

Approved: B. Lawrence  
Date

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION.

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Barbara Lawrence at 9:00 a.m. on January 28, 1997 in Room 123-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except:

Avis Swartzman, Revisor  
Committee staff present: Ben Barrett, Legislative Research Department

Others attending: See attached list

Chairperson Lawrence called the meeting to order and informed those who had not been present at the Monday meeting of the two KASB publications that would be available in her office for anyone who would like to use them for reference purposes.

**SB 37**--boards of education and school districts; conferring the power of local control

The chairperson called on Craig Grant, K-NEA, who was present to present a compromise amendment that will relieve the organization's concerns so it can become neutral on the bill. On page 2, line 38, (H.) "School districts may not adopt policies which modify, diminish or reinterpret state or federal laws which affect school district employees."

Senator Oleen moved adoption of the amendment. Senator Downey gave a second to the motion.  
The motion carried.

Senator Downey moved to pass **SB 37** favorably as amended. Senator Oleen gave a second to the motion.  
The motion carried.

**SB 36**--concerning school districts; relating to the duration of short-term suspensions

The Chairperson called for discussion.

One of the committee commented that, as the Committee had just voted on a bill that gave more local control to the communities, this would seem like a good piece of legislation.

Senator Downey moved to pass **SB 36** out favorably. Senator Emert gave a second to the motion.  
The motion carried.

**SB 35**--establishing the Kansas School Board Development Program

Mark Tallman, KASB, appeared as a proponent on the bill. Copies of his testimony were distributed to the Committee. (Attachment I).

Mr. Tallman stated the bill would require each local school board member to earn a minimum of 10 credit hours of board development each year. KASB believes that school board members need more training and information to carry out their duties.

Mr. Tallman gave some history on the bill beginning in 1991. A former House chairman stated he planned to introduce a bill requiring in-service training. He assumed that KASB would oppose the bill. Prior to 1991, Mr. Tallman stated that KASB would have opposed the bill. They informed the chairman that they would support the concept. The bill was introduced, passed both houses of the Legislature, but was then vetoed by Governor Finney. Mr. Tallman ended his testimony by stating that KASB does not believe this legislation would work a hardship on any board member.

Several Committee members volunteered comments. The non-enforcement aspects of the bill were discussed. If a member does not comply with the provisions of the bill, there would be no type of mechanism for penalties or removal of board members.

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, Room 123-S Statehouse, at 9:00 a.m. on January 28, 1997.

One of the Committee asked if there was a fiscal note on the bill. The response was that there will be additional costs associated with implementation of the bill in addition to the FY 1998 Governor's budget.

Mr. Tallman responded to questions regarding in-service training and seminars. Some of these are well attended and others less well attended. Many school districts do a good job with in-service training and the addressing of finances, school laws and so forth.

In response to the number of persons serving on a school board, Mr. Tallman replied that the standard number is seven, with the exception of Ft. Leavenworth which has three members appointed by the base commander.

The Revisor was asked to give an opinion on the bill. She replied that these are elected officials. Without some sort of recall or some other penalty, she doesn't see how this law would be enforced.

The comment was made that many school board members serve but a short time and that sometimes this is the reason they do not take any type of training.

A further comment from one of the members of the Committee was that board members are persons of varying qualifications; it would be good to see them all voluntarily acquire some type of training, but this will not always be the case.

After several further comments, Chairperson Lawrence directed attention to the written testimony of Jacque Oakes, Schools For Quality Education. The organization is in favor of the bill. (Attachment 2).

Ms. Oakes also provided the Committee with the list that had been requested from the previous meeting. (Attachment 3).

The chairperson called on the Committee for action on the bill. No motion was forthcoming.

The Chairperson called for action on the January 22 and 23 minutes.

Senator Oleen moved to amend the minutes of January 22 with qualifying language that she will provide to the Secretary. Senator Lee gave a second to the motion. The motion carried.

Senator Oleen moved to pass out the minutes of January 22 as amended and the minutes of January 23. Senator Emert gave a second to the motion. The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned.



KANSAS  
ASSOCIATION



OF  
SCHOOL  
BOARDS

1420 S.W. Arrowhead Rd, Topeka, Kansas 66604  
913-273-3600

TO: Senate Committee on Education  
FROM: Mark Tallman, Director of Governmental Relations  
DATE: January 26, 1997

**RE: Testimony on S.B. 35 - Kansas School Board Development Program**

Madam Chair, Members of the Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to appear as proponents of S.B. 35, which you introduced at our request. S.B. 35 would require each local school board member to earn a minimum of 10 credit hours of board development each year. Any organization or individual desiring to provide school board development courses, programs or activities which would count toward this requirements would have to be approved by the State Board of Education, which would adopt rules and regulation for the administration of this bill.

The purpose of this bill is simple. KASB supports the improvement of educational opportunities and results for all students. We believe that such improvement can only occur under local control and leadership. As such, we have consistently asked for greater local autonomy for schools under the direction of elected public school board members. In advocating that school board members have more responsibility, we believe school board members will also need more training and information to carry out those duties. We therefore believe that this bill will be beneficial to the students of Kansas.

I want to conclude by discussing some of the arguments in opposition to this bill, as well as offer some history. When I came to work for KASB in 1990, our association had a position against mandatory school board development programs, an idea which was being discussed by several states around the nation. In 1991, KASB reviewed a number of our position in light of the school improvement movement. Our Legislative Committee recommended that we switch our position to support of school board development, and that recommendation was adopted by our Delegate Assembly.

At the beginning of the 1991 session, the new chairman of the House Education Committee, Rep. Rick Bowden, called us in to warn that he planned to introduce a bill requiring that school board members receive inservice training; an idea he assumed that we would oppose (and prior to that year, he would have been correct). To his surprise, we told his we would support the concept. A bill was passed by both houses during the 1991 Legislature session. However, it was vetoed by Governor Joan Finney. In her veto message, she said that no additional conditions should be put on local elected officials.

*Senate Education  
1-28-97  
attachment 1*

We disagree with that argument. This bill does not put new conditions or limitations on who may be elected to serve on school boards. It simply says that once elected, a board member is expected to take steps to be educated on the duties his or her position entails.

Another argument is that KASB will benefit from this bill because board members would be in greater need of training programs, which we provide. We can only respond that many other organizations and individuals also provide such training; that all of these groups (and others) would be equally eligible to do so under this bill; and that KASB would have to compete in this marketplace in order to be successful. If our support for this measure is seen by some as cynical, I can only speculate that, were we in opposition to this concept, KASB would be criticized as self-serving or hypocritical for that stance as well. At least we are prepared to accept greater responsibilities at the same time that we seek greater authority for our members.

We do not believe this measure would work a hardship on any board member. Inservice opportunities could be provided at times and in places convenient for everyone. We urge the committee to support this measure as a means of strengthening local control of public education by ordinary citizens chosen from their communities.

Thank you for your consideration.



---

## Schools for Quality Education

---

Bluemont Hall    Manhattan, KS 66506    (913) 532-5886

January 27, 1997

TO: SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

SUBJECT: SB 35--ESTABLISHING THE KANSAS SCHOOL BOARD  
DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

FROM: SCHOOLS FOR QUALITY EDUCATION

Madam Chair and Members of the Committee:

I am Jacque Oakes representing Schools For Quality Education, an organization of 111 small school districts.

We submit written testimony in favor of SB 35 which would require school board members to earn a minimum of 10 credit hours of board development per year.

Each year the business of school boards developing policy for school districts becomes more complicated. School finance, QPA, and comprehensive school reform are not easy subjects to master. Sometimes time and experience help, but unfortunately the average school board member serves a short time. They need to gain knowlege of their work in as short a time as possible.

School district teachers and employees are required to do inservice. It only seems consistent that school board members should be better trained for their job.

We believe that many board members have been attending seminars and workshops to improve their learning curve, but this bill will certainly hasten the attendance of those members who have not recognized the importance of inservice.

SB 35 represents a significant commitment for personal devlopment on the part of Kansas school board members to ensure educational improvement. Please give your favorable support to this measure.

*Senate Education  
1-28-97*

---

**"Rural is Quality"**

---

*Attachment 2*



---

## Schools for Quality Education

---

Bluemont Hall    Manhattan, KS 66506    (913) 532-5886

January 28, 1997

TO: SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

SUBJECT: SB 37--CONCERNING BOARDS OF EDUCATION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS; CONFERRING THE POWER OF LOCAL CONTROL THEREON; IMPOSING LIMITATIONS

At the request of school districts, the following bills were passed since 1991. There may have been other bills introduced.

1991--SB 47--Authorized school boards to adopt trimester or quarterly calendars.

1991--HB 2070--Authorized school boards to make the determination when mail ballots would be used in question submitted elections.

1992--SB 512--Permits school districts to self insure employees for life insurance.

1993--HB 2036--Authorized school based child care programs.

1993--HB 2236--Authorized school boards to remove their appointees to recreation commissions.

1994--HB 2514--Would permit non-public schools to participate in public school textbook rental programs.

1994--HB 2553--Authorizes school districts to establish "extraordinary school programs."

1996--SB 521--Extend the twelve month payment method to non-certified employees.

1996--HB 2913--Authorizes boards to enter into meal service contracts with non-public schools and child care institutions.

---

**"Rural is Quality"**

*Senate Education*  
*1-28-97*  
*Attachment 3*