

Approved February 12, 1992
Date

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

The meeting was called to order by SENATOR JOSEPH C. HARDER at
Chairperson

1:30 ~~XX~~ p.m. on Thursday, February 6, 1992 in room 123-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except:

Senator Doug Walker, excused

Committee staff present:

Mr. Ben Barrett, Legislative Research Department
Ms. Avis Swartzman, Revisor of Statutes
Mr. Dale Dennis, Assistant Commissioner of Education
Mrs. Millie Randell, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee:

SB 145 - State educational institutions, student admission qualifications

Opponents:

Mr. Mark Tallman, Coordinator of Governmental Relations, Kansas Association of School Boards
Ms. Jennifer Hanlon, Associated Student Government, Emporia State University
Ms. Kay Coles, Kansas National Education Association
Senator Kenneth D. Francisco
Dr. Phyllis A. Chase, General Director of Curriculum and Instruction, Topeka Public Schools
Mr. Gerald Henderson, Executive Director, The United School Administrators of Kansas
Dr. David DePue, Executive Director, Kansas Council on Vocational Education
Mr. Ladi Hernandez, Education Advisor to the Governor
Mr. Scott Brunner, President, Associated Student Government, Emporia State University (written testimony only)

After the meeting was called to order by Chairman Joseph C. Harder, Senator Frahm moved that minutes of the meeting of February 4 be approved. Senator Kerr seconded the motion, and the minutes were approved.

The Chair called Committee attention to SB 386 (school district income tax fund), a Committee bill carried over from the 1991 session and considered by the Committee at a previous meeting. The Chair informed the Committee that although the bill had been referred separately to both the Education and Ways and Means Committees, the Education Committee is required to take action on it first, because it had been referred to the Education Committee first.

Senator Frahm moved that SB 386 be reported adversely. Senator Montgomery seconded the motion, and the motion carried.

The Chairman announced that the Committee will commence hearing testimony by opponents of SB 145, relating to qualified admissions to post-secondary institutions, and he called upon Mr. Mark Tallman.

Mr. Tallman, Coordinator of Governmental Relations, Kansas Association of School Boards, informed members that although KASB's legislative committee had voted to recommend a modification of its previous position, a large majority of school board delegates voted to retain their previous position of open admissions. Mr. Tallman said that if the legislature should decide to change the present admissions statute, his organization would like some modifications of the bill to make it more acceptable. (Attachment 1)

Ms. Jennifer Hanlon, representing the Associated Student Government at Emporia State University, explained four reasons why Emporia State students oppose the proposed recommendation of qualified admissions. (Attachment 2)

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

room 123-S, Statehouse, at 1:30 ~~xxx~~ p.m. on Thursday, February 6, 1992

SR 91014, originated by Mr. Scott Brunner, President of the Associated Student Government, Emporia, is found in Attachment 3.

Kansas National Education Association spokesperson, Ms. Kay Coles, testified that her organization's opposition to SB 145 is based upon two strong beliefs: 1) all students should have equal educational opportunity, and 2) all students can learn. (Attachment 4)

Senator Kenneth D. Francisco, urging defeat of SB 145, stated that "we must correct the problems in education from the bottom up, not from the top". (Attachment 5)

The General Director of Curriculum and Instruction of the Topeka Public Schools, Dr. Phyllis A. Chase, asserted that the qualified admissions proposal as presented by the Board of Regents overlooks certain factors for assessment, and these include: level of motivation, attitude toward attending college, degree of tenacity, and level of emotional maturity. (Attachment 6) Dr. Chase stated that exclusion is not the road to excellence in Kansas and suggested an emphasis be placed on teaching strategy for professors so as to reach all students.

Dr. Gerry Henderson, Executive Director, The United School Administrators of Kansas, stated that although there has been a steady decrease in the number of members in his organization who favor open admissions, the majority of members still support it. Mr. Henderson called attention, however, to two reasons why U.S.A.'s position on open versus qualified admissions may change. (Attachment 7)

Dr. David DePue, Executive Director, Kansas Council on Vocational Education, called Committee attention to the following factors: 1) the Kansas educational system in many respects has a higher performance rating than most states and most of our neighboring states, 2) the restrictive admissions system has not made a significant difference in student retention nationwide, and 3) our public universities should focus on helping students rather than instigating barriers to their success. (Attachment 8) Dr. DePue further stated that SB 145 will not solve any problems that need to be addressed.

After the Chair called for additional conferees in opposition to SB 145, he recognized Mr. Ladi Hernandez, Education Advisor to the Governor. Speaking on behalf of the Governor, Mr. Hernandez said that SB 145 will not resolve any existing education problems. He said the Governor feels we must correct the problems in the lower and secondary systems prior to correcting any inequity that may be caused by those systems in the higher education institutions.

Speaking as a constituent, Mr. Hernandez gave two reasons why he would never have been admitted into the university had the qualified admissions policy been in force when he was in school: 1) his grades may not have been up to par, and 2) he attended school prior to the 1954 Supreme Court decision. Mr. Hernandez described his role in the education system for the past 37 years and said that although he is aware of the importance of a quality education, SB 145 is not the answer. Mr. Hernandez said he agrees with testimony which has suggested sanctions for those schools which are turning out poor students.

After calling for additional conferees, the Chair opened the meeting for questions.

Responding to a question, Mr. Tallman, KASB, replied that fulfilling the foreign language requirement is a main concern by his organization. Mr. Tallman also indicated that his organization supports an outcomes-based approach as a measurement of success.

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION,
room 123-S, Statehouse, at 1:30 ~~am~~/p.m. on Thursday, February 6, 1992.

Mr. Ayres, Board of Regents, replied that statistics indicate that students who have fulfilled the foreign language requirement perform better on the ACT and generally demonstrate better performance.

The Chair announced an agenda change for next week and informed members that the Committee will meet on Monday, February 10 to complete the hearing on qualified admissions, and he invited all conferees to return for Committee discussion and to respond to questions.

The Chair further announced that the Committee meeting Tuesday, February 11 will commence at 1 p.m. when the Committee will have as its guests Dr. John Augenblick, Denver, a national consultant on school finance; and Dr. John L. Myers of the National Conference of State Legislatures, both of whom will be in town that day. He then adjourned the meeting.

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

TIME: 1:30 p.m. PLACE: 123-S DATE: Thursday, February 6, 1992

GUEST LIST

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ADDRESS</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>
Brilla Scott	Topeka	USA
John Marshall	Topeka	Harris News Service
Tim Carpenter	Lawrence	Lawrence Journal-World
Kim Rodgers	Emporia	Page
Amarda Legendre	Emporia	Page
DICK CARTER	TOPEKA	Pete McGill & Associates
HAROLD P. JES	TOPEKA	AARP-CCTF
Gregory Kenalig	Topeka	League of Women Voters
Shyllish Chase	USD 501	
Charles D. [unclear]	USD 501 #	Topeka Kansas
TED D. AVRES	TOPEKA	KS BOARD REGENTS
Mike Bohnhoff	Topeka	Division of Budget
ERIC Sexton	Wichita	WSU
Susan Peterson	MANHATTAN	KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Jon Soderalo	LAWRENCE	UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS
Ladislav M. Horvath	Topeka	Gov. Office
Jim Edwards	Topeka	KCOLT
Joe [unclear]	"	KCOLT
Jim McBride	"	Observer
Kim Vickers	Topeka	Intern (Karr)
Mable Hill	"	KACC
Katharine Ullrich	Topeka	USA
Dennis Zimmerman	WYSSSES	Gr. Co. Fed. Dev. Council

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

TIME: 1:30 p.m. PLACE: 123-S DATE: Thursday, February 6, 1992

GUEST LIST

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ADDRESS</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>
<i>Jennifer Charles</i>	<i>226 W. 12th Emporia, KS 66801</i>	<i>Emporia State Univ.</i>
<i>Krista Wardell</i>	<i>Topeka</i>	<i>ASK</i>
<i>Tim Nitz</i>	<i>Topeka</i>	<i>ASK</i>
<i>Fran Nash</i>	<i>Emporia, KS</i>	<i>ESU</i>
<i>Greg Farmer</i>	<i>Laurence</i>	<i>Univ. Daily Kansan</i>
<i>Jaquie Dalkes</i>	<i>Topeka</i>	<i>SQE</i>
<i>Dina Brinney</i>	<i>Topeka</i>	<i>Warrens University</i>
<i>Gerald Anderson</i>	<i>Topeka</i>	<i>USA/KS</i>
<i>Denise Aft</i>	<i>Topeka</i>	<i>USA # 500</i>
<i>Kay Cook</i>	<i>Topeka</i>	<i>KNEA</i>
<i>Mark Tallman</i>	<i>Topeka</i>	<i>KASTB</i>



Testimony on S.B. 145
before the
Senate Committee on Education

by

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

February 6, 1992

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, we appreciate the opportunity to comment on Senate Bill 145, which would repeal the "open admission" entitlement for Kansas high school graduates and adopt the Board of Regents proposal for "qualified admissions."

As I indicated last year on this same bill, the debate over state university admission standards has been going on seriously for several years now. As you heard yesterday, individuals and organizations have changed their position on this issue. But when KASB's Legislative Committee voted this year to recommend a modification in our position, a large majority of school board delegates voted to retain the position we have expressed in the past.

We support the current policy of open admissions. However, we believe that if qualified admissions standards are instituted, there should be different standards that are related to each institution's mission. Therefore, we are opposed to SB 145, especially in its current form.

EDUC
2/6/92
A1-1

Let me summarize why I believe our delegates have not been convinced by the Board of Regents' arguments that Kansas admission policy should be changed.

The Regents have argued that admission to the universities should be based on standards that measure high school achievement and/or probability of college success, with the goal of reducing the failure rate of university students. Of course, if the universities are only required to accept students with a high probability of success, their success rate will certainly increase. If Kansas high schools did not enroll students "at risk" of failure, we would certainly have a significant reduction in the high school drop-out rate.

We believe most of our members see this issue as a trade off. It is reasonable to assume that some students will accept the challenge of higher admissions standards to become better prepared. This should reduce the college drop out rate. On the other hand, it is equally reasonable to assume some students will be deterred by those higher standards, and not even attempt college. Some of these students are successful in the current system. We do not know whether more students will be "saved" from dropping out than will be "lost" by being discouraged.

We differ from the proponents of qualified admissions in believing that students should be given a chance at educational progress through admission to college, even if statistics indicate they will probably fail. Many students will not be able to excel in college prep courses, or have the test scores or class rank the universities would prefer. But some will succeed despite the odds. We differ from the proponents of qualified admissions in our evaluation that the benefits of those who succeed outweigh the costs of those who do not.

EDUC
2/6/92
1-2

We do believe that if the Legislature decides to change the state admissions statute, this particular proposal can be made more acceptable. First, many of our members are deeply suspicious of the "exceptions window." Either this window will allow students who have not met the regular criteria admissions on a purely random basis, which would defeat the purpose of higher standards; or it will be used to admit students with "special talents" on a highly subjective basis. It also suggests that universities will continue to need remedial courses.

Second, there is considerable controversy over the foreign language component of the recommended preparatory curriculum, as foreign language may not be required for university degrees. Many of our members question the need and accessibility of this requirement.

Third, we disagree with the provisions in the Regents proposal, reflected in this bill, that impose higher but uniform standards for every state university. If Kansas abandons the uniform entitlement for high school graduates, we suggest it makes more sense to adopt admissions standards that more closely reflect the institutional mission of each university. For example, some institutions might remain open to all high school graduates, which would maintain greater educational opportunity. Others would be allowed to adopt more stringent admission requirements.

Thank you for your consideration of these points. I would be happy to answer any questions.

EDUC
2/6/92
1-3

EMPORIA STATE UNIVERSITY
Associated Student Government

OPPOSITION TO
QUALIFIED ADMISSIONS

Jennifer Hanlon

February 6, 1992

EDUC
2/6/92
A2-1

College students are easily preoccupied by the stress of classes, extra-curricular activities, and their personal lives. Issues that students are extremely concerned about are rare. Qualified admissions at Kansas Board of Regents institutions is one of those rare issues. Throughout the 1991 fall semester Emporia State University students voiced strong opposition to the qualified admissions proposal outlined in Senate Bill 145.

Initially, the members of the Emporia State Associated Students of Kansas advisory board discussed and voted against the qualified admissions proposal. Following that vote, the Associated Student Government passed a resolution in opposition to restricted admissions. In addition, the student senate sponsored an open forum to receive student input regarding the issue. Students expressed an overwhelming amount of opposition to qualified admissions. Clearly, the consensus among Emporia State University students is for the Regent's qualified admissions proposal to fail.

Emporia State students oppose qualified admissions for four reasons. Foremost, students feel that everyone is entitled to an education. Despite previous success or failure all students have the potential to learn. Denying an individual the opportunity to utilize his or her potential is denying an inherent right. Perhaps Kansas is the only state without a qualified admissions proposal, but we are privileged to be a part of a state that recognizes the need to educate its future leaders. ESU students enjoy and cherish the opportunity to study at Emporia State and feel that all future generations are entitled to the same opportunity. In addition, ESU students contend that individuals who pay taxes have a rightful

EDUC
2/6/92
2-2

claim to Kansas higher education. As long as the taxpayers of Kansas finance higher education, they are justified in their expectations to participate in the Kansas educational system.

Secondly, Emporia State students believe an individual's potential and worth cannot be measured by a grade point average or test score. ESU has a number of students that contribute to all facets of university life, who would not be on campus if the proposed restrictions were instituted. Students who did not succeed in high school could succeed in college. The Regent's proposal ignores the fact that some students do not become successful until their college years. Additionally, students who are extremely talented in a specific area are overlooked. For example, a student may be an exceptionally talented artist, but struggles to succeed in English and math. That individual could be a tremendous asset to the institution and may grow academically in the college setting. Proponents of qualified admissions would argue that the 15 percent window takes this situation into consideration. Unfortunately, schools that allow exceptions for special talents primarily admit athletes in the exception category. As a result, talented drama students, debaters, or band members will be overlooked.

The third argument in opposition to qualified admissions involves the location of the root of the problem. A student who must take a remedial class at the college level has not received adequate education at the elementary and secondary level. Making it more difficult to be admitted to a Regent's institution is only a band-aid to a problem that goes much deeper. The Board of

Regent's do not consider that the quality of education at high schools will vary, even with the proposed restrictions. One high school could have an exceptional college preparatory program, while another is just mediocre. The students who attended the exceptional program will clearly be more prepared. As a result Regent's institutions will continue to receive under-prepared students even if they have completed the proposed curriculum. The quality of high school education will remain the same, even though Regents have attempted to change it. ESU students believe the educational system should be stronger. We contend that change must occur on a larger scale and go to the root of the problem, not just the surface. Regent's restrictions may provide a short-term solution, but poor education will continue in the long-term.

Finally, we believe the Regents are acting in an area out of their jurisdiction. If the legislature actually wants change to occur in the high school curriculum the action needs to come from the Board of Education, not the Board of Regents. Genuine change can only come from within. External pressure from other bodies will not serve as a motivator. Such pressure will only result in animosity from lower level institutions, without a genuine desire to change. The result is nothing more than surface level improvement, not better educated students.

Kansas students appreciate the caliber of education provided by Regent's institutions. We also depend on the opportunity to achieve in the area of higher education. College education is a must and no one should be denied the right to succeed.

EMPORIA STATE UNIVERSITY

ASG Opposition to Qualified Admissions

SR 91014

ORIGINATOR: Scott Brunner

University Affairs

SENATE SPONSOR: Senator Kramer

October 31, 1991

Resolution in entirety:

Whereas, Associated Student Government believes the proposed Qualified Admission policy from the Board of Regents is not in the best interest of the future students whom may attend attending Emporia State University;

Whereas, Kansas state-funded universities have traditionally provided a publicly-funded education for high school graduates of the State of Kansas; and

Whereas, Associated Student Government believes the proposed Qualified Admissions, if structured as written, is nothing more than a form of structured racism; and, if implemented, Associated Student Government believes the proposed Qualified Admissions will discriminate against minority students with special talents (i.e., artists, musicians, mathematicians, etc.); and

Whereas, Associated Student Government believes the proposed Qualified Admissions policy discriminates against high school students who do not have a quality college preparatory program available to them in their academic institution; and

Whereas, Associated Student Government believes that instead of dealing with student underpreparation and attrition at an early stage, the proposed Qualified Admissions policy restricts student access to higher education; and

Whereas, Associated Student Government believes the disadvantages of the proposed Qualified Admissions outweigh the advantages and that all students should be allowed an equal opportunity to higher education; now, therefore be it

Resolved, that Associated Student Government opposes the Qualified Admissions proposal set forth by the Board of Regents.

Be it enacted upon the approval of the Student Senate, the signature of the President of Student Senate, and the signature of the President of Associated Student Government.

PASSED FAVORABLY
19 Affirmative
1 Negative
0 Abstain

Jina Blou
PRESIDENT,
STUDENT SENATE

11-21-91

DATE PASSED

APPROVED

G. A. C. R.

PRESIDENT,
ASSOCIATED STUDENT GOVERNMENT

11/21/91

DATE SIGNED

EDUC
2/6/92
A3



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

Testimony before the Senate Education Committee
Kay Coles, Kansas NEA
SB 145
February 6, 1992

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Members of the Committee, I am Kay Coles, here today representing the 24,000 members of Kansas NEA. I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you in opposition to SB 145.

Our opposition to qualified admissions at Kansas' Regents institutions rests in two very strong beliefs of our members: That all students should have equal educational opportunity, and, as stated in the effective schools literature, all students can learn.

Our members believe that closing the door of opportunity to some students is closing the door on too many. Many students wait until late in their education to choose a vocation or profession. Many are underachievers in high school and may perhaps be unable to meet the qualifications listed in SB 145. We do not believe the opportunity to attend a Regents institution should be denied them. While no guarantee of success, open admissions at least provides opportunity.

We, too, have some difficulty with the genesis of qualified admissions recommendations in Kansas. For many years, the Board of Regents supported open admissions. Enrollments were boosted when more students were given the opportunity to try; and enrollments drove budget increases. But a few short years ago when enrollments kept growing and resources began dwindling, the Regents changed their tune. We have often wondered if this conversion was driven by the desire for more academically prepared students, or by the budget squeeze faced by Regents schools. Certainly the Regents institutions have been underfunded for many years.

We also have concerns that the qualified admission standards proposed in SB 145 would be nearly impossible to meet for many of our smaller school districts, and by those whose budgets now are stretched beyond capacity. Adding courses to enable each student to have the opportunity to enroll in all of the pre-college preparatory classes being recommended simply is beyond the financial capability of many school districts. More dollars will have to be added to school budgets.

Kansas NEA members philosophically are opposed to the concept of qualified admissions and would ask you to not support SB 145.

EDUC
2/6/92
A4

KENNETH D. FRANCISCO
STATE SENATOR, 26TH DISTRICT
SEDGWICK AND SUMNER COUNTIES
BOX 488
MAIZE, KS 67101



TOPEKA

SENATE CHAMBER

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS
MEMBER AGRICULTURE
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS &
INSURANCE
GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION
LEGISLATIVE AND CONGRESSIONAL
APPORTIONMENT
JOINT COMMITTEE ON
ADMIN. RULES & REGS

THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS, FOR THIS OPPORTUNITY TO APPEAR IN OPPOSITION OF SENATE BILL 145. AS YOU KNOW, THIS ISSUE HAS BEEN AROUND FOR MANY YEARS AND MOST OF THE ARGUMENTS HAVE BEEN MADE IN PAST HEARINGS. THEREFORE, I WILL TRY TO BE BRIEF.

ASK YOURSELVES TWO QUESTIONS.

1. HOW MANY STUDENTS PRESENTLY ENROLLED IN OUR PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES WOULD NOT MEET THE ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS CONTAINED IN S.B. 145?
2. WHAT PERCENT OF THESE STUDENTS ARE DROPPING OUT?

HOW CAN ANYONE IN THIS ROOM MAKE AN INFORMED DECISION ON THIS ISSUE WITHOUT THIS KNOWLEDGE? HOW DO WE KNOW WHO'S DROPPING OUT! THIS BILL COULD CLOSE THE DOORS OF EDUCATION TO A CATAGORY OF STUDENTS THAT MAY OR MAY NOT BE THE PROBLEM. OUR REMEDIAL COST IN KANSAS IS LOWER THAN MANY STATES WITH SELECTIVE ADMISSIONS. OUR DROP-OUT RATES ARE AS LOW OR LOWER THAN A LOT OF STATES WITH SELECTIVE ADMISSIONS. OUR PARTICIPATION RATE IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN KANSAS IS MUCH HIGHER THAN MOST STATES WITH SELECTIVE ADMISSIONS. OUR HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION RATE IS HIGHER THAN ALMOST ALL STATES WITH SELECTIVE ADMISSIONS. WHERE IS THE BENEFIT?

S.B. 145 WOULD ISOLATE THE REGENTS' SYSTEM FROM THE PROBLEMS WE FACE IN EDUCATION. IT WOULD NO LONGER BE THEIR CONCERN. WE MUST CORRECT THE PROBLEMS IN EDUCATION FROM THE BOTTOM UP, NOT FROM THE TOP.

WHEN A BUILDING IS CRUMBLING, YOU REPAIR THE FOUNDATION, NOT THE ROOF.

I URGE YOU TO DEFEAT THIS BILL.

THANK YOU,

SENATOR KEN FRANCISCO

EDUC
2/6/92
A5-1

STATE OF KANSAS

D. W. RYAN,
DIRECTOR
BEN F. BARRETT,
ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR
EDMUND G. AHRENS,
CHIEF FISCAL ANALYST



STAFF—
LEGISLATIVE COORDINATING COUNCIL
INTERIM COMMITTEES
STANDING COMMITTEES
LEGISLATIVE INQUIRIES

THE LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH DEPARTMENT

ROOM 545-N, STATEHOUSE
PHONE: (913) 296-3181
TOPEKA, KANSAS 66612

January 6, 1992

Senator Kenneth Francisco
P.O. Box 296
Maize, Kansas 67101

Dear Senator Francisco:

You asked that the schools identified as having high school transcripts be surveyed and that a listing be prepared of the academic qualifications held by freshmen dropouts. A survey was sent to the three schools during the fall semester of 1991.

Schools Surveyed: University of Kansas, Fort Hays State University, and Pittsburg State University

You asked that the results of the survey be compared with the proposed "Qualified Admissions Standards" which have been included in 1991 S.B. 145.

The results of this survey may be summarized two ways:

1. number of dropout students who met the qualified admissions standards; and
2. number of dropout students NOT meeting those standards.

The attached table, "Academic Qualifications of Freshmen Dropouts," shows the distributions by category for each school. It is important to note that while some students drop out for academic reasons such as bad grades, other students who dropped may have transferred or left the institution in good academic standing.

I will be happy to visit with you to review the "findings" as presented in the enclosed table. Please let me know when it is convenient for you.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Julian Efir".

Julian Efir
Principal Analyst

JE/jl

Enclosure

EDUC
2/6/92
5-2

ACADEMIC QUALIFICATIONS OF FRESHMEN DROPOUTS

Number of Students Meeting Standards			
	<u>Kansas</u>	<u>Ft. Hays</u>	<u>Pittsburg</u>
<u>A. At Least One Required:</u>			
High School GPA	95	25	22
ACT Score	48	6	7
High School Rank	42	6	9
<u>B. Required Units In:</u>			
English	100	24	12
Math	91	15	14
Social Studies	100	23	23
Science	64	8	12
Foreign Language	57	3	8
Students Qualified a)	36	0	2
Sample Size	100	25	25

a) Meeting at least one of A & all of B

Number of Students NOT Meeting Standards			
	<u>Kansas</u>	<u>Ft. Hays</u>	<u>Pittsburg</u>
<u>A. At Least One Required:</u>			
High School GPA	5	0	3
ACT Score	52	19	18
High School Rank	58	19	16
<u>B. Required Units In:</u>			
English	0	1	13
Math	9	10	11
Social Studies	0	2	2
Science	36	17	13
Foreign Language	43	22	17
Students Deficient	64	25	23
Sample Size	100	25	25

franc90a.wk1

EDUC
2/6/92
5-3

What:

Position Paper
Qualified Admissions Proposal by the Kansas Board of Regents.

Recommended Position:

The Topeka Public Schools unequivocally opposes the qualified admissions proposal in its current form, as well as its formulation process.

Rationale:

Historical Facts:

In 1955, George Baxter Smith, then Dean of the University, completed an ingenuous study of who would be eliminated if a policy of selective admissions were instituted at the University of Kansas. Dean Smith obtained scores on entrance exams for 1,066 of the 1,134 students who graduated from the University in June 1955 and identified those graduates who would not have been admitted if they scored below the 50th percentile, a "cutting score" widely discussed at the time. Two hundred eight students, or roughly one-fifth of the graduating class, would have been eliminated by this criterion. Of these 208 students, 29 were on a dean's scholastic honor roll one semester, while two were for six semesters. A total of 46 were on the honor rolls at least one semester. Perhaps even more striking, Dean Smith discovered that this cutting score would have resulted in a "loss to the state and nation" for "forty teachers, twenty-two engineers, five journalists, seven lawyers, seven doctors, seven pharmacists, and 96 graduates from the college of Liberal Arts and Sciences and the School of Business. Similar results were produced when the study was replicated for 1958 graduates. Dean Smith concluded that because "a free society's survival depends upon the widest and fullest possible development of all its human resources," a policy of selective admissions was the least desirable response to large enrollments. His study was widely read and no doubt played an important part in maintaining support for the open admissions policy.

(Professor Ray Heiner, Assistant Professor of History and Education,
The University of Kansas)

Perceptions:

The Qualified Admissions Proposal as presented by the Kansas Board of Regents is void in an area of profound significance: affective assessment. This area includes assessing the level of motivation, attitude toward attending college, degree of tenacity, and level of emotional maturity of aspiring applicants. The rationale for assessing these affective indices is easily discernable. As one seeks to identify the possible variables that mediated Dean Smith's study, it becomes obvious that arbitrary 50th percentile scores did not accurately predict those students who would not be successful, but actually included students who were academically outstanding in their academic pursuit.

EDUC
2/6/92
A6-1

Motivation, attitude, tenacity, and emotional maturity are affective variables that impact student achievement at any given point on the educational continuum. Can these indices be accurately measured and serve as valid predictors of college success? Probably to no more of a degree than college entrance exams that, by their own admission, are not capable of being culturally free and produce scores with more predictive validity of family wealth than academic success.

There is no one predictor of success in college, or in life. A combination of experiences and circumstances, often internal to the student alone, determines that person's success. This is as it should be in a democratic nation. The issues are complex. The ramifications will be felt ubiquitously with such magnitude as to require our concerted evaluative input in a collaborative fashion as we seek excellence at all levels of education.

Issues:

1. Will the proposed changes enhance or restrict educational opportunity?
2. Do the proposed changes represent a unilateral effort by those in higher education to assert hegemony over secondary education, or do they provide a framework for cooperative decision-making that recognizes the interest and needs of all those involved in Kansas education.
3. In 1987 the Board of Regents termed their proposal as Selective Admissions. This year the term used is Qualified Admissions. Does this change in terminology represent a change in philosophy?

EDUC
2/6/92
6-2



SB 145

February 6, 1992

Testimony presented before the Senate Committee on Education
by Gerald W. Henderson, Executive Director
United School Administrators of Kansas

Mister Chairman and Members of the Committee:

United School Administrators of Kansas rises in opposition to **SB 145** which would abandon the policy of open admissions to Kansas regent institutions. While our surveys of membership have shown a steady decrease in the number who favor open admissions, the majority still support existing law.

Two things have happened, or are happening, which may well change the opinion of the majority of my members. The most significant change is the one under which Kansas will begin to accredit schools based on what students know and are able to do, rather than on the numbers of courses offered and other in-put data. It is my belief that a logical extension of the QPA process will be admissions to universities and colleges based on agreed upon standards of student performance rather than the number of courses completed.

The education community in concert with business and industry and higher education is coming ever closer to reaching agreement on what we as Kansas want from our schools. Agreements are also being reached on the assessments necessary to demonstrate that progress is being made toward delivering what we want. When that is 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. Until that time, I must represent the majority of my members and oppose the provisions of **SB 145**.

My second reason for believing that our organizational position on open versus qualified admissions may change is that meetings are being scheduled between leaders of my association and members of the board of regents to discuss the issue. Who knows what will happen as a result of talking with each other.

Thank you for hearing our concerns.

GWHLEG\SB145

EDUC
2/6/92
A7



KANSAS COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

717 KANSAS AVE • TOPEKA, KANSAS 66603-3811 913-296-2451

J.C. "Cash" Bruner, Chair Business Representative International Assn. of Machinists and Aerospace Workers Wichita

Eddie Estes, Ph.D., Vice Chair President, Western Kansas Manufacturers Association Dodge City

Robert Thiry Executive Committee Member Coordinator, KS Carpentry Apprenticeship Perry

Karen Conklin Market & Survey Research Analyst Johnson Co. Community College Overland Park

Fran Graham Vocational Counselor Johnson County AVTS Olathe Center Olathe

Allene Knedlik Coordinator of Tech Prep Southeast Kansas Tech Prep Consortia Southeast Kansas AVTS Coffeyville

Jule E. Kuhn Counselor/Placement Coordinator Manhattan AVTS Manhattan

Janis Lee State Senator Farmer/Rancher Kensington

D. Joe Mildrexler Dean of Community Services Colby Community College Colby

Carol Nigus, Director Brown County Kansas Special Education Cooperative Hiawatha

Dennis K. Shurtz Agribusiness/Commodities Arkansas City

Mitch Sexton Manager of Training & Quality Programs Jostens School Products Group Topeka

Gary Withrow Employee Relations Manager Morton International Hutchinson

TO: The Honorable Senator Harder, Chairman and Members of the Senate Education Committee

FROM: David L. DePue Executive Director

SUBJECT: Testimony on SB 145 "Qualified Admissions"

DATE: February 6, 1992

Thank you for the opportunity to address this issue. I cannot say that it is a pleasure to be here. I prefer speaking for issues rather than in opposition. However I am speaking for many of your and my constituents. The State Council on Vocational Education serves the U.S. Congress, providing policy advice and oversight on vocational education and training programs in Kansas. Each of our 13 members represents one of the constituents of Education programs.

COMPLIMENTS TO OUR UNIVERSITIES:

The American University is the envy of the world. I understand that approximately half of the world's PhDs were educated here. Many nations send their young to us for their baccalaureate level education. Our universities do an outstanding job with the top 10%, the gifted and highly motivated student. The large lecture sections, the emphasis on research and publication, and the social atmosphere has minimal impact on these students.

COMPLIMENTS TO KANSAS EDUCATORS AND POLICYMAKERS:

Kansas rates significantly better than the national average on all essential indicators of educational achievement.

Table with 8 columns: H.S., 1-3yrs, 4yrs, H.S., Dropouts, A.C.T., Minorities/Enrolled, Average. Rows for Kansas and Nat'l Average.

Kansas has higher statewide high school graduation requirements (21 units) than all but one of our neighbors. Our 30% increase in college enrollments over the past decade compares favorably with the two largest states with their 3% and 6% increases.

EDUC 2/6/92 AS-1

ROOM FOR IMPROVEMENT:

Kansas can boast that 80% of first-time college freshmen enroll on campuses in their home state. However, this is the lowest proportion among the 7 states touching our border (Arizona, Colorado, Missouri and Arkansas have 90% or over in attendance.) While Kansas has 1% of the population of the U.S., we have .9% of the college enrollments (up from .82 in 1988). Minority enrollments at Kansas universities will have to stretch to reach the 10% national increase over the past two years. We still have less than the national average of American Indian, Asian, Black, and Hispanic students enrolled at our universities. Robert Atwell, President of the American Council on Education is concerned that due to tight budgets we may cut recruitment and retention programs for underserved groups. He stated, "We made that mistake in the late 1970's and have been struggling to regain those lost advances."

After a period of concern over lower birth rates, public school enrollments in Kansas and the nation indicate some increase can be expected in first time freshmen applications. Projections are for a 1% increase per year over the next decade. However, experience has shown that the community colleges will see the greatest share of increases. Perhaps the demand for freshman enrollments at Kansas universities will level causing admissions representatives to welcome applications.

WHO COULD BE AGAINST HIGHER STANDARDS?

American workers are facing increased pressure for higher technical skills along with improved oral and written communication skills. The Kansas State Board of Education has responded by moving to an outcomes-based accreditation system. Outdated is the century-old system of counting courses and "seat time". New curricula are being implemented to develop higher order skills and contemporary competencies. Examples include applications oriented subjects: applied math, applied communications, and principles of technology. The focus is on analysis and synthesis rather than "recall" and "number manipulation". For example, math emphasis shifts to problem solving, probability theory, logic, statistics, and measurement systems. A shift back to admissions standards based on a curriculum conceived in 1912 would be foolish. This restricts the ability of the State Board of Education and local boards in efforts to meet the needs of the 50% who do not go to the university and the 50% who do attend and do not complete their studies. We are aware that whatever the Regents prescribes for admission, will become the desired high school curriculum. A liberal arts curriculum does not prepare a young person for a desirable entry level job in today's competitive marketplace.

ADMISSIONS STANDARDS HAVE LITTLE EFFECT ON RETENTION:

The 50 states have a wide variety of requirements for university admission. Yet, 50 years of data show that the 50 states have about the same retention rates. In fact, Kansas universities do better than the national average (43% complete a B.S. in six years nationally).

NATIONAL DATA - FOUR YEAR PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

- 15% of traditional entry path students complete a baccalaureate in four years.
- 43% (approx) of traditional entry path students completed a BS in six years
- 42% of these students dropped out (and did not return)
- 42% of **high ability** low social economic status students dropped
- 20% dropped out before the 3rd semester (18% dropped during 1st year)
- 20% dropped **after** eight semesters (4 years)
- 90% who received a grant during 1st year were still enrolled 2nd year
- 75% who **did not** receive a grant during the 1st year were still enrolled in the 2nd year

HOW TO IMPROVE RETENTION RATES:

Develop highly restrictive admissions criteria. Private universities and "elitist" or "flagship" state universities boast graduation rates of 55 to 77% over five years. Even high school valedictorians are not assured admission. In my experience at four universities, I can report that students drop out primarily because of social, personal, and/or financial problems. These all result in poor academic progress. Approaches to alleviate these problems might include some social restrictions, giving a grant to first year completers who are at risk, and developing learning centers to help with study skills, including: time management, preparing for tests, and career planning. This would be especially helpful as we attempt to serve those with one or more barriers to success. The economically disadvantaged and those with language or cultural challenges.

The challenge of remedial work to meet higher expectations is a national issue. In a Chronicle of Higher Education 1992 report, beginning freshmen were asked if they thought that they will need remedial work. Responding "yes" were 28.7% in mathematics, 12.5% in English, and 11.7% in science. There are no easy answers here.

DATA SOURCES:

- "America's Choice: High Skills or Low Wages", National Center on Education & the Economy, Rochester, NY 1990.
- "Undergraduate Completion and Persistence At Four Year Colleges and Universities", National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities, Washington, D. C. 1989.
- "Almanac" The Chronicle of Higher Education, Washington D. C., 1990, 1992.
- "Minority-Group Enrollment", The Chronicle of Higher Education, Washington, D. C., January 22, 1992.