

Approved March 26, 1991  
Date

MINUTES OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

The meeting was called to order by Representative Rick Bowden at  
Chairperson

3:30 a.m. on March 5, 1991 in room 519-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except:

Rep. Larkin - Excused

Committee staff present:

Avis Swartzman, Revisor of Statutes Office  
Ben Barrett, Legislative Research  
Dale Dennis, State Department of Education  
Donna Luttjohann, Secretary to the Committee

Conferees appearing before the committee:

Representative Edlund	Robert Shuler
Susie Stanzill	Mark Tallman, KASB
Ralph Bartley	Robin Nichols, Wichita
Larry Waymire	Harold Beedles, Rose Hill
Jeff Balek	
Glen Yancey	
Georgia Layton, Rehabilitation Center	
Brilla Scott, USA	
Robert Tabor	
James Canaday, KU Grad Student	
Bonnie Byington, KS Assoc. of the Blind	
David Bateman, Council for Exceptional Children	

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Bowden and hearings on HB 2208 were opened.

The Chairman introduced Rep. Edlund, author of the bill. Rep. Edlund urged the committee to pass the bill favorably and then introduced the first conferee, Susie Stanzill of the National Federation of the Blind, proponent of the bill (Attachment 1).

The next conferee, proponent, was Ralph Bartley, Superintendent of the Kansas State School for the Visually Handicapped. He said that competency should be standardized for the teachers of the blind in the state. He said competency should be standard with the National Library Services of the Blind. He said this bill would allow the State Department of Education to develop consistent standards. (Attachment 2).

Larry Waymire was the next proponent to speak on HB 2208. He explained several benefits the bill would have if passed. (Attachment 3).

Proponent, Jeff Balik was the next speaker. He is 13 years old and a blind student attending Berryton School. He said the human hands had to be a creation of God because of their so many uses. (Attachment 4)

The next proponent was Glen Yancey, Acting Commissioner of Rehabilitation Services with SRS. He also urged the committee to favorably pass this out of committee. (Attachment 5)

Georgia Layton, Instructor for the blind at the Rehabilitation Center, was the next conferee. She was a proponent of the bill highlighting that the braille skill is needed. She stated that braille enhances the other skills the blind learn and the slate stylis functions as the blind's pencil and paper, is very small and quiet. She can use it anywhere she goes and it is very helpful. She said that teaching braille would add to the independence and confidence of the blind students at the Rehabilitation Center.

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

room 519-S, Statehouse, at 3:30 ~~am~~ XX/p.m. on March 5, 191

Proponent, Brilla Scott, USA urged the committee to pass the bill favorably. (Attachment 6)

Mr. Robert Tabor was the next proponent, but waived speaking to the committee as he felt the points raised in his testimony had been clearly made by the other proponents. (Attachment 7)

Mr. Canaday requested to speak to the committee, also a proponent of the bill. He said Jeff Balek, previous conferee, should be envied because he was taught braille even before he went to school and praised his parents. He said that blind children should not be able to go without learning braille just as children with sight should not be able to go without learning to read print. Mr. Canaday's master's theses was on this subject and went over the results of his research and that braille is even more needed in the computer and technology fields.

Bonnie Byington, Kansas Association of the Blind was the next speaker. She also explained the need of teaching and writing braille and urged the committee to pass the bill favorably.

The last conferee, also proponent was David Bateman from the Council for Exceptional Children. He has been a teacher of braille and stressed the importance of learning braille. He said he at one point, would have been fired from his job if he had not been able to read and write in braille. He urged the committee to pass the bill favorably.

Testimony received by the committee was from Madeleine Burkindine, (Attachment 9) and Cindy Lou Hallenbeck, (Attachment 9) whom did not appear before the committee.

Chairman Bowden asked of the cost and Tom Balek, father of Jeff Balek, stated that the cost will decrease because the use of computer technology. He felt it would not be an added monetary burden.

The Chairman then closed the hearings on HB 2208 and opened hearings on HB 2428.

The first to testify before the committee was Superintendent Howard Shuler from Auburn-Washburn School District #437, proponent of HB 2428. He said rapid growth and the reappraisal/classification increased their district's assessed valuation. Student population increased and for the first time, the two are now more closely related. (Attachment 10)

Mark Tallman, KASB, also a proponent of HB 2428 stated that if the freeze on capital outlay continues, it will lock school districts into arbitrary limits on funds they can raise to meet certain requirements and needs. (Attachment 11)

The next conferee, also proponent and co-author of the bill, Robin Nichols from the Wichita Public Schools spoke. Ms. Nichols stated that the lid that is now in place has not allowed districts to adjust to natural growth. (Attachment 12)

The last conferee, Harold Beedles from Rose Hill Schools and proponent of HB 2428 talked of the increase in enrollment and how this bill has affected their district. (Attachment 13)

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

room 519-S, Statehouse, at 3:30 ~~am~~ XXX/p.m. on March 5, 1991.

Chairman Bowden closed hearings on HB 2428 and opened discussion on HB 2162. This bill changes the process of notifying parents of truant students. The motion was made by Rep. Amos to change line 40 the word semester to school year. Rep. Smith seconded the motion. A substitute motion was made by Rep. Hackler made the motion to amend the word five to ten days of the school year. The motion was seconded by Rep. Amos. This amendment would leave the three consecutive days as is and in line 39 it would strike the five and replace it with 10. It also includes Rep. Amos's motion to change the word semester to school year. The motion to amend did not carry. Rep. Crumbaker made the motion to pass the bill in its original form favorably out of committee. It was seconded by Rep. Blumenthal. Motion carried.

The Chairman then called attention to HB 2352 which was passed over because of Rep. Heinemann's absence.

Attention then was placed on HB 2163 and opened for discussion. Rep. Blumenthal made the motion to pass the bill favorably out of committee. It was seconded by Rep. Pottorff. Chairman Bowden asked Vice-Chairman Reardon to Chair the meeting in order to present an amendment to the bill. The amendment by Chairman Bowden would require the local school boards to put a ban on corporal punishment. The motion to amend passed. A motion by Rep. Hensley to to pass the bill favorably out of committee as amended was made. It was seconded by Rep. Pottorff. The motion carried with 13 in favor. Those wishing to be recorded as voting no are Rep. Smith, Rep. Ramirez, Rep. Jennison and Rep. Reinhardt.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:13 p.m. with the next meeting scheduled for March 6th, 1991 in Rm. 519-S at 3:30 p.m.

DATE March 5, 91

GUEST REGISTER

HOUSE

EDUCATION COMMITTEE

NAME	ORGANIZATION	ADDRESS
Ralph Raitly	KSSWH	1100 State Ave KC165
Paul Clark	NFB	
<del>Ramona Raitly</del>		
Georgia Layton	SRS - DSB	Topeka
Glen Yancy	SRS - KRS	Topeka
Dr. W. Wade	SRS - U.S.	Topeka
Jim Youally	USD # 512	Overland Park
Don Pickering	KSSWH	KCK
Jim McHenry	KCAPC	Topeka
Mark Callman	KASB	Topeka
CHUCK STUART	USA	TOPEKA
Beilla Highfill Scott	USA	Topeka
Nicole Danielle Andrist	Student KSU	Manhattan KS
Gemie Thurell	St Bd of Ed	Topeka
Denise Grant	U.S.D. # 500	Topeka
Kriste Wardell	ASL	Topeka
<del>Jackson Alexander</del>	NFB & SCOBV	Topeka
Janet Shuler	USD 437 + USA	Topeka
DON LINDSEY Jr	UTU	OSAWATOMIE
Linda Balch	NFB	Berwyn
Jo & S Balch	Braille student	✓
TOM BALEK	NFB	✓
Jim Nymen	NFB	Topeka
Craig Grant	H-NEA	Topeka
KAD CUES	KNEA	Topeka





National Federation of the Blind of Kansas, Inc.

Susan L. "Susie" Stanzel, President

11905 Mohawk Lane  
Leawood, Kansas 66209-1038  
Telephone: 913/339-9341

A publicly supported organization as described in section 501(c)(3) of the IRS code.

HOUSE BILL NO. 2208

TESTIMONY DELIVERED TO THE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

March 5 1991 by Susan L. Stanzel President

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND OF KANSAS

My name is Susie Stanzel and I am the president of the National Federation of the Blind of Kansas. I have the honor of succeeding now Representative Richard J. "Dick" Edlund. Before his election to the Kansas State House of Representatives, Representative Edlund devoted much of the past twenty-two years championing for improvements in the lives of blind persons. By introducing House Bill #2208, Representative Edlund has continued his championship for blind persons.

We in the National Federation of the Blind of Kansas are changing what it means to be blind. We urge passage of House Bill #2208. By doing so, you as Legislators will be changing the lives of Kansas blind children. By passage you will be providing the foundation for literacy and opportunities for better education.

When we seek employment as blind persons we must be (or seem) more capable than our sighted peers. The unemployment rate of blind persons is 70%. Of the 30% who do work, 70% are under employed. The State of Illinois Blind Agency commissioned a study (published by The American Foundation for the Blind) to determine what commonalities exist among employed blind persons. The study revealed a correlation between blind people who are both good Braille users and good travelers and employment.

I have been blind all my life. I am fortunate to receive my Braille training at the Kansas State School for the Blind. This began in the first grade and continued during the nine years of my education there. After leaving the blind school at the beginning of my sophomore year things were much different. I had to begin learning to depend on readers and taped material. The good thing was that all my math books were in Braille. It would have been extremely hard to take Algebra using a reader and almost impossible with a tape. I was the first of many blind students to graduate from the Shawnee Mission School System.

After my graduation from high school, I went to Emporia State where I majored in Business with an emphasis in computers. Back in the dark ages, the 60's, there was not a specific degree in computer science. Even though I used tapes and readers for some of my classes, I still relied totally on Braille for my computer classes. Braille was the only way for me to understand the precise way I had to enter information into the computer.

HOUSE EDUCATION  
Attachment 1  
March 5, 1991

I have been a Computer Programmer Analyst for the past twenty years. Seventeen have been spent with the United States Department of Agriculture. I write all my instructions in Braille. As with the process of learning programming, I must have the ability to read the material myself. It is easier for me to find specific items and make recommendations when I read the material.

In closing, I strongly support this House Bill #2208. Blind job seekers need to be better equipped than the average sighted job seeker to even stand a chance. Even though sighted people go to book stores and get tapes to read while driving down the road, they do not want to replace printed material with tapes. The same is true of myself. Because I can read some material on tape, I would never give up the use of Braille.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Rick Bowden, Chairperson, House

Education Committee

Bill Reardon, Vice-Chairperson; Gary

Blumenthal;

Ruth Ann Hackler; Jesse Harder; Anthony

Hensley;

Sherman Jones; Richard Lahti; Bruce

Larkin;

Richard Reinhardt; Allan White; Stephan

Wiard;

Don E. Crumbaker; Ranking Minority

Member; Eugene Amos;

Lisa Benion; Cindy Empson; Dorothy

Flottman;

Robin Jemison; Al Lane; Jo Ann

Pottorff; Sandy Praeger;

Al Ramirez; Marvin Smith

FROM: Ralph E. Bartley, Superintendent

Kansas State School for the Visually



Handicapped

Re: HB 2208

DATE: March 5, 1991

My name is Ralph E. Bartley, and my  
address is 1100 State Avenue, Kansas

City, Kansas. I am a proponent of HB  
2208.

This bill establishes two important policies  
that will benefit Kansas students.

First, the decision to teach braille to students will be  
consistent across Kansas, and secondly, the standards  
that Kansas requires of teacher preparation  
programs will be consistent.

This bill is extremely important to Kansas  
students because it will have a direct impact on their  
literacy and on their employment. Students who  
need braille are definitely "at risk," if they are  
not instructed at the appropriate time. Teachers of  
braille, similar to teachers of English or foreign  
languages, must learn the skills to read, write,

and teach the braille code. Standards which are to be adopted by the Kansas State Department of Education would be consistent with the national library services for the blind.

This legislation can be implemented by Kansas schools, and in my opinion, many are already subscribing to these standards.

Thank you for the opportunity to present this testimony.

REB: gl

TESTIMONY

To: Chairperson , RICK BOWDEN, and Fellow Committee Members

HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Date: March 5, 1991

Regarding: House Bill #2208

From: Larry E. Waymire  
A Blind Native Kansan  
2nd Vice President, National Federation of the Blind of Kansas  
Vice President, N.F.B. of Kansas, Capitol Chapter  
Secretary, State Committee of Blind Vendors

I come before you today, on behalf of myself and the above organizations, to ask for and urge your support of HB 2208. It appears to me, the purpose of this bill is to enable any and all blind students who desire braille instruction to receive this vital communication skill. By achieving this purpose many benefits would be realized, not only for blind persons, but for society as a whole. Just a few of the benefits are as follows:

1. Blind students would not be reduced to becoming a part of the demoralized and degraded portion of society, and the educational system, referred to as "illiterate".

2. By not becoming a member of the illiterate portion of society, blind students/individuals could and would become a more positive and productive force within society.

3. By learning braille skills, blind students would be able to achieve their highest potential more effectively and efficiently. Not only within the educational system, but throughout the rest of their lives.

4. Blind students with braille skills would be better prepared to compete with their sighted peers.

5. Braille skills would greatly reduce stress, anxiety and frustration that a blind student feels when placed in a disadvantageous situation.

6. By providing braille skills to students at an early age, it is very conceivable that this would lessen the need for Voc. Rehab. Services for the individuals whose eyesight worsens with age. This in turn would create benefits:

A. Blind individuals could reduce their time and expense to learn braille skills at a later age.

B. The Voc. Rehab. System could lessen the already stressed caseload being handled, and the number of requests for this particular service.

HOUSE EDUCATION  
Attachment 3  
March 5, 1991

C. Kansas Tax Dollars used to teach braille skills later in life, along with time and energy, could be channeled into other badly needed educational programs.

7. Modern technology now makes the task of educating blind students easier and less costly than it once was. With the use of braille printers and other computer adaptations, sighted teachers can generate braille, and blind students can generate print.

It is my belief that in order to more rapidly maximize the benefits of this bill, upon its passage, two very basic philosophies that educators, Voc. Rehab. personnel and parents of blind children/students need to accept are:

1. That even with the use of all the sight utilization equipment and gadgets available, there will never be any guarantee that further vision loss will not occur.

2. That even though a visually impaired student can function adequately at a given point in time, prevention against illiteracy is the best medicine. Emotional stability, social acceptance and contributions to society will all benefit from learning braille skills. Coupled with the fact that totally blind children are born every day, this bill becomes even more imperative to be favorably passed.

In closing let me say, "let us, the blind, be who we are; blind people." Please, with the help of HB 2208, give us the chance to demonstrate that we are just as good as (and in some cases, better) than our sighted peers, when provided with this necessary tool for success. Ask us not to be sighted, but give us the chance to become the best that we can be.

Thank you for your time and consideration to our plight. (Please refer to article attached) As an education committee, I respectfully submit that you recognize the merits of HB 2208 and will realize that a favorable committee recommendation to the House Floor is the only realistic choice that can be made.

# Illiteracy on the rise among vision-impaired students

The Associated Press

DENVER — There is a crisis of illiteracy among blind students because many of them aren't learning Braille in public schools, the head of a national parents group says.

Nearly half of all vision-impaired students — 48 percent — read Braille in 1965. By 1989, the number had dropped to 12 percent, according to the American Printing House for the Blind.

"Illiteracy among blind children is a real crisis," said Barbara Cheadle, president of Parents of Blind Children at the National Federation of the Blind in Baltimore. "I don't think it's adequate education if you let a student get through college without the ability to read a sentence that

they have written themselves."

Cheadle traces the genesis of the decline to the 1950s, when parents began enrolling blind children in local public schools rather than specialized residential schools.

"Some parents think their children don't need it, but they would if they knew blind professionals and saw them struggling to learn it at midlife," Cheadle said.

Diane McGeorge, executive director of the Colorado Center for the Blind, said, "With the advent of the tape recorder, the educational system said, 'Kids don't need to know Braille because everything is on tape.' We now have bright kids who can't take notes in the classroom."

McGeorge, the federation's Colorado president,

said Colorado schools routinely teach Braille.

"But if children have even a minimal amount of sight, they make them use closed-circuit television, which enlarges print for kids. These kids aren't taught Braille," she said.

In the state's largest school district, Jefferson County, 11 of 72 blind or vision-impaired students receive Braille instruction. About half of the 27 blind students in Denver schools take Braille.

"If a child is totally blind, the need for Braille is definitely obvious," said Sara Officer, a Jefferson County teacher for the vision-impaired. "If they have a visual impairment, it would depend on what their future is predicted to be, what their interest is in Braille and whether the need is seen educationally for the near future."

ATTACHMENTS

4-1 THROUGH

4-3 ARE IN

BRAILLE. DID

NOT SCAN.

## HANDS

FOR JUST A MINUTE  
LOOK AT YOUR HAND.  
HAVE YOU EVER THOUGHT  
OF HOW MANY THINGS  
YOUR HAND CAN DO?

YOUR HAND IS ONE OF  
THE BEST TOOLS IN THE WORLD.  
IT CAN DIG.  
IT CAN HOLD.  
IT CAN SEW.  
IT CAN TWIST.  
IT CAN PICK UP.

YOU CAN USE YOUR HAND  
TO PRETEND.  
PRETEND YOUR HAND IS  
A SHOVEL,  
A CUP,  
A TELESCOPE,  
A HORN,  
A TWEEZER,  
A HAMMER,  
A FORK.

MAYBE YOU CAN THINK  
OF ANOTHER WAY  
HANDS ARE USED.  
THE HUMAN HAND MUST BE  
ONE OF GOD'S GREATEST CREATIONS.  
IT HAS SMALL BONES  
AND CRAFTY FINGERS.  
A HAND IS SO WELL MADE  
IT CAN REMOVE A TINY SPLINTER  
FROM ANOTHER FINGER.

A HAND IS A GIFT  
THAT YOU CAN USE  
TO HELP OTHERS.

HAVE YOU EVER USED YOUR HAND  
TO PAT A CRYING BABY?  
HAVE YOU EVER USED YOUR HAND  
TO HELP WASH A CAR?  
HAVE YOU EVER USED YOUR HAND  
TO PICK UP CLOTHES FROM THE FLOOR?  
HAVE YOU EVER USED YOUR HAND  
TO HELP A CHILD GET UP  
WHO HAS FALLEN DOWN?

SOMETIMES WE SAY  
WE DON'T HAVE ANYTHING  
TO GIVE SOMEONE ELSE.  
BUT WE DO.  
WE HAVE A HAND.  
WE CAN USE IT AS A GIFT.  
WE REACH IT OUT  
AND HELP SOMEONE ELSE.

YOUR HAND IS ONE  
OF THE SPECIAL THINGS  
YOU HAVE.

State Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services

Testimony in Support of House Bill No. 2208

Mr. Chairperson and Members of the Committee:

SRS supports House Bill 2208 which provides that any student who is blind or eligible for special education services for visually impaired may receive instruction in Braille reading and writing as part of the student's individualized education plan. Braille continues to be an important communication skill for blind persons to use in many ways related to employment and independent living. Yet, the teaching of Braille has diminished due to development of alternative means of communication and lack of specialized teaching personnel. This proposal moves to restore deserved prominence and importance to skill in using Braille. Any action which will facilitate preparation of blind persons for employment and independent living is welcomed by vocational rehabilitation personnel. House Bill 2208 will have that net effect, and I urge you to pass it.

Glen Yancey  
Acting Commissioner  
Rehabilitation Services  
Social and Rehabilitation Services  
296-3911  
March 5, 1991

HOUSE EDUCATION  
Attachment 5  
March 5, 1991





## **HB 2208**

### **BRAILLE READING AND WRITING INSTRUCTION**

**Testimony presented before the House Education Committee**

**by**

**Brilla Highfill Scott, Associate Executive Director  
United School Administrators of Kansas**

**March 5, 1991**

**Mister Chairman and Members of the House Education Committee:**

United School Administrators supports HB 2208 which provides braille instruction in reading and writing to blind students. Our association encourages your committee to promote this bill which assures this essential training for the visually disabled child.

United School Administrators of Kansas appreciates your attention to this testimony.

(t:hb2208)

HOUSE EDUCATION  
Attachment 6  
March 5, 1991

TESTIMONY OF ROBERT L. TABOR  
BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON  
EDUCATION  
The Honorable Rick Bowden, Chairman  
4 March, 1991  
Concerning: House bill 2208

Good afternoon Mr. Chairman and members of the committee:

My name is Robert Tabor, and I live at 1234 Tennessee, Lawrence, Kansas. I appreciate this opportunity to testify as a member of the National Federation of the Blind of Kansas, in favor of HB 2208.

As a general principle, most of us have heard or have said that "reading is fundamental" or that "we must be literate in order to perform successfully in modern society." We often catch ourselves saying this glibly, as if this were our own original thoughts; and when we hear these things, few if any of us question its validity or accuracy. In other words, this paraneitic advice has evolved into a truism. Yet, when education of the blind is at stake, some, including some members of the education community some how find ways to take exception to the premise that braille literacy education is not always necessary for the blind. Yet, for many with some residual eye sight, braille is the only practical means of literacy; and yet hundreds of legally blind children and youth are denied opportunities to learn braille. Instead, they are forced to use large print with a magnifying glass, or, sometimes, with more elaborate electronic visual aids, such as a VTEK, greatly resembling a TV screen. But even these sophisticated devices require the proper lighting, some level of training, and a great deal of financial resources.

Pre-recorded tapes and talking computers are also utilized quite heavily, and I personally appreciate them, but they will never replace braille literacy skills. For without braille, how can one be sure of the correctness of spellings of names of cities, countries; and proper names, such as the names of the membership of this legislative committee?

I am enabled to write and to spell your names correctly and with confidence; first, because a braille roster has been provided, and, more importantly, because I learned to use braille at an early age. I was taught braille due to my total blindness, but most of my partially sighted peers were not taught braille because of their remaining vision. Though it has been many years since I attended a residential school for the blind, I still recall how some of my class mates had to hunch over books just to peek out a story, poem, or math problem, character by character, or to see what they were writing. In most cases, some training in braille literacy would have eliminated much of this type of mental and physical stress, and would have benefited them in their adult lives. Section 2 (L28) underscores precisely where the source of difficulty has been in teaching and learning braille to blind students. As a rule, parents and educators have little if any

HOUSE EDUCATION  
Attachment 7  
March 5, 1991

problem recognizing a totally blind student's need for braille. There may be any number of reasons for the resistance to teaching braille to legally blind students who have some remaining vision. Perhaps some educators feel that teaching braille to a child or teenager may remind him/her of the eventual loss of eye sight. School districts are often hesitant to commit resources to provide braille instruction in schools wherein some legally blind, but no totally blind students are enrolled. In any event, there is no credence to the theory that even the most inefficient use of printed media is better than braille for a student. Braille reading may be slow at first, but so it is with any newly acquired skill. Likewise, most books, periodicals, and other literature are not available in braille, although production of braille is made much easier with computerized braille embossment printers and translator software. But history has shown that braille books will become available to the extent driven by consumer demand. But without systematic braille education, the braille-reading blind population will continue to dwindle. Let me conclude by thanking the committee for considering this important policy decision, and to encourage you to show leadership in the improvement of educational opportunities for our young blind Kansans by reporting favorably on House Bill 2208.

Robert L. Tabor  
1234 Tennessee,  
Lawrence, Ks 66044

**BRAILLE: THE OPENING OF DOORS  
TO REAL LITERACY FOR THE BLIND**  
Submitted By: Cindy Lou Hallenbeck  
In Support of House Bill 2208

I am a blind individual, totally blind since birth, so my learning of braille was never an issue. I attended the Kansas State School for the Blind, now the Kansas State School for the Visually Handicapped. The reading alternatives to braille--recordings, computers and scanners--were either not available to the blind or were in a limited supply then. Most blind children attended state schools for the blind, or they attended private schools for the blind. For those students who had no vision braille materials were provided, though often the texts were old and worn. In high school our literature materials were not available in braille, so our English teacher produced them herself with a braille writer in order that we would be able to read them. It was exciting to learn to read and to have library books, school texts, and music at my finger tips, and I became a proud and proficient braille reader with the ability to read at speeds comparable to sighted students of my age and intelligence, and much better than many students who were struggling to read print.

At the school as we were growing up it became apparent that those students who had enough vision to see print at all were superior to those of us who "had to read braille." They were given very large, cumbersome, books which were produced in very large print, and some of them even read some books produced in smaller print. These students were known as "sight savers," and it was viewed as some sort of tragedy if a student's vision deteriorated to the extent that he/she was required to begin braille instruction. Even at schools for the blind the attitude existed that braille should only be taught if all else failed.

The public as a whole views braille as a medium that is only used when all else fails. The general public believes that no real speed can be achieved in braille, and that it is bulky and cumbersome. If this is the case, they rationalize, it is much too expensive to produce. With today's available technology, braille is no longer necessary, they say. I became a lector at my church a couple of years ago, and one standard comment has been, "I had no idea braille could be read that fast," so I know that people believe this. Teachers often indicate that they would prefer not to teach blind students braille unless it is necessary because it is too slow. Often such teachers have acquired little or no proficiency in the reading and writing of braille. However, like any other skill, speed in braille reading can be achieved with disciplined, regular practice.

It is now possible, because of some of the same technology that is believed to deem braille as unnecessary, to get almost any material in braille that one could want, and it can be

obtained in a cost effective manner. Scanners are available to read the printed page and then produce a computer file of the text on that page, braille translation software is available which can translate computer files in to Standard English braille, and a wide range of computer driven braille printers is available.

I have known a number of people who attended school at schools for the blind in the days when I was a student. They were "sight savers" and did not read braille. They now have no vision, or their vision has become so limited that they cannot use print efficiently, nor do they have any facility in braille. What do they do? They cannot keep easy track of check books, name and address lists or other kinds of lists, etc. To make matters worse, they are now so busy making a living, as well as performing other day-to-day tasks, that they find it difficult, if not impossible, to spend the time that would be required of them to learn braille, so they are unable to read. Such people often express regret about this fact, and I feel a great deal of sympathy. I am so pleased that I have had the opportunity to learn braille--to be literate like my sighted friends. I cannot imagine constantly relying on others to read materials I need, or having to search for things on recordings. I love using my computer, but I would grow weary of synthesized speech and am glad that I can also produce braille with it.

I hope you will pass House Bill 2208 and provide such an opportunity to all the blind students in the State of Kansas.

**KANSAS STATE SCHOOL FOR THE VISUALLY HANDICAPPED**

**TEACHER ASSOCIATION  
1100 State Avenue  
Kansas City, Kansas 66102**

To: House Education Committee  
From: Madeleine Burkindine, Member  
Re: HB 2208  
Date: March 5, 1991

My name is Madeleine Burkindine, and I live at 11900 Wenonga Lane, Leawood, Kansas 66209. I represent the Kansas State School for the Visually Handicapped's Teacher Association, and we are a proponent of HB 2208.

It is well documented that skilled teachers are essential to the development and success of students. Therefore, members of our Teacher Association support the standards in HB 2208 relating to braille skills of teachers. We currently have members who are completing the national library service for the blind course through the University of Minnesota teacher preparation program. As you may know, our teachers must now go out of state for training since the Kansas Board of Regents does not train teachers of the blind.

An important aspect of HB 2208 is its recognition of the Individual Education Plan (IEP). The IEP, mandated by Kansas and federal law is indeed the most important part of the historic P.L. 94-142, the Education of All Handicapped Children Act (now referred to as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act - IDEA). However, it falls short, on occasion, in that it relies on the assumption that schools have the desire, access, and money to hire trained teachers of the blind and to purchase the necessary books and equipment.

This bill assures equal access and opportunity for all Kansas children who are blind, and therefore our association proudly supports HB 2208.

MB:gl

HOUSE EDUCATION  
Attachment 9  
March 15, 1991



AUBURN-WASHBURN JSD No. 437

ADMINISTRATION OFFICE

Howard L. Shuler  
*Superintendent*

Dr. Dennis Shoemaker  
*Assistant Superintendent*

Gary Swart  
*Business Manager*

Dr. Garth Renken  
*Administrative Assistant*

Arlene Keltner  
*Administrative Assistant*

Donald Fast  
*Administrative Assistant*

5928 S.W. 53rd Street • Topeka, Kansas 66610 • (913) 862-0419

Hearing on H.B. 2428

March 5, 1991

MR CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

I am Howard Shuler, Superintendent of Schools of Auburn-Washburn Unified School District No. 437. I am representing our district and the United School Administrators of Kansas. I appreciate the opportunity to give testimony in support of H.B. 2428.

I encourage reinstating full authority of 4 mills under K.S.A. 72-8801. I will be using data from our own district to illustrate our support.

Since 1985, when our district last published our Capital Outlay resolution, our assessed valuation has increased 130 percent (\$58,830,520 to \$135,074,873). Eighty percent of the increase is a result of the combined affect of rapid growth and reappraisal/classification. During the same period of time, our student population has increased 40 percent. For the first time our assessed valuation growth and student growth are more closely related.

Since the capital outlay lid was imposed, the affect has been a loss or the inability to access capital outlay dollars from our

HOUSE EDUCATION  
Attachment 10  
March 5, 1991

natural growth. In our opinion, the lid has accomplished its intended goal: to limit excessive dollars from being assessed against inequitably assessed property. Now, two years later, through the appeals process and the re-examination of many parcels of property, we should be operating under a fair and justifiable appraisal system.

The inability to levy the full 4 mills in the 1989-90 school year cost the district \$228,000 in potential revenue. For 1990-91, that figure was \$219,000.

These dollars are desperately needed to provide additional facilities, equipment and maintenance of facilities for our consistently growing student population.

Again, we encourage you to allow a full 4 mill capital outlay levy to be applied to the total assessed valuation of a school district.

Thank you for the opportunity to share our thoughts on this issue.



Howard L. Shuler, Superintendent of Schools



**KANSAS  
ASSOCIATION**



**OF  
SCHOOL  
BOARDS**

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

Joint Testimony on H.B. 2428  
before the  
House Committee on Education

by

Mark Tallman  
Coordinator of Governmental Relations  
Kansas Association of School Boards

On behalf of:

Schools for Quality Education  
Kansas Association of School Boards

March 5, 1991

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, we appreciate the opportunity to speak today in favor of H.B. 2428, which would exempt school district capital outlay tax levies from aggregate limitations.

While the freezing of capital outlay levies may have been necessary during the process of reappraisal, continuing these limitations will lock school districts into arbitrary limits on funds they can raise to meet needed equipment, construction and repair requirements. The current limitations keep districts from receiving additional resources through the natural growth in property valuation.

Capital outlay levies are subject to protest petitions, which we believe provides an appropriate level of responsiveness to tax concerns.

We urge you to recommend this bill favorably for passage.

HOUSE EDUCATION  
Attachment 11  
March 5, 1991



Public Affairs

Testimony On House Bill 2428  
To The House Education Committee  
March 5, 1991  
By Robin Nichols, Wichita Public Schools

Mr. Chairman, Members of The Committee:

My name is Robin Nichols. I represent the Wichita Public Schools. We come before you today to request support for House Bill 2428. It is with pressing concern that we ask you to consider restoring to all districts the ability to use up to 4 mills for capital outlay funding.

Because of anticipated shifts among and between school districts caused by reappraisal, a lid was put into place to stop the clock at 1988 pre-reappraisal dollar amounts. Although we are statutorily allowed up to 4 mills for capital outlay funding, our most recent figures show that the Wichita Public Schools are effectively limited to only 3.081 mills as the rate which produces the same amount 4 mills raised prior to reappraisal.

The lid has disabled districts to the extent that they cannot adjust to natural growth, and yet, districts are required to be accountable for the infrastructure demands such growth has brought. Since the lid was placed in 1988 our enrollment has increased by 1,057 FTE students. While our spending source has been held constant, our costs to maintain safety continue to increase as our plant suffers from aging and wear over time, a process for which the clock never stops. The freeze denies us access to \$1,352,527 for this year alone. Our environmental safety problems cost us nearly that much alone each year.

Our buildings are full of environmental problems which their designers could not have foreseen - problems which are now critical to our students' safety. Safety measures bring new meaning to capital outlay spending. We spend \$1 million per year to abate asbestos; remove, monitor and manage underground fuel storage tanks; and test and correct lead levels in our drinking water. And, we know we face Radon gas testing in the near future, for which initial screening costs will be \$70,000 even prior to remediation.

For the Wichita Public Schools the issue is one of forced choices. We are forced to defer maintenance, which has and will continue to become capital renewal, in the face of growing safety needs. The average age of our 115 buildings is 45 years, which means many of our buildings are 70, 80 and 90 years old. Because of limited capital outlay resources, the repair of roofs, pipes, electrical systems and windows can no longer be

HOUSE  
EDUCATION  
Attachment  
12  
March 5, 91

adequately patched and improved - but must be replaced as the aging process dictates. Capital replacement of entire systems and structures are required. Every effort is made to reduce energy costs in the replacement process. The cost to replace old broken windows with energy efficient ones is \$180,000 per building. Our capital outlay levy is the only source of revenue to address these replacements. We implore you, do not put us in a situation where we must continue to choose safety and defer maintenance to the point of major capital replacements.

The Wichita Public Schools' plant is valued at \$400 million dollars, yet we receive only 1% of that amount per year to maintain it. The restoration of 4 full mills would afford the \$1 million needed to address both safety needs, and to address maintenance issues which we are now forced to defer.

We urge you to support HB 2428. If we continue to put our decaying campuses on hold, we not only risk costs beyond our control, but are held back from taking necessary steps to insure the safety of Kansas youth.



# ROSE HILL PUBLIC SCHOOLS

UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT No. 394

TERRY McGREEVY  
*Superintendent of Schools*

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT  
315 S. ROSE HILL ROAD  
ROSE HILL, KANSAS 67133  
(316) 776-2197

WESLEY S. DREYER  
*Associate Superintendent  
For Administration*

## Capital Outlay Levy Limit House Bill 2428

Thank you for the opportunity to address this committee relative to House Bill 2428. The Rose Hill U.S.D. 394 district supports the provisions of this bill to allow districts to levy 4 mills for capital outlay on the new valuation due to reappraisal. We understand that the 1989 legislation was to prevent governmental units from "wind falling" because of increased assessed valuations brought about by reappraisal. The assessed valuation in the Rose Hill district increased by a significant 36.7%, from \$13,757,895 in 1988 to \$18,805,852 in 1990, in the reappraisal process. The "windfall" or additional levy amount available to the district during the 1990-91 school term would have been \$20,228. Although the additional income of \$20,228 may appear to be insignificant, it would be an additional 5% in the total income for capital outlay in the Rose Hill district. Rose Hill must maximize the use of each and every dollar to meet the expanding capital needs of the district. The district has utilized the capital outlay fund in the past to provide for normal maintenance, major repairs, and has added nine classrooms through new construction as well as purchasing seven modulars for classrooms during the past six years. It is vital to the continued facility growth of the Rose Hill district to levy a maximum of four mills for capital outlay; in addition, the district would also encourage the committee to consider additional relief by looking favorable at power equalizing capital expenditures.

The Rose Hill district, located 15 miles southeast of Wichita, is among the top ten districts statewide in terms of percentage of student enrollment growth. The enrollment has doubled in the last fifteen years to 1423 FTE. The district experienced a growth of over 7% (96 new students) in 1990-91. The city of Rose Hill had the largest number of new housing starts (46) in Butler County in 1990 and there have been 23 new housing starts since January, 1991. Projected enrollment growth indicated that the district will have 2200 students by the year 2000. (See attached enrollment projection charts) This projection is based on a conservative 3-5% growth per year. If the district should continue with the 7% plus growth of this year, the projected student count by the year 2000 would be over 2600. In fact, a professor at the University of Kansas, has projected that the district growth would be closer to 6-7% than the 3-5% projection used by the district. The current high school was built in 1966, with an addition in 1978, for a 300 student capacity. The 1990-91 high school enrollment is 370 students projected to be 498 within four years. The elementary and middle school buildings are over the original intended capacity. Obviously, the district is facing tremendous needs for facilities.

In the face of this fast growth and the limited income for capital outlay, the district has had four bond elections during the past seven years to provide for the growth. Only one of these, a \$398,000 issue to add four very necessary science labs in 1988, have succeeded in gaining patron approval. Why, you may ask, have the patrons of Rose Hill failed to approve these bond issues in light of the enrollment increases in the district. It is a simple matter of tax economics. You, as legislators, have heard many times during the past year concerns by taxpayers statewide about the high rate of property taxes. The 1990 total mill levy in the Rose Hill district is 91.25 mills, 6th in the state. The last bond issue, in November, 1990, for \$5,750,000 on a new high school designed for 600 students, would have added another 26 mills (a 28% increase) to an already staggering tax load for the Rose Hill patrons. The Rose Hill district is a classic example of a high student concentration low tax base school district with a high rate of enrollment increase. Approximately 80% of the district's assessed valuation is residential property. The 1989 assessed valuation of \$14,421 per pupil ranked 297th out of 303 in the state. The 1990 assessed valuation per pupil of \$13,216 is even lower. In addition, the district's taxable income per pupil of \$28,274 is in the bottom 40% of school districts statewide.

HOUSE EDUCATION  
Attachment 13  
March 5, 1991



# ROSE HILL PUBLIC SCHOOLS

UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT No. 394

TERRY McGREEVY  
*Superintendent of Schools*

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT  
315 S. ROSE HILL ROAD  
ROSE HILL, KANSAS 67133  
(316) 776-2197

WESLEY S. DREYER  
*Associate Superintendent  
For Administration*

It is difficult to explain to local patrons why a neighboring district proposes and passes a \$20 million plus bond issue that increase taxes in that district by only 9 mills whereas our proposal (1/3 as much) would have been three (3) times the mill levy increase. It is our understanding that the total dollars budgeted for bond and interest payments for schools statewide in 1990-91 amounts to \$55,000,000. The state's share would be approximately \$22,000,000 (based on state paying 44% of cost of elementary and secondary education). Had power equalizing been in place for the November, 1990, bond election, the chances for passage would have been greatly improved in our district. The Rose Hill district, under power equalization, would have been eligible for 65% state aid on the proposed bond. Instead of asking the patrons for an additional 26 mills, the local effort would have been approximately 9 mills. Therefore, we encourage the committee to look favorably towards power equalizing capital expenditures.

1988 Assessed Valuation	\$13,757,895
1988 Capital Outlay levy in dollars	\$54,995
1988 Capital Outlay levy in mills	3.997
1990 Assessed Valuation	\$18,805,852
1990 Capital Outlay levy in dollars	\$54,995
1990 Capital Outlay levy in mills	2.925
1990 Capital Outlay levy in dollars without limit 4 mills	\$75,223
Additional income	\$20,228
1989 Assessed Valuation Per Pupil	\$14,421
1989 Taxable Income Per Pupil	\$28,274
1990 Assessed Valuation Per Pupil	\$13,216
1990 Taxable Income Per Pupil	\$29,732
1990 Total Mill Levy	91.25
1990 General Fund Levy	80.68
1990 Capital Outlay Fund Levy	2.92
1990 Bond & Interest Fund Levy	5.66
1990 Other Fund Levy (Rec Comm, Sp Assess)	1.99

Capital Outlay Income 1990-91 School Year

Beginning Cash Balance 7-1-90	\$156,439
Property Tax	\$54,995
Interest Income	\$90,000
Motor Vehicle Tax	\$15,005
General Fund Transfer (2%)	\$114,597
Total	\$431,036

Enrollment Projections Sept 20 Enrollment with 3 Yr Avg Proj

Year	K	Gr 1	Gr 2	Gr 3	Gr 4	Gr 5	Gr 6	Gr 7	Gr 8	Gr 9	Gr 10	Gr 11	Gr 12	SpEd	HDCT	FTE	HDCT In	Pct Inc
1974-75	45	43	54	34	47	55	50	55	54	64	54	62	61	12	690	667.5		
1975-76	51	57	47	54	46	45	56	53	53	63	72	52	58	13	720	694.5	30.0	4.35%
1976-77	53	56	61	57	67	53	62	62	56	61	70	68	47	12	785	758.5	65.0	9.03%
1977-78	59	64	64	68	64	67	55	67	53	58	68	63	63	20	833	803.5	48.0	6.11%
1978-79	67	67	73	80	79	77	62	69	83	74	67	69	62	22	951	917.5	118.0	14.17%
1979-80	71	79	68	81	88	88	86	67	78	93	78	62	64	20	1023	987.5	72.0	7.57%
1980-81	69	81	82	72	94	92	92	92	75	81	95	68	64	17	1074	1039.5	51.0	4.99%
1981-82	79	79	85	90	77	100	101	92	97	75	88	91	62	14	1130	1090.5	56.0	5.21%
1982-83	105	78	76	84	91	77	97	93	93	98	73	84	85	14	1148	1095.5	18.0	1.59%
1983-84	95	105	80	80	85	96	74	106	98	91	98	69	81	17	1175	1127.5	27.0	2.35%
1984-85	107	100	109	89	80	94	102	78	105	93	89	94	63	14	1217	1163.5	42.0	3.57%
1985-86	78	113	91	109	98	87	88	98	78	106	91	88	92	15	1232	1193.0	15.0	1.23%
1986-87	100	81	114	95	110	104	92	90	100	78	104	87	84	15	1254	1204.0	22.0	1.79%
1987-88	98	131	81	109	107	112	110	84	89	93	81	96.8	79	11	1282	1232.8	27.8	2.22%
1988-89	98	126	114	91	110	122	110	108	91	95	93	82	95.5	8.5	1344	1295.0	62.2	4.85%
1989-90	110	120	120	113	100	120	132	110	106	86	93	93	77	8	1388	1333.0	44.0	3.27%
1990-91	119	129	121	128	124	106	123	131	115	103	87	93	93	12	1484	1423.0	96.0	7.14%
1991-92	123	136	123	125	134	133	109	126	135	116	103	87	91	15	1556	1494.5	72.0	4.85%
1992-93	127	141	129	127	131	144	137	112	130	136	116	103	85	18	1636	1572.5	80.0	5.14%
1993-94	131	145	134	133	133	140	148	140	116	131	136	116	101	14	1718	1652.5	82.0	5.01%
1994-95	135	150	138	138	140	143	144	152	145	117	131	136	114	14	1797	1729.5	79.0	4.60%
1995-96	139	154	142	142	145	150	147	148	157	146	117	131	133	10	1861	1791.5	64.0	3.56%
1996-97	144	159	146	147	149	156	154	151	153	159	146	117	128	12	1921	1849.0	60.0	3.22%
1997-98	149	165	151	151	154	160	161	158	156	155	159	146	115	9	1989	1914.5	68.0	3.54%
1998-99	154	170	157	156	159	165	165	165	163	158	155	159	143	9	2078	2001.0	89.0	4.47%
99-2000	159	176	162	162	164	171	170	169	170	165	158	155	156	5	2142	2062.5	64.0	3.08%
2000-01	164	182	167	167	170	176	176	174	174	172	165	158	152	3	2200	2118.0	58.0	2.71%
Average	7.21%	14.38%	2.03%	7.36%	10.46%	7.22%	4.71%	3.69%	3.71%	4.81%	3.80%	-4.22%	-5.00%					
6 Yr Avg	3.25%	18.12%	-4.17%	3.02%	7.37%	7.63%	2.34%	-2.15%	1.99%	-1.27%	-0.19%	-1.87%	-3.88%					
3 Yr Avg	6.81%	22.76%	-5.64%	6.05%	6.85%	9.70%	2.97%	-0.86%	3.68%	-0.53%	-0.31%	0.41%	-2.48%					
Proj Pct	3.25%	14.25%	-5.00%	3.25%	5.00%	7.25%	3.00%	2.50%	3.25%	1.00%	0.00%	0.00%	-2.00%					

Enrollment Projections Sept 20 Enrollment with 3 Yr Avg Proj

BUILDING ENROLLMENTS 3 BLDGS

	K-4	5-8	9-12	SE	Total
1990-91	621	475	376	12	1484
1991-92	641	503	397	15	1556
1992-93	655	523	440	18	1636
1993-94	676	544	484	14	1718
1994-95	701	584	498	14	1797
1995-96	722	602	527	10	1861
1996-97	745	614	550	12	1921
1997-98	770	635	575	9	1989
1998-99	796	658	615	9	2078
99-2000	823	680	634	5	2142
2000-01	850	700	647	3	2200

BUILDING ENROLLMENTS 4 BLDGS

	K-2	3-5	6-8	9-12	SE	Total
	369	358	369	376	12	1484
	382	392	370	397	15	1556
	397	402	379	440	18	1636
	410	406	404	484	14	1718
	423	421	441	498	14	1797
	435	437	452	527	10	1861
	449	452	458	550	12	1921
	465	465	475	575	9	1989
	481	480	493	615	9	2078
	497	497	509	634	5	2142
	513	513	524	647	3	2200



MILL RATES

YEAR	1983-84	1984-85	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88	1988-89	1989-90	1990-91
GENERAL	65.66	59.51	70.89	75.492	79.359	78.669	64.077	80.676
CAPITAL OUTLAY	3.98	3.88	4.00	3.960	3.988	3.994	2.858	2.925
BOND & INT	5.75	6.50	4.75	6.140	2.490	2.940	8.697	5.657
SP. ASSESS.								1.260
TOTAL USD	75.39	69.89	79.64	85.592	85.837	85.603	75.632	90.518
REC COMM	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.651	0.997	0.999	0.715	0.732
TOTAL	75.89	70.39	80.14	86.243	86.834	86.602	76.347	91.250
INC/DEC		-5.500	9.750	6.103	0.591	-0.232	-10.255	14.903
ASSESSED VAL	\$12,519,857	\$12,983,707	\$13,169,341	\$13,131,792	\$13,343,104	\$13,756,895	\$19,242,432	\$18,805,852

ROSE HILL U.S.D. 394  
315 S. ROSE HILL RD  
ROSE HILL, KANSAS 67133

<u>BUILDING</u>	<u>SQFOOTAGE</u>	<u>CONSTRUCTION</u>	<u>FINANCING</u>
<b>High School</b>			
Main Bldg and Gymnasium	58,773	1967,1974	\$430,000 1967 Bond \$784,000 1974 Bond
Shop Building	10,300	1978	\$ Capital Outlay
Portables (3) New E. of H.S.	2,304	1985	\$75,000 Capital Outlay
Portables (2)	2,288	1986	\$10,000 Capital Outlay
Science Wing	6,800	1989	\$398,000 1988 Bond
<b>Middle School</b>			
Classrooms	20,924	1978,1980,1981	\$ Capital Outlay Bonds \$155,000 1981 C Hall, Cap
Modular	1,000	1986	\$12,000 Capital Outlay
Nurse Office	864	1980	
Music Modular	720	1987	Donated
4 Rm Addition C Hall	4,200	1989	\$120,000 Capital Outlay
<b>East Elementary School</b>			
East Elementary Classrooms	14,553	1950, 1983	\$189,000 1983-Capital Outlay
East Elementary Cafeteria	8,607	1950,1984,1986	\$30,800 1984-Capital Outlay \$65,000 1986-Capital Outlay
Stoll Media Center	8,528	1984	\$ 275,000 Capital Outlay
<b>West Elementary School</b>			
West Elementary Classrooms	17,238	1955,1958	

Old Gymnasium

Old Gym and Classrooms	20,646	1949,1976,1986	\$50,000	1986-Capital Outlay
Cafeteria MultiPurpose	16,750	1990	\$650,000	Lease Purchase
Maintenance Shed	2,440	1979	\$20,000	Capital Outlay
Bus Barn	3,200	1979	\$45,000	Capital Outlay
Stadium Concession	1,800	1979	\$18,000	Capital Outlay
Central Office	1,800	1946		