

Approved: March 3, 1992
Date

MINUTES OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION.

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Rick Bowden at 3:30 p.m. on February 24, 1992 in room Room 519-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except:

Committee staff present:

Dale Dennis, Department of Education
Avis Swartzman, Office of Revisor of Statutes
Ben Barrett, Legislative Research
Shirley Wilds, Secretary to the Committee

Conferees appearing before the committee:

Representative Henry Helgerson
Mark Tallman - KASB
Ted Ayers, General Counsel - Board of Regents
Brilla Scott, USA
Craig Grant - KNEA
Ladislado Hernandez, Education Advisor, Governor's Office
Walt Chappell
David DePue, State Counsel, Vocational Education

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Rick Bowden.

Chairman Bowden announced he had three more bill requests to be introduced as committee bills.

Representative Empson moved to introduce a Reconciliation bill; seconded by Representative Ramirez. Motion carried.

Representative White moved to introduce Inter-agency Provision of Services for Children, Adolescents and Family Act bill; Representative Harder seconded. Motion carried.

Representative Amos moved to introduce a bill listing property that is owned by inter-local units and cooperatives to be exempt from local ad valorem taxes; second by Representative Jones. Motion carried.

Hearing on HB 3075:

Ben Barrett. Mr. Barrett explained the concepts of HB 3075 and gave a summary of the main provisions of the Governor's proposed revised school finance plan. (See Attachment #1.)

Ladislado Hernandez. Mr. Hernandez discussed the Governor's proposed revised school finance plan. He reported the Governor strongly urges the committee to consider her bill stating it is imperative that a balance between education interests, the taxpayers and the state and the other needs of state government, and can be accomplished with her package. (See Attachment #2.)

Walt Chappell. Mr. Chappell said that HB 3075 does not provide an equal basis for funding education and is not worth the committee's time.

Larry Clark. In written testimony, Mr. Clark protested the concepts in HB 3075, emphasizing that the bill will have a negative effect on all taxing units. (See Attachment #3.)

Phil Knight. Mr. Knight indicated in his written testimony that Kansas Education Coalition cannot support HB 3075, listing the reasons as listed in his testimony. (See Attachment #4.)

Hearing on HB 2998:

Representative Henry Helgerson. Representative Helgerson provided an explanation of his bill and held a lengthy discussion with committee members.

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, Room 519-S Statehouse, at 3:30 p.m. on February 24, 1992.

Ted Ayres. Speaking in support of HB 2998 as it relates to a "state university preparatory curriculum" and enhanced admission requirements, Mr. Ayres said that such enhanced standards will serve to establish a benchmark for quality education in Kansas, providing students and their parents with additional motivation for academic achievement and success.

Brilla Scott. Ms. Scott said USA supports outcomes-based accreditation and the essential skills assessment portions of HB 2998; they are opposed to the qualified admissions portion of the bill. (See Attachment #5.)

Walt Chappell. Mr. Chappell reported to the committee that he strongly endorses HB 2998.

Craig Grant. Mr. Grant, referring to New Section 3 on page 4, said KNEA has had a long-standing policy against restricted admissions to regents universities, and changes in open enrollment. Their policies are not in conflict with Sections 1 and 2. (See Attachment #6.)

David DePue. Mr. DePue said that with 50 years of research over the 50 states has shown that graduation rates for 4-year public institutions and universities has been 50% over five years. He said there is one way that graduations could be increased to about 60% and that is to go to a highly selective, elitist system, wherein it would eliminate a number of residences in Kansas. He offered to gather 1991-92 research data for the committee if desired.

Hearing on HB 2963:

Representative Steve Wiard. Representative Wiard discussed the concept of HB 2963, stating this is a bill to verify that the student does meet the essential skills to receive a high school diploma. He says it is of value to provide some designation to determine if a student has attained a certain skill level.

Brilla Scott. Ms. Scott said USA is supportive of the concept of establishing essential skills assessment in Kansas. She provided the committee with a copy of the memorandum presented to the state board outlining USA's involvement in such a process. (See Attachment #7.)

Mark Tallman. Mr. Tallman said that while KASB cannot support every aspect of HB 2963, they strongly endorse Sections 1 and 2. (See Attachment #8.)

Craig Grant. Mr. Grant said KNEA supports the concepts of HB 2963, but deals with only part of the changes, and hopes they can continue to coordinate efforts between the State Board of Education and Legislature to restructure our schools. (See Attachment #9.)

Representative Jones moved to adopt the minutes for February 12, 13, 17, 18, 19 and 20; seconded by Representative Larkin. Motion carried.

The next scheduled meeting is February 25, 3:30 p.m., Room 519-S, Statehouse.

Upon completion of its business, meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.



GUEST LIST

COMMITTEE: House Education

Date: 2/24/92

Name (Please Print)	COMPANY ORGANIZATION	ADDRESS
---------------------	----------------------	---------

ONAN P. BURNETT	USD 581 #	Topeka
Jim Allen	Petroleum Guild Assoc	"
Wanda Galt	USD 500	"
TED D. AYRES	BOARD OF REGENTS	TOPEKA
Connie Wheeler	St. Bd. of Ed	Topeka
Dan Hermes	Budget	TOPEKA
John F. Welsh	Regents	Topeka
Mark Tallman	KASIS	Topeka
Craig Grant	KNEA	Topeka
Ledialda M. Hernandez	Gov. Office	Topeka
Ken Baker	4th Enrollment USD's	Topeka
Kevin Givers		Topeka
Robert Nichols	USD 259	Wichita
TREVA POTTER	PEOPLES NAT. GAS	TOPEKA
Bruce Landsberg	Citizen	Wichita
W. Bradford	Leg 94th Dist	Wichita

**SUMMARY OF MAIN PROVISIONS OF PROPOSED GOVERNOR'S REVISED
SCHOOL FINANCE PLAN**

(H.B. 3075)

Overview

- The main components of the distribution plan for school operations include:
 - state financial aid (SFA) determined by multiplying base state aid per pupil (BSAPP) by the adjusted (weighted) enrollment of a district, and
 - equalized local option budget (LOB) spending authority of up to 5.0 percent of the amount of the district's SFA, subject to elector approval.
- A uniform 45 mill statewide property tax is imposed to help finance school district operations.
- Local property tax levying authority is provided for the LOB option.
- The authority of school districts to levy up to 4.0 mills for five years for the capital outlay fund is repealed.
- A uniform 3.33 mill statewide property tax is imposed to provide state equalization aid for capital improvement debt obligations.

The State Financial Aid Plan and Related Provisions

Following is a somewhat more detailed summary of the principal provisions of the school funding plan.

*Education
Attachment #1
2/24/92*

General Fund

The general fund of a district is the fund from which operating expenses are paid and to which is deposited general state aid, payments relating to transfers of territory, PL 874 funds (except for major disaster amounts and amounts received under the low-rent housing program), and other moneys specified by law.

State Financial Aid (SFA)

The SFA of a district is determined by multiplying the base state aid per pupil (BSAPP) of a district by the district's adjusted enrollment. The BSAPP is set at \$3,615.* Adjusted enrollment is calculated by adding to the enrollment of a district (as such enrollment historically has been determined) "program," "low enrollment," "transportation," and "at-risk pupil" weightings, as follows.

Program Weighting. This weighting is provided for pupil attendance in educational programs which differ in cost from regular programs. These are:

Bilingual Education. The State Board of Education (SBOE) computes the full-time equivalent enrollment in bilingual education and multiplies that amount by 0.2.

Vocational Education. The SBOE computes the full-time equivalent enrollment in vocational education and multiplies that amount by 0.5.

The sum of these two weights is the program weighting of the district.

[Please note that no weighting for special education is included. While this weighting has figured prominently in proposals discussed prior to this time, the decision was made not to include special education in this plan. There would continue to be separate state categorical aid funding for special education.]

Low Enrollment Weighting. This weighting is assigned to school districts having enrollments of under 2,000 pupils in recognition of higher costs attributable to the operation of low enrollment districts.

The low enrollment weighting is determined by constructing linear transitions between the 1991-92 median budget per pupil (BPP) of districts having enrollments of 75-125 and 200-399 and between the 1991-92 median BPP of districts having enrollments of 200-399 and 2,000 or more.

This procedure provides the basis for determining a "schedule amount" for each school district having an enrollment of under 2,000. The 1991-92 median BPP of districts having 75-125

*This amount is subject to reduction upon an order by the Governor and approval by the State Finance Council to reduce State General Fund expenditures in order to insure a State General Fund and State Cash Operating Reserve Fund (combined) balance of \$100 million at the end of a fiscal year. The reduction in the BSAPP is in proportion to any reduction in the amount of appropriations from the State General Fund for general state aid.

enrollment serves as the schedule amount for districts having enrollments of less than 100. For districts with enrollments of 100 to 1,999, the schedule amount is determined from the linear transition schedule based upon the district's enrollment in the current school year. (The increments in the linear schedule for districts having enrollments of 100 to 299 vary from the increments in the schedule for districts having enrollments of 300 to 1,999.)

The amount of the median BPP of districts having enrollments of 2,000 or more is subtracted from the schedule amount determined for each district having an enrollment of less than 2,000. The result is divided by the median BPP of districts having enrollments of 2,000 or more and the quotient so derived is applied to a district's current year enrollment to produce the low enrollment weighting.

Transportation Weighting. The State Board of Education determines the expenditures in the preceding year for transporting public and nonpublic school pupils on regular school routes. Calculations are then made to net out a portion of these costs designed to represent 50 percent of the costs of transporting pupils who reside less than 2.5 miles from school. The remaining amount is divided by the number of pupils enrolled in the district who were residing 2.5 miles or more by the usually traveled road from the school attended and for whom transportation was made available by the district. The result (quotient) is the per pupil cost of transportation.

The per pupil cost of transportation of each district is then plotted on a density-cost graph to which a statistical technique is applied to construct a "curve of best fit" for all school districts. This procedure recognizes the relatively higher costs per pupil of transportation in sparsely populated areas as contrasted with densely populated areas. Based on the school district's density, the point on the curve of best fit is identified for each district. This is the "formula per pupil" cost of transportation of the district. This figure is divided by the BSAPP and the quotient is multiplied by the number of pupils in the current school year who live more than 2.5 miles from school and for whom transportation is being provided. This produces the district's transportation weighting.

At-Risk Pupil Weighting. This weighting is determined on the basis of pupil qualification for free meals under the National School Lunch Program. To obtain this weighting for a district, the number of pupils who qualify for free meals under the federal program is multiplied by 0.05.

Local Effort

A district's local effort is the sum of the following revenues received in the current school year:

1. unexpended and unencumbered cash balances remaining in the general fund, except for revenues specifically characterized by law as not being operating expenses;

New
*

2. unexpended and unencumbered cash balances remaining in the "categorical funds" of the district;*
3. remaining proceeds of a transportation or technology education tax levy prior to their repeal;
4. amounts credited to the school district general fund from industrial revenue bond and port authority bond payments;
5. motor vehicle tax receipts;
6. mineral production tax receipts;
7. rental/lease vehicles sales tax receipts; and
8. federal impact aid (PL 874), in accord with federal law and regulations.

General State Aid

In each school year the State Board of Education determines a school district's general state aid entitlement by subtracting the district's local effort from the amount of SFA the district is entitled to receive. General state aid payments are made in accord with appropriation acts from the State School District Finance Fund (SSDFF) and State General Fund (SGF).

School districts receive payments each month from July through May based on 8.33 percent of their entitlement for the school year and the balance of such entitlement in June. Monthly payments in July through May are to be made by the 20th of the month at the earliest and not later than the last day of the month. The final payment is made on June 15.

* Categorical Funds

The bill identifies several special operating funds as "categorical funds." The categorical funds are special education, transportation, food service, bilingual education, driver training, adult education, adult supplementary education, vocational education, area vocational school (a new fund), inservice education, parent education, and educational excellence grant program fund.

[Note: Even though it is not treated as a categorical fund, the technology education fund is continued. Other special funds of school districts as have been authorized by law are not affected by the plan.]

Transfers From the School District General Fund

Transfers from a district's general fund to any other fund is an operating expense in the year the transfer is made. Transfers may be made from the general fund of a district to any

*See listing of categorical funds below.

categorical fund or to the technology education fund of the district in any school year, subject to the following conditions:

1. the transfer may not be made before the money in the categorical fund is needed; and
2. the transfer amount may not exceed the obligation which is the object of the transfer.

The board may transfer money to the capital outlay fund in an amount not to exceed 4 percent of the general fund budget.

With regard to capital outlay, it should be noted that school districts are authorized to make general fund expenditures for acquiring equipment and repairing school buildings, but only when the unencumbered cash balance in the capital outlay fund is depleted.

Districts are authorized to transfer back to the general fund amounts transferred to other funds during the same school year.

Capital Outlay Tax Levy Abolished

The authority of school boards generally to levy up to 4 mills for a period of not to exceed five years for capital outlay is abolished. (In this regard, see school district general fund transfer provision above.)

Miscellaneous Revenue

Miscellaneous revenue a district receives, such as interest on idle funds, which is not required by law to be deposited in some specific fund may be credited to any categorical fund of the district.

[Note: This basically is current policy except that under current policy such amounts also may be credited to the capital outlay fund.]

Local Option Budget (LOB)/Supplemental General State Aid

In addition to the SFA funding, in any year a district may approve spending (LOB) in any amount up to 5.0 percent of its SFA. Use of this LOB spending authority requires approval by the electors in each year all or some portion of this authority is to be used.

School districts are authorized to levy property taxes to fund their portion of the LOB. State aid is provided for the purpose of equalizing the ability of a district to utilize this provision. Money for the LOB is deposited in the school district's supplemental general fund.

Attache #1-3

Supplemental general state aid is based on an equalization feature which is designed to treat each district as if its assessed valuation per pupil (AVPP) were equal to that of the district at the 85th percentile of AVPP. For each school district that uses all or a portion of its LOB, the State Board divides the district's AVPP in the preceding year by the 85th percentile AVPP and subtracts the ratio so determined from 1.0. If the ratio resulting from this calculation equals or exceeds 1.0, the district is entitled to no LOB supplemental general state aid. (This is because the district's AVPP equals or exceeds the AVPP at the 85th percentile.) If the ratio resulting from the calculation is less than 1.0, the district's LOB is multiplied by such ratio to determine the district's LOB supplemental general state aid entitlement.

A proration provision applies in the event the state appropriations for this aid are not sufficient to fund school district entitlements.

School districts may spend LOB revenues for any purpose for which expenditures from the general fund are authorized or these revenues may be transferred to the general fund of the district or to any categorical fund of the district.

Statewide Property Tax

A statewide property tax of 45 mills is levied in 1992 on all taxable tangible property in the state. These tax revenues are collected by the county treasurer for deposit by the State Treasurer in the SSDFF. This money, and any other money credited to the SSDFF, is allocated to school districts in the form of general state aid under the School District Finance Act.

Of the motor vehicle taxes produced during the period from July 1, 1992 to June 30, 1993 attributable to taxes levied by the state in 1992, the appropriate portions of each such deposit are credited to the SSDFF, School District Capital Improvements Fund (SDCIF), the Educational Building Fund (EBF), and to the State Institutions Building Fund (SIBF). These amounts represent the 45 mills share for the SSDFF, a 3.33 mills share for the SDCIF, a 1 mill share for the EBF, and the 0.5 mill share for the SIBF.

State Aid Program – Capital Improvements/Bond and Interest Obligations

A new state aid program, based on an equalization concept, is created to assist school districts in making certain bond and interest payments. The state aid provided for this program is produced by a 3.33 mill statewide property tax levy. This levy is imposed in 1992.

Each school year, any school district that is obligated to make payments from a bond and interest fund is entitled to receive state aid inversely to its assessed valuation per pupil (AVPP). The State Board of Education administers this program. Each year, the State Board determines each school district's AVPP, rounded to the nearest \$1,000; determines the median AVPP of all districts in the state; assigns the factor of 50.0 percent to the median AVPP; and, for each \$1,000 of AVPP above or below the state median AVPP, changes the factor by 1.0 percentage point inversely to AVPP. (Example: If the median AVPP was \$40,000, the factor would be 50 percent; if a district's

AVPP was \$39,000, its factor would be 51.0 percent; if a district's AVPP was \$41,000, its factor would be 49 percent; and so on.) A district's factor could not exceed 100.0 percent.

The school district's entitlement of state aid each year from the School District Capital Improvements Fund (SDCIF) is determined by applying its percentage factor (as described above) to its bond and interest fund payment obligation for that year. A proration provision applies in the event that there is insufficient state money available to pay each school district's entitlement for the school year.

Miscellaneous

Following are several items of note relative to implementation of the proposed program:

1. Fort Leavenworth is incorporated as a part of the overall school funding program.
2. The income tax rebate program is eliminated.
3. By virtue of the weighting plans for bilingual education and pupil transportation, the specific categorical aid programs for these purposes are eliminated. Other statutory categorical aid programs, except for inservice education aid, are continued. Presumably, the state appropriations for the vocational school categorical aid program also would be discontinued. (The Governor is proposing to add these funds to the vocational school postsecondary aid program.)
4. The property tax levying authority for technology education is eliminated.
5. The special limited authority to levy property taxes for a school transportation system is eliminated.
6. The specific declining enrollment "cushion" for budgetary purposes is eliminated.

STATE OF KANSAS



OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR

JOAN FINNEY, Governor
State Capitol, 2nd Floor
Topeka, KS 66612-1590

913-296-3232
1-800-432-2487
TDD# 1-800-992-0152
FAX# (913) 296-7973

TESTIMONY OF LADISLADO M. HERNANDEZ
TO THE HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 24, 1992

I am Ladislado Hernandez, education advisor to Governor Joan Finney. As a former government teacher, I appreciate the opportunity to participate directly in the political process about which I endeavored to teach my students. Today, I would like to speak to you in support of the Governor's recommendations for structuring the public school finance system in Kansas.

As a parent of five children, and as a responsible citizen of the State of Kansas, I believe that every succeeding generation of children must have a better opportunity to receive an education than did their parents.

Education
attachment #2
2/24/92

The Governor's primary concern is to do the best we can possibly do to provide an equal and equitable opportunity for the education of every child in the State of Kansas. Therefore, she is seriously concerned that our public schools need our help in equalizing and stabilizing a financial basis for funding.

I firmly believe we are all in agreement that education decisions must be made with the child as our primary concern, while at the same time not creating an excessive tax burden on the people of Kansas.

It is for this reason that we must set aside our district and regional bias and do what is best for the state as a whole.

Because of past practices the constitutionality of the current system is under question.

Regarding the District Judge's findings:

District Court Judge Bullock did not go looking for a case. The fact is, some 39 school boards brought it to him.

attch^d 2-2

Secondly, the Judge avoided throwing the system into turmoil by encouraging us to resolve the legal problems he identified. He could have made a decision and eliminated our opportunity to live up to our responsibility.

If we accept the premise that the child is the primary concern in our schools, then we must agree with the Judge that the system must be shaped to meet the needs of all children.

The Governor would like to thank those of you on the Education Committee who participated on the task force and reached a consensus on setting a common set of principles . . . equal education opportunity funded by an equitable method of finance, and the proposed weighting standard which addresses specific student and educational needs.

In the area of funding authority:

The Governor's recommendations preserve the principle that the State has the duty to fund public schools.

Attach[#] 2-3

The Governor's recommendations preserve the principle that education dollars must be evenly allocated while maintaining local control of local policy and spending.

The Governor's recommendations further provide flexibility for school districts beyond the task force's original plan. The Governor believes it is necessary that the school district taxpayers retain some ability to decide if they wish to raise taxes to increase support of their schools.

The Governor realizes that different districts can raise different amounts of money with local effort and therefore provides a method to equalize this effort with state funds.

The Governor understands the special and varying needs of pupils. Therefore, the Governor's recommendations preserve the previously proposed weighting system with some exceptions.

The Governor strongly supports the rural Kansas schools and provides for additional weighting for enrollments in districts below 200 students.

Attach[#] 2-4

The Governor sincerely believes that help must be given for the high-risk students. A weighting is provided to help those children who, due to circumstances beyond their control, live in poverty conditions.

Additionally, special education is retained as a categorical aid program as in current law. The Governor further recommends that the program be funded at \$147.8 million, or 90 percent of costs.

The Governor's recommendations include not only the distribution formula, but also include a provision establishing a 45-mill local property tax levy to support local schools which reduces the local property tax burden in 253 districts.

The Governor's bill also includes a mechanism to equalize bond and interest payments of local schools financed by a 3.33 statewide mill levy. The overall effect is to increase local school expenditures by an estimated \$91.8 million, or 4.6 percent above current levels.

I ask members of the committee to set aside their district, regional or political concerns and act favorably on this legislation that will provide access to equal educational opportunities for every child in an equitable fashion.

The Governor believes that it is of the utmost importance that we not continue the great disparities that presently exist in our current financing system.

Governor Finney's school finance plan also provides meaningful tax relief -- \$217 million of real property tax relief, and \$40 million of motor vehicle tax relief, with no new taxes to burden the poor and middle class.

We must work together to keep a field of equalness in education. Our children's education should not pit school districts into competition for resources because of economic interests or regional disputes.

Johnathon Kozal states in his book Savage Inequalities that the tragedy of many of our nation's schools is perpetuated by school funding laws. He also strongly indicated that the consequences of unequal education have a terrible finality and that those denied can never be made whole by later legislated acts.

The Governor urges you as legislators to strongly consider the bill that she has proposed. It is imperative that a balance between education interests, the taxpayers of the state, and the other needs of state government be balanced. Governor Finney feels that her package accomplishes this in a reasonable manner.

TESTIMONY FOR THE HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE
Opposing House Bill 3075

by

Larry Clark, Superintendent of Schools
Burlington U.S.D.No. 244
February 24, 1992

The Burlington Unified School District No. 244 on behalf of its taxpayers wishes to protest the concepts of House Bill 3075. We appeal to the members of this committee to consider the ramifications of a bill that; 1. does not address long range funding. 2. is tied to a uniform mill levy without a system of checks and balances, 3. places an undue hardship on certian districts and 4. restricts the home rule decision-making process of the local Boards of Education.

The funding of the HB 3075 is questionable. The bill as outlined by the Governor seems to have a funding shortage of approximately two hundred million dollars. We cannot support a bill that sets a uniform mill levy not knowing if the mill levy will remain at the initial level or be increased as there is a need for additional money.

The home rule decision-making authority of the local boards will be eroded with the implementation of HB 3075. The uniform mill levy will eliminate the local input through the first 45 mills, thus leaving local patrons or elected officials without a voice in a very important part of running a school district. The people of Burlington USD 244 make the best decisions for our students.

In conclusion, we want to emphasize that House Bill 3075 will have a negative effect on all taxing units. It is not a long term solution to the current funding dilemma. The legislature rushed into classification and reappraisal with very little understanding of what the effect would be on taxpayers. We urge the House Education Committee to not rush into HB 3075 without fully understanding the long term effects on taxpayers and taxing units.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

*Education
Attachment #3
2/24/92*

TESTIMONY FOR THE HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Opposing House Bill 3075
by Phil Knight - Chairman
Kansas Education Coalition
Ulysses, Kansas
February 24, 1992

We support equal educational opportunities for all Kansas students. Equal educational opportunity is determined by many factors including geography, cultural diversity, dollars spent, availability of services, recruitment of quality staff, etc.

We support local control. Property tax has always been the source of revenue for schools, cities, counties, and local communities. Through local government, people tax themselves balancing local needs and desires. Thus the people can control their own destiny and effectively participate in government.

We support the idea that education is the responsibility of all taxpayers. We are concerned that greater reliance upon property tax will produce greater inequality of taxation and education. We fear that special interests will continually bring about changing classification systems, exemptions, and assessment formulas.

Based on the above beliefs the Kansas Education Coalition cannot support H.B. 3075.

*Education
Attachment #4
2/24/92*



#4

HB 2998: EDUCATIONAL REFORM (Rep. Helgerson)

Testimony presented before the House Education Committee

by

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

February 24, 1992

Mister Chairman and Members of the House Education Committee:

This bill requires adoption of an outcomes-based accreditation system, an essential skills assessment program, and a state university preparatory curriculum.

As mentioned in earlier testimony, United School Administrators of Kansas supports outcomes-based accreditation and the essential skills assessment portions of the bill. Through the Quality Performance Accreditation process, established by the Kansas State Board of Education, we feel both these objectives can be achieved. We would encourage you to allow the state board to continue their plans for QPA.

Our association is opposed to the qualified admissions portion of the bill. While our membership surveys have shown a steady decrease in the number who favor open admissions, the majority still support existing law.

With Quality Performance Accreditation in place, it seems reasonable that admissions to our regent institutions can then be based on what college bound students know and are able to do rather than numbers of courses completed.

Leaders from our association are scheduled to meet with three members of the Board of Regents on Tuesday evening in Wichita. We welcome the opportunity for this overdue dialogue on the qualified admissions issue.

*Education
Attachment #5
7/24/92
FAX (913) 232-9776*



#5



KANSAS NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION / 715 W. 10TH STREET / TOPEKA, KANSAS 66612-1686

Craig Grant Testimony Before
House Education Committee
Monday, February 24, 1992

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am Craig Grant and I represent Kansas-NEA. I appreciate this opportunity to visit with the committee about HB 2998.

We were doing just fine reading HB 2998 until we arrived at New Section 3 on page 4. Kansas-NEA has had a long-standing policy against restricted admissions at our regents universities. We have testified for many years, including this year, against changes in our open enrollment policy which we have had for years.

Since we have not altered that policy, we are forced to oppose the passage of HB 2998. Our policies are not in conflict with sections 1 and 2, but sections 3 and 4 give us problems. Thank you for listening to our concerns.

*Education
Attachment #6
2/24/92*

#6



HB 2963: ESSENTIAL SKILLS ASSESSMENT PROGRAMS

Testimony presented before the House Education Committee

by

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

February 24, 1992

Mister Chairman and Members of the House Education Committee:

United School Administrators of Kansas is supportive of the concept of establishing essential skills assessment in Kansas. We are presently working with the Kansas State Board of Education in the identification of **Foundation Skills** as mentioned in the report issued by the U.S. Department of Labor. Attached to my testimony is a copy of the memorandum presented recently to the state board which outlines our involvement.

We agree that an essential skills assessment program is needed. We are working diligently with the state board to provide such a program. Again, we would urge the committee to coordinate efforts in focusing resources and energy on the Quality Performance Accreditation project, so that we are all pulling in the same direction.

*Education
Attachment #7
2/24/92*



To: Kansas State Board of Education
From: KASA/KASCD Ad-hoc Committee
Date: February 12, 1992
Subject: Addition of Foundation Skills to the QPA Document

In late November, we shared with the superintendents of Kansas the minutes of a KASA/KASCD Task Force which developed a plan for adding Foundation Skills to the QPA document. That report is repeated here with revisions prompted by action of both the KASA and KASCD Boards of Directors, discussion conducted during the recent KASA breakfast in Wichita, and recent work by this ad-hoc committee.

Of particular importance to superintendents in attendance in Wichita was the understanding that the following recommendations are directed at:

- 1- identifying specific outcomes for each of the **foundation skill areas**. We must clearly state what we want, and
- 2- developing or adopting assessments for each of the **foundation skills areas** which address not only knowledge and comprehension, but all levels of Bloom's Taxonomy.

The KASA/KASCD Task Force identified two major tasks.

- I. The first task was to review the QPA document in light of recommendations from the SCANS report, America 2000 and other exit outcomes documents. After a lengthy discussion, it was consensus that it is important to protect the integrity of the QPA goals because of its consistency in moving schools toward integrated learning. However, it was consensus that mastery in foundation skill areas is necessary to an integrated curricular approach. Foundation skill areas, in fact, are defined for the purpose of this document to be those skills necessary to participate in the integrated curriculum.

Finally, it was concluded that it is important that we communicate to students, parents and the public the necessity of establishing a strong foundation for continued learning. Therefore, we recommend that the QPA document be amended as follows:

Outcome No. 5:

Students will demonstrate mastery in the foundation skill areas which are consistent with recommendations from America 2000 and SCANS (Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills).

- Communication/Reading, Writing, and Speaking
- Mathematics/Arithmetic
- Social Science/History and Geography
- Science

The amendment should become a new No. 5, and be included in the current outcomes Nos. 5, 6, 7 and 8 under the heading of integrated curriculum. The current outcomes numbered 5, 6, 7 and 8 in this section would become outcomes 6, 7, 8, and 9 and the last two outcomes would be renumbered to 10 and 11.

NOTE: Recent draft revisions of QPA material suggests that this revision is already in progress. KASA and KASCD support the direction the Board is taking along these lines.

II. The second task was to develop a strategy to gain approval of the above amendment for addition to the QPA goals and to assist Kansas schools in meeting this new goal.

A. Have state board of education approval for amendment to the QPA document.

1. Seek endorsement from the QPA advisory council.
2. Seek support from the commissioner of education.
3. Present to and seek approval of the state board of education.

B. To offer assistance to school districts in Kansas.

1. Establish a task force for each of the four foundation skill areas with the following job description:

- Write a definition for each foundation skill area identified, i.e., arithmetic/mathematics.
- Define outcomes of significance, at a minimum of three benchmark levels, grades K-12.
- Identify standards (these are high standards not minimum competencies).
- Develop/Adopt assessments. All available assessments, including state assessments, are to be reviewed to ensure that there is no duplication of effort and assessments will not be reinvented. Instruments will be developed or adopted which will assess across all levels of Bloom's Taxonomy.

2. The four foundation skill areas of task force responsibility are:

- Communications/Reading, Writing, and Speaking
- Mathematics/Arithmetic
- Social Science/History and Geography
- Science

3. Membership of each task force will consist of:

- One curriculum generalist selected jointly by KASA and KASCD.
- One content specialist jointly selected by KASCD and KASA.
- One assessment specialist jointly selected by KASCD and KASA.
- Three classroom teachers, one elementary, one middle level and one high school selected by KASCD.
- Two business/community representatives selected by KASA.

4. Each district in Kansas will be given the opportunity to participate. The outcomes of significance and assessments which are designed will be made available to each participating school district

5. To become a participating school district with rights to all outcomes and assessments, districts will be asked to share in the financing of the project at a level to be agreed upon. Subsequent years will also be voluntary and the fee structure will be commensurate with the identified task.

Again, any participation fee gives the district the right to all materials developed.

6. The first progress report and possible preliminary documents will be submitted to all participating districts and to all USA member associations by May 1, 1992.
7. Districts which wish to participate in the project should notify the USA office in writing by February 20, 1992.

III. The activities described will be considered as phase one of the project. Phase two will be to add the remaining foundation skills contained in the SCANS report: **Thinking Skills** and **Personal Qualities**. The ad-hoc committee believes this separation into phases is necessary to the adequate focus of energies on the skills included in phase one.

#7
KANSAS
ASSOCIATION



OF
SCHOOL
BOARDS



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

Testimony on H.B. 2998 and H.B. 2963
before the
House Committee on Education

by

Mark Tallman, Coordinator of Governmental Relations
Kansas Association of School Boards

February 24, 1992

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

KASB is pleased to rise in support of the concepts for school improvement contained in H.B. 2998 and H.B. 2963. While we cannot support every aspect of these bills, we strongly endorse most of the provisions they contain.

This fall, our association adopted a comprehensive school reform strategy called "Quest for Quality." Prior to adopting specific legislative positions, we developed a list of "vital elements for school improvement," containing the concepts we believe must be the basis of a legislative program. The very first concept is "Goals that establish high performance standards, and clear indicators of progress toward those goals that ensure accountability." We have endorsed the State Board's Quality Performance Accreditation plan as an appropriate process for this concept.

In short, we believe that school improvement must be organized around clear educational goals or outcomes. Accountability should be provided by standardized measurements of progress toward those goals or outcomes.

Education
Attachment #8
2/24/92

We therefore strongly support sections one and two of H.B. 2998, which would place in statute the mission, outcomes and performance indicators developed by the State Board for Q.P.A. We believe Q.P.A. should be the basis of a state school improvement strategy because of the development time and energy already invested.

We support the essential skills assessment program proposed in H.B. 2963 and in sections five through ten of H.B. 2998, because it would place in statute the communications and mathematics tests developed by the State Board to measure progress on Q.P.A. (We also supported this concept last week in H.B. 2688.) Such an assessment program should be part of state performance indicators, as well as a means for identifying and remediating areas of student weakness.

However, we question the proposal in H.B. 2963 to place an honors designation on the diplomas of pupils "who demonstrate mastery of essential skills." We believe that Q.P.A. should ensure that every graduate will have mastery of essential skills, and that this is an inappropriate use of the term "honors." We would not object to recognizing students who achieve a certain score on an essential skills test at a "mastery" or "honors" level on the students' transcripts.

Finally, we do not support the repeal of open admissions to the state universities for a required preparatory curriculum as proposed in sections three and four of H.B. 2998. Our delegate assembly is not convinced that higher admissions standards will raise the level of student performance. On the contrary, many fear that this step will simply "weed out" or discourage less advanced students who still have a chance at a college education under the open admissions policy.

Thank you for your consideration.

Attain # 8-2



KANSAS NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION / 715 W. 10TH STREET / TOPEKA, KANSAS 66612-1686

Craig Grant Testimony Before
House Education Committee
Monday, February 24, 1992

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am Craig Grant and I represent Kansas-NEA. I appreciate this opportunity to speak in support of the concepts contained in HB 2963.

We certainly support the work of the State Board of Education in establishing essential skills assessment programs for Kansas. This assessment should be one part of a comprehensive assessment program which will identify individual and collective problems in instructional approaches and give us information as to what strategies may need to be changed.

When we begin to put these items in statute, we see that we must be careful. The first obvious item is specifically stating the grade levels when tests are to be administered. The term "appropriate stages" would be better and let the state department determine that grade. As we learned last week, the grade 3 math test will now be given at grade 4 because of problems with the objectives.

We are also worried that the state department is not being given adequate resources to complete this assignment. We do not believe adequate personnel have been allowed to implement the test and the resulting assistance which should accompany such. We bring this to your attention so that when the Department of Education budget is before you, you will remember our problem and vote to appropriate adequate resources.

We believe HB 2963 or some future bill should be expanded even more to provide a comprehensive public policy statement on restructuring plans as the state board is attempting to do. We are pleased that the proposed Task Force on Restructuring and Accountability will be charged with that responsibility. HB 2963 only deals with part of the changes, but we certainly have no problems with those concepts.

We support the concepts in HB 2963 and hope we can continue to coordinate efforts between the State Board of Education and the Legislature to restructure our schools. Thank you for listening to our concerns.