856.00
Kearny	\$40,733.00	0.22	\$322.00	0.00	\$41,055.00	0.22	\$42,840.00
Kingman	\$62,456.50	0.83	\$2,231.00	0.03	\$64,687.50	0.86	\$67,500.00
Kiowa	\$27,025.00	0.54	\$276.00	0.01	\$27,301.00	0.55	\$28,488.00
Labette	\$15,111.00	0.21	\$0.00	0.00	\$15,111.00	0.21	\$15,768.00
Lane	\$25,001.00	0.84	\$1,771.00	0.06	\$26,772.00	0.90	\$27,936.00
Leavenworth	\$329,479.60	2.66	\$10,890.50	0.09	\$340,370.10	2.75	\$355,168.80
Lincoln	\$18,089.50	0.67	\$0.00	0.00	\$18,089.50	0.67	\$18,876.00
Linn	\$76,291.00	0.67	\$92.00	0.00	\$76,383.00	0.67	\$79,704.00
Logan	\$24,725.00	0.95	\$0.00	0.00	\$24,725.00	0.95	\$25,800.00
Lyon	\$28,336.00	0.24	\$3,565.00	0.03	\$31,901.00	0.27	\$33,288.00
Marion	\$41,446.00	0.76	\$276.00	0.01	\$41,722.00	0.77	\$43,536.00
Marshall	\$63,618.00	1.27	\$4,462.00	0.09	\$68,080.00	1.36	\$71,040.00
Mc Pherson	\$114,006.40	0.78	\$2,909.50	0.02	\$116,915.90	0.80	\$121,999.20
Meade	\$32,407.00	0.39	\$851.00	0.01	\$33,258.00	0.40	\$34,704.00
Miami	\$156,664.50	2.10	\$7,877.50	0.11	\$164,542.00	2.21	\$171,696.00
Mitchell	\$39,721.00	1.11	\$2,323.00	0.06	\$42,044.00	1.17	\$43,872.00
Montgomery	\$32,752.00	0.27	\$0.00	0.00	\$32,752.00	0.27	\$34,176.00
Morris	\$8,510.00	0.26	\$1,403.00	0.04	\$9,913.00	0.30	\$10,344.00
Morton	\$20,056.00	0.19	\$736.00	0.01	\$20,792.00	0.20	\$21,696.00
Nemaha	\$61,927.50	1.34	\$11,235.50	0.24	\$73,163.00	1.58	\$76,344.00
Neosho	\$17,526.00	0.29	\$0.00	0.00	\$17,526.00	0.29	\$18,288.00
Ness	\$27,657.50	0.53	\$276.00	0.01	\$27,933.50	0.54	\$29,148.00
Norton	\$66,907.00	2.53	\$0.00	0.00	\$66,907.00	2.53	\$69,816.00
Osage	\$54,786.00	1.15	\$41,779.50	0.87	\$96,565.50	2.02	\$100,764.00
Osborne	\$26,484.50	0.86	\$0.00	0.00	\$26,484.50	0.86	\$27,636.00
Ottawa	\$35,868.50	0.99	\$2,012.50	0.06	\$37,881.00	1.05	\$39,528.00

* Note: Estimates Based on 87-88 Enrollments & \$24/Student

1987-88
Estimated Dollar Amount of County Out-District Billings

County	--Community Colleges--		--Washburn University--		-- Combined --		Estimated* 1988-89 Billings
	Billings	Millage Equiv.	Billings	Millage Equiv.	Billings	Millage Equiv.	
Pawnee	\$79,660.50	1.71	\$0.00	0.00	\$79,660.50	1.71	\$83,124.00
Phillips	\$51,186.50	1.23	\$0.00	0.00	\$51,186.50	1.23	\$53,412.00
Pottawatomie	\$65,734.00	0.25	\$17,503.00	0.07	\$83,237.00	0.32	\$86,856.00
Pratt	\$2,921.00	0.04	\$0.00	0.00	\$2,921.00	0.04	\$3,048.00
Rawlins	\$26,507.50	0.93	\$1,196.00	0.04	\$27,703.50	0.97	\$28,908.00
Reno	\$5,014.00	0.02	\$0.00	0.00	\$5,014.00	0.02	\$5,232.00
Republic	\$60,087.50	1.67	\$0.00	0.00	\$60,087.50	1.67	\$62,700.00
Rice	\$103,592.00	1.28	\$1,840.00	0.02	\$105,432.00	1.30	\$110,016.00
Riley	\$48,852.00	0.38	\$5,853.50	0.05	\$54,705.50	0.43	\$57,084.00
Rooks	\$36,374.50	0.70	\$0.00	0.00	\$36,374.50	0.70	\$37,956.00
Rush	\$41,986.50	1.16	\$0.00	0.00	\$41,986.50	1.16	\$43,812.00
Russell	\$49,381.00	0.79	\$874.00	0.01	\$50,255.00	0.80	\$52,440.00
Saline	\$111,228.00	0.64	\$9,119.50	0.05	\$120,347.50	0.69	\$125,580.00
Scott	\$33,166.00	0.94	\$0.00	0.00	\$33,166.00	0.94	\$34,608.00
Sedgwick	\$866,283.50	0.58	\$15,904.50	0.01	\$882,188.00	0.59	\$920,544.00
Seward	\$2,599.00	0.02	\$0.00	0.00	\$2,599.00	0.02	\$2,712.00
Shawnee	\$26,443.10	0.05	\$296,240.00	0.55	\$322,683.10	0.60	\$336,712.80
Sheridan	\$37,329.00	1.64	\$23.00	0.00	\$37,352.00	1.64	\$38,976.00
Sherman	\$45,517.00	1.17	\$92.00	0.00	\$45,609.00	1.17	\$47,592.00
Smith	\$28,934.00	1.02	\$3,139.50	0.11	\$32,073.50	1.13	\$33,468.00
Stafford	\$61,812.50	1.29	\$0.00	0.00	\$61,812.50	1.29	\$64,500.00
Stanton	\$20,654.00	0.32	\$0.00	0.00	\$20,654.00	0.32	\$21,552.00
Stevens	\$44,953.50	0.21	\$0.00	0.00	\$44,953.50	0.21	\$46,908.00
Sumner	\$149,247.00	1.71	\$5,968.50	0.07	\$155,215.50	1.78	\$161,964.00
Thomas	\$1,771.00	0.03	\$0.00	0.00	\$1,771.00	0.03	\$1,848.00
Trego	\$18,032.00	0.58	\$1,380.00	0.04	\$19,412.00	0.62	\$20,256.00
Wabaunsee	\$32,706.00	1.05	\$10,557.00	0.34	\$43,263.00	1.39	\$45,144.00
Wallace	\$22,574.50	1.02	\$161.00	0.01	\$22,735.50	1.03	\$23,724.00
Washington	\$42,665.00	0.98	\$2,944.00	0.07	\$45,609.00	1.05	\$47,592.00
Wichita	\$28,589.00	1.02	\$345.00	0.01	\$28,934.00	1.03	\$30,192.00
Wilson	\$103,339.00	2.46	\$2,093.00	0.05	\$105,432.00	2.51	\$110,016.00
Woodson	\$37,007.00	1.58	\$1,449.00	0.06	\$38,456.00	1.64	\$40,128.00
Wyandotte	\$40,940.00	0.10	\$0.00	0.00	\$40,940.00	0.10	\$42,720.00
Totals:	\$5,876,486.20		\$619,079.50		\$6,495,565.70		\$6,777,981.60

* Note: Estimates Based on 87-88 Enrollments & \$24/Student

STATE PROCEDURES

TABLE 2.2
PERCENT OF 1985-86 OPERATING FUNDS BY SOURCE

State	State %	Local %	Student Fees %	Federal %	Other %	Total Funds
Alabama	64.0	1.0	12.0	16.0	7.0	204,000,000
Alaska*	74.9	2.13	11.1	3.0	6.4	-
Arizona						
Arkansas	77.0	0	19.0	1.0	3.0	25,561,307
California	61.63	29.28	4.27	0	4.82	1,701,153,544
Colorado	58.9	0	25.6	0	15.5	78,035,313
Connecticut	68.85	0	24.45	6.7	0	59,971,572
Delaware	78.0	0	13.0	9.0	0	32,000,000
Florida	74.68	0.04	22.03	0.27	2.98	481,937,469
Georgia	78.0	0	21.0	0	1.0	68,634,872
Hawaii						
Idaho	38.7	31.8	14.3	4.3	10.8	15,018,800
Illinois	37.0	34.8	23.2	0.5	4.5	513,487,504
Indiana	64.0	0	36.0	0	0	77,610,000
Iowa	49.07	10.96	30.72	5.31	3.94	137,610,836
Kansas	25.2	59.4	9.8	2.3	3.3	105,710,633
Kentucky	74.8	0.2	24.8	0.1	0.1	42,420,293
Louisiana	69.24	0	30.14	0.24	0	16,729,582
Maine						
Maryland	40.0	32.0	27.0	0	2.0	196,886,793
Massachusetts						
Michigan	40.6	25.3	29.1	1.5	3.5	413,346,318
Minnesota	64.0	0	36.0	0	0	89,668,328
Mississippi	45.8	16.7	17.0	6.4	14.1	125,619,077
Missouri	39.8	28.7	20.5	2.6	8.4	119,148,025
Montana	42.5	38.8	7.2	7.4	4.0	-
Nebraska	36.8	42.5	15.9	1.7	3.1	60,992,309
Nevada	81.2	0	17.3	0	16.6	21,452,317
New Hampshire						
New Jersey	34.0	30.0	28.0	0	8.0	-
New Mexico	77.7	5.9	10.7	.9	4.8	-
New York SUNY	33.8	31.6	28.2	1.5	4.9	32,814,132
North Carolina	78.6	12.3	5.7	3.2	0.2	304,901,343
North Dakota						
Ohio	48.89	21.56	25.8	0.13	3.62	141,797,410
Oklahoma*	79.1	0	12.4	0	7.9	-

(continued)

FINANCING COMMUNITY COLLEGES

TABLE 2.2—Continued

State	State %	Local %	Student Fees %	Federal %	Other %	Total Funds
Oregon	34.7	48.3	17.0	0	0	165,124,828
Pennsylvania	37.4	27.2	35.0	0.4	0	207,449,869
Rhode Island	74.0	0	23.0	0	1.0	29,256,456
South Carolina	67.74	8.22	14.55	0.75	2.49	133,657,528
South Dakota			No community colleges			
Tennessee	77.3	0	16.9	0	1.3	73,079,700
Texas	61.33	17.0	11.58	4.41	5.68	757,502,517
Utah	58.0	0	18.0	5.0	19.0	67,552,507
Vermont						
Virginia**	69.7	0	21.9	5.7	2.7	213,034,141
Washington	84.6	0	15.4	0	0	244,990,332
West Virginia	70.0	0	19.0	6.0	5.0	14,559,000
Wisconsin	26.0	53.0	16.0	5.0	0	304,932,500
Wyoming	64.0	30.0	6.0	0	0	53,810,091

* 1984-85 reported data

** 1986-87 reported data

NOTE: These are as reported by state officials and a few do not total 100%.



"Service to County Government"

212 S. W. 7th Street
Topeka, Kansas 66603
(913) 233-2271
FAX (913) 233-4830

EXECUTIVE BOARD

President
Winifred Kingman
Shawnee County Commissioner
200 S.E. 7th St. - Room 205
Topeka, KS 66603
(913) 291-4040
(913) 272-8948

Vice-President
Gary Hayzlett
Kearny County Commissioner
P.O. Box 66
Lakin, KS 67860
(316) 355-7060

Past President
John Delmont
Cherokee County Commissioner
(316) 848-3717

Mark Hixon
Barton County Appraiser
(316) 792-4226

Marjory Scheufler
Edwards County Commissioner
(316) 995-3973

DIRECTORS

Leonard "Bud" Archer
Phillips County Commissioner
(913) 689-4685

Keith Devenney
Geary County Commissioner
(913) 238-7894

Berneice "Bonnie" Gilmore
Wichita County Clerk
(316) 375-2731

Harry "Skip" Jones III
Smith County Treasurer
(913) 282-6838

Thomas "Tom" Pickford, P.E.
Shawnee County Engineer
(913) 291-4132

Dixie Rose
Butler County Register of Deeds
(316) 321-5750

NACo Representative
Joe McClure
Wabaunsee County Commissioner
(913) 499-5284

Executive Director
John T. Torbert

TESTIMONY

March 2, 1989

TO: Senator Gus Bogina, Chairman
Members Senate Ways and Means Committee

FROM: Bev Bradley, Legislative Coordinator
Kansas Association of Counties

RE: SB 210 Out district tuition

Thank you Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. I will speak only to New Section 36, page 45, of SB 210. This is the portion of the bill which deals with out district tuition. The Kansas Association of Counties has a convention adopted position which states, "The Kansas Association of Counties would be supportive of efforts to eliminate out district tuition and transfer that financial responsibility to State financing."

We believe New Section 36 phases out the out district tuition currently paid by counties and transfers that responsibility to the state. We understand the importance of community colleges to the students of Kansas and to the economy of the counties in which they are located. We have, however, over the years that I have been involved, encountered many problems. Most particularly the problems have been with budgeting. For some reason the numbers submitted supposedly in May according to part 2 (d) of new section 36, many times arrived very late, often after the county budget was formally adopted. Also, the numbers seemed to be very loose approximate numbers. In one county last year the estimates were \$40,000. low. The commissioners who are currently charged with levying the taxes to support out district tuition have absolutely no control over the funds. For all of the above reasons we feel out district state aid is a far better way of funding community colleges.

We have been told that community colleges get 5% of their funding and 95% of their problems from counties. We will be very glad to relieve them of both. The Kansas Association of Counties supports the portion of the bill dealing with out district tuition and we have no position on the remainder of SB 210.

ATTACHMENT 5
SWAM 3-3-89