

Approved: 4/28/99
Date

MINUTES OF THE SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE.

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Senator Barbara Lawrence at 9:00 a.m. on March 11, 1999 in Room 123-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except:

Committee staff present: Avis Swartzman - Revisor
 Ben Barrett - Legislative Research
 Carolyn Rampey - Legislative Research
 Jackie Breymeyer - Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee: Steve Kearney, Executive Director, Kansas Association Of Area Vocational Technical Schools
 Duane M. Dunn, Ed.D., President, Manhattan Area Technical College
 Craig Grant, Kansas National Education Association
 Mark Tallman, Kansas Association of School Boards
 Jim Edwards, Kansas Chamber of Commerce and Industry
 Senator Pat Ranson

Others attending: See Attached List

Chairperson Lawrence called the meeting to order and stated the hearing on **SB 345** - Kansas postsecondary education program, would continue with representatives of some of the area vocational technical schools. She called on the first conferee, Steve Kearney, Executive Director, Kansas Association of Area Vocational Technical Schools.

Mr. Kearney stated that the Board of Directors has not had an opportunity to meet formally on this matter, but he has received input from Board members that he would share. They believe the bill's provisions deliver opportunities to solve the problems in post secondary education. Those provisions include the coordination of all post secondary educational opportunities, advocacy for the Community Colleges and Area Vocational-Technical schools and the selection of the CEO of the reconstituted Board of Regents, leaving local control in place while providing for oversight, coordination and dispute resolution that is lacking today. In closing, Mr. Kearney asked the committee to address funding in its deliberations, as well as how programs delivered both to secondary and post-secondary student by the Area schools would be addressed. (Attachment 1) He also questioned the shortness of the time frame for bill implementation.

Dr. Duane Dunn, President, Manhattan Area Technical College, presented his testimony (Attachment 2) Dr. Dunn stated that Manhattan Area Technical College has evolved from an area vocational school awarding certificates to an associate degree granting college. Post-secondary student enrollment accounts for over 95% of the student population, with the secondary student enrollment providing the other 5%. He believes that this bill can provide coordination among the universities, community colleges, technical colleges, and area vocational-technical schools. Mr. Dunn's attachment listed several concepts that he would like the committee to consider. He concluded by stating that he believes the time has come to make the move toward a coordinated system of higher education.

Senator Emert asked Dr. Dunn what were the pros and cons of postsecondary education in his area going to the new Board of regents while maintaining the secondary level with the State Board of Education. If 95% of the students and resources are moving to another board, will this be difficult? He would be dealing with a split system.

Dr. Dunn replied that with only 5% of the student population in secondary, there would not be the challenge that there would be with Kansas City or Wichita, because they have a higher percentage of secondary students. The local governance issue might be a question that needs to be gone over with some of the local board members because the local board would be working under two separate boards. Dr. Dunn said he works somewhat independently with the State Board of Education because the funding structure and course approvals don't go through the secondary approval process that a high school or an elementary curriculum funding mechanism does. A lot of policies and procedures are already separate from the secondary procedures with the State Board of Education. He does not believe that this is going to be a real burden for them to work under two separate boards. He is not sure what the local board

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE, Room 123-S Statehouse, at 9:00 a.m. on March 11, 1999.

Senator Emert commented that right now Dr. Dunn's school is under a board that deals in both areas. Would it be reasonable and practical to move all vocational-technical education to the Board of Regents and then let the Board of Regents contract with different school districts to provide the same secondary services that are now being provided.

Dr. Dunn replied that this is done in a way now, because it works just the opposite. The State Board of Education and then the post-secondary element; it would be a reversal. It is a simple matter for them because of such a low secondary enrollment. There may be other issues that he does not have to deal with. The other issue is that there are approximately five area high schools that are developing solid articulation agreements to get the secondary students to complete all their education at their home high school before they come to his school. He believes the coordinating system could spur some of those agreements across the state.

Mark Tallman, KASB, spoke to the bill (Attachment 3), stating that although his organization has very specific positions regarding state supervision and governance of public elementary and secondary schools, several years ago the Delegate Assembly decided to take no position on the questions of postsecondary governance. Although many of these institutions may be members of KASB, the association believes that those institutions should speak through their own advocacy. In closing he stated that the bill should be clarified so that all secondary vocational programs continue to be under the authority of the State Board of Education.

Craig Grant, KNEA, appeared on the bill (Attachment 4) and stated although his organization does not have an official position on the bill, it believes that the bill does meet the criteria their delegates set in the resolution about community college governance. Local boards of trustees should maintain their rights as currently provided under state statute.

Jim Edwards, KCCI, distributed testimony (Attachment 5) and stated the fact that 97% of the employees in Kansas businesses are graduates of Kansas institutions of higher education, have attended one or more of the institutions or will attend or take course work provided by these institutions after they are hired. He asked the committee to keep in mind the protection of the role and responsibilities of local governing boards. The measure should be considered as a separate issue from funding, and initially the measure should be addressed with statutory changes rather than a constitutional change.

Senator Pat Ranson appeared as a conferee and a member of the advisory board at Wichita Technical College. The college works very hard on its mission statement and accreditation. They work cooperatively with Wichita State University and the community colleges in the area and the private colleges to provide the academic courses for the associate degree that the technical colleges can use.

Senator Ranson said that the next step is where they continually have problems. If they are going to thrive and grow and meet the needs of the Wichita community, which is the manufacturing center of the state, they must also meet the needs of the Regents because so many people come to work and receive an education in Wichita. They need to go to the next step. They have been discussing how to get there. Senator Ranson and Senator Lawrence met with a committee of the Chamber of Commerce in Wichita at a business roundtable and discussed the same issue. They are very supportive of the technology in the technical college because they have the expertise, the equipment and know the needs of the business and manufacturing community are. They work very closely with the technical college and with the board, but they are frustrated because they cannot go forward until they become independent, not only of the State Board of Education, but also the local board of education. It has nothing to do with the quality of their local board; they have their hands full with K-12. They are as an afterthought about their needs and direction. If they are truly going to become a technology center of training, which they believe they should be and can be, they need and have the support of the community, certainly the business community. **SB 345** appears to be a step that could be taken that could help toward that independence.

She stated she knew the question to be asked about the sorting of the secondary and post secondary. It is a matter of restructuring some things. The funding will be of great interest. It is one that can be addressed after the governance issue is decided. She is excited about the bill. This is an avenue. If this doesn't happen, we will have to consider what other direction they can go within their community to become more

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE, Room 123-S Statehouse, at 9:00 a.m. on March 11, 1999.

independent. It would be nice to be a part of a state-wide system that is looking at the total picture of post secondary education. She hopes for passage of the bill.

The Chairperson announced that the subcommittee on **SB 345** would meet Friday morning at 8:00 a.m. in Room 423-S. The subcommittee plans to address the issues raised by all the entities at the hearings. Monday the subcommittee's recommendations will be presented to the full committee for discussion. Tuesday will be set aside for continuation of the discussion.

The question was raised about the opportunity to discuss both the bill and **SCR 1613**. Copies of the resolution were distributed.

The comment was made that through some of the testimony on **SB 345**, the resolution was addressed by statements that were made that indicated support for the bill because it did not require a constitutional amendment.

Sheila Frahm, Executive Director, Kansas Association of Community College Trustees, was recognized and stated that two of the community college persons did specifically refer to the resolution

It was also stated by one of the committee that every conferee has indicated in their support that funding is a very important piece of this. It was asked if the subcommittee was looking at funding to go with this change.

The Chairperson responded that, as of this point, no. There may be some people that will come forth with ideas.

A member of the committee added that the House is looking at a proposal that is very similar to this. There are several Representatives that have funding pieces that are coming together that would match up well with this legislation. **SB 345** can be done totally without a funding package. At some point in the discussion the convergence of the two will give the chance for both of these to pass.

It was the Chairperson's impression that in all the other 24 studies, that is the thing that bogged it down.

A further comment of concern was made that when governance and coordination have been spoken of in the past, that was part of the reason there was a problem because of the funding mechanism currently in place. The subcommittee was encouraged to be apprized of the funding pieces that were being considered.

The Chairperson stated that she had spoken with Representative Rinehart, who is spearheading the funding question on the House side. She told those House persons involved that the subcommittee would appreciate a visit from them tomorrow.

Senator Emert stated that when this proposal was originally being developed, the most workable number that came up was 15, which was 5 for each board. What they chose to do was to proceed with the most that could be done without changing the constitution. Hopefully, then, the people of the State of Kansas would propose to take the number nine out and thereafter the Legislature would set that number and then the feeling was still that it should be in the Legislature by statute. What we are at this point is locked in.

In response to a few comments, Senator Emert replied that he does not know if any constitutional amendment has been passed since the State Board of Education was created.

Senator Jones stated that Senators represent a lot of people. When decisions are made that the people have no part in, we sometimes get in a jam and not come back. He does not think we should skirt the people.

The Chairperson stated that they were staying within what the constitution requires with the nine members and designating the congressional districts from which they will come. Nothing has been done to change the constitution. Statutes are changed all the time without the vote of the people.

It was commented that three people representing such a massive organization is not enough.

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE, Room 123-S Statehouse, at 9:00 a.m. on March 11, 1999.

Senator Emert stated that there are nine people that make policy. Nine people vote on the policies for each of those categories. The idea was to have three people dedicated to doing the basic work of developing the information and developing proposed policy, but all nine people vote on every policy. He explained that it is something like Senator Kerr's Ways and Means committee where there is a subcommittee on a department or agency, but the decisions are made by the entire committee.

As there were no further comments, the Chairperson welcomed the committee to attend the subcommittee meeting Friday and adjourned the meeting.

Testimony prepared for the Senate Education Committee

Thursday, March 11, 1999

Steve Kearney, Executive Director
Kansas Association of Area Vocational Technical Schools

Madam Chair and members of the Senate Education Committee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today on behalf of the Kansas Association of Area Vocational Technical Schools.

We are enthusiastic about the possibilities embodied in Senate Bill 345. Our Board of Directors has not had the opportunity to meet formally on this matter, but I have received input from many of our members and would like to share those thoughts with you today. Additionally, Dr. Kirby from the Wichita Area Technical College and Dr. Dunn from the Manhattan Area Technical College are here to provide comment as well.

With the diverse system of post secondary education currently available, the task of coordination has been the overarching problem is delivering post secondary education opportunities that are seamless in nature. We believe that SB 345 contains the following provisions that move toward that seamless system:

- A three member board of the Board of Regents to coordinate all post secondary educational opportunities. Today coordination has been developed between institutions out of necessity and a desire to serve the students with no statewide seamless vision. A Board focused on this responsibility is the most significant missing link in the delivery of post secondary education in Kansas today.
- A three member board providing advocacy for the Community Colleges and Area Schools. We believe that the recognition in this proposal of the significance of technical education, and the focus that such a Board would bring, is critical to our continued service to the students seeking marketable job skills. We would suggest that careful consideration be given to the make-up of such a Board with a emphasis on including members with careers that require the nature and type of education the Area schools provide.
- Another common thread in the responses I have received from our members is the selection of the CEO of the reconstituted Board of Regents. An Executive Director that has a background and true appreciation for a program teaching a welding student the skills necessary for employment in his or her field, and the PHD candidate in Anthropology, will be a challenge to find.

*Senate Education
Attachment 1
3-11-99*

- Leaving local control in place, in recognition of the diverse system of delivery and that a one size fits all, cookie cutter approach does not work in the State of Kansas, while providing for the oversight, coordination and dispute resolution that is lacking today.

In closing, I would ask that you consider in your deliberations how to address adequate funding, how programs that are delivered both to secondary and post-secondary students by the Area schools would be addressed and whether the implementation date of this proposal is too quick to accommodate all the changes required.



The TECHNICAL COLLEGE
MANHATTAN AREA TECHNICAL COLLEGE

Testimony before the
Senate Education Committee

Thursday, March 11, 1999

Duane M. Dunn, Ed.D., President
Manhattan Area Technical College
Manhattan, Kansas

Madam Chair, members of the Senate Education Committee. Thank you for the opportunity to speak before you this morning. My name is Duane Dunn and I am president of Manhattan Area Technical College. This morning I am representing Manhattan Area Technical College as I speak to you, but I also provide you with information I believe my peer institutions would support.

Senate Bill 345 provides an opportunity to move toward a coordinated system of higher education in Kansas. Kansas has a unique structure of institutions that provides diverse options for education and career employment training. Each type of institution is somewhat different in mission, but we are all challenged with providing a service to students who are members of our society. As educators, it is our intent that these students are productive, contributing members of society, and more effective as a result of the education and skills obtained while attending our college, school, or university.

Manhattan Area Technical College has evolved from an area vocational school awarding certificates to an associate degree granting college. We are still in the beginning stages of addressing many issues related to college status, including accreditation, scheduling, curriculum integration, etc., but the evolution has been a positive choice for our students. The opportunity for a student to obtain the associate of applied science degree has provided an avenue of employment and lifelong learning that we could not previously offer. We believe that we must strive to provide students with the most effective method of technical education available, and for the Manhattan area, that is college status. Our post-secondary student enrollment accounts for over 95% of our student population, with the secondary student enrollment providing the other 5%. Articulation arrangements with area high schools provide an opportunity for students to pursue our degree and certificate programs at an advanced level upon high school graduation. These coordinated efforts truly provide a seamless system of education.

*Senate Education
Attachment 2
3-11-99*

I believe Senate Bill 345 can provide a similar arrangement of coordination among the universities, community colleges, technical colleges, and area vocational-technical schools. The need for seamless systems of education has never been more evident. Distance learning opportunities, inverted degree plans, experiential learning processes, and rapid growth of non-traditional student populations combine to increase awareness of a need to work cooperatively in providing students an effective educational choice. It is also a need of our society to provide an efficient method of providing this education.

As you discuss Senate Bill 345, I would ask that you consider the following concepts as benefits and concerns related to Technical Colleges and Area Vocational-Technical Schools:

- The three-member board for community colleges and vocational/technical education will provide advocacy for our institutions.
- The three-member board for higher education coordination will have valuable input towards development and implementation of articulation agreements, development of distance and experiential learning standards, and other lifelong learning issues.
- The system of higher education in Kansas should become a coordinated avenue of information and support for students, employers, and public agencies.
- There remains a need for consideration of adequate funding for all levels of post-secondary education. The three systems involved (universities, community colleges, and technical colleges/schools) currently struggle with inadequate funding for equipment, facilities, personnel, and expansion needs. The funding issue will need to be addressed, or a coordinated system will not become a reality.
- The Executive Director of the state board of regents will certainly be challenged with implementing the needs of this coordinated system of higher education. I encourage the committee to fully evaluate the requirements of this position as advocacy of instruction will need to meet the needs of a technical skill certificate student and the student who is pursuing post-graduate work in arts or sciences. Clear expectations of regent staff responsibilities will be necessary to prevent any of the institutions from being under-represented philosophically during policy and procedure development.
- There is a concern with the implementation date of August 1999 as to facility ownership, fund transfers, funding mechanism adjustments, staff relations and contact development, and information dissemination.

In conclusion, please be aware that I believe the time is upon us to make the move toward a coordinated system of higher education. I have seen the benefits of an evolving institution, and believe similar benefits can be accomplished within Kansas' system of post-secondary institutions. I urge you to move forward with this bill, while considering the issues I have addressed.

Thank you for the time to speak with you today, and I will answer any questions you may have.

KANSAS
ASSOCIATION



OF
SCHOOL
BOARDS

1420 SW Arrowhead Road • Topeka, Kansas 66604-4024
785-273-3600

TO: Senate Committee on Education
FROM: Mark Tallman, Assistant Executive Director for Advocacy
DATE: March 11, 1999

RE: **Testimony on S.B. 345**

Madam Chairman, Members of the Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to express our views on S.B. 345, which would restructure the governance and coordination of postsecondary institutions in Kansas.

Although KASB has very specific positions regarding state supervision and governance of public elementary and secondary schools, several years ago our Delegate Assembly decided to take no position on the question of postsecondary governance. Although many community colleges, technical colleges and vocational schools are members of KASB, our association believes that those institutions should speak through their own advocacy organizations on these important matters.

There is one exception, however. Our members believe that supervision and state approval of *secondary* vocation programs and courses should remain under the control of the State Board of Education, including those secondary vocational programs offered by vocational and technical institutions. We believe that S.B. 345 should be clarified so that all secondary vocational programs continue to be under the authority of the State Board of Education.

We would also suggest that although S.B. 345 might improve the coordination of higher education, there will remain a need to coordinate higher education with K-12 education. The articulation of secondary and postsecondary vocational programs is one example. Others include such areas as dual enrollment in high school and postsecondary programs and Qualified Admissions. Some mechanism to link elementary and secondary education with postsecondary and higher education may be as important as strengthened coordination of postsecondary institutions.

Thank you for your consideration.

*Senate Education
Attachment 3
3-11-99*



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

Craig Grant Testimony Before
Senate Education Committee
Tuesday, March 9, 1999

Thank you, Madame Chair. I am Craig Grant and I represent Kansas NEA. I appreciate this opportunity to visit with the committee about SB 345.

Kansas NEA has faculty members in every community college in the state and in the vocational schools. We are the recognized agent in the community colleges (16 of the 19), in many vocational schools and at Pittsburg State University. Our higher education members have a vested interest in what governance structure is in our state regarding higher education.

Although we do not have an official position on SB 345, we believe that the bill does meet the criteria our delegates set in the resolution about community college governance. In the resolution, our delegates indicate that they believe "that the community college system is an important component of the Kansas education system. KNEA believes that local boards of trustees should govern each Kansas community college. Local boards of trustees should maintain their rights as currently provided by state statute." Our delegates further indicated that the community college should not be governed or controlled by the Kansas Board of Regents.

To the extent possible, we would ask this committee and the legislature to keep this position in mind when working any restructuring of the higher education system. We thank you for listening to our concerns.

*Senate Education
Attachment 4
3-11-99*

LEGISLATIVE TESTIMONY



The Unified Voice of Business

835 SW Topeka Blvd. • Topeka, KS 66612-1671 • 785-357-6321 • Fax: 785-357-4732 • E-mail: kcci@kansaschamber.org • www.kansaschamber.org

SB 345

March 11, 1999

KANSAS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY

Testimony Before the

Senate Education Committee

by

Jim Edwards

Vice President - External Affairs

Madam Chair and members of the Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to appear today and express KCCI's support for SB 345, a bill which would enhance the coordination of higher education in Kansas. The Kansas business community's involvement in this arena stems from the fact that close to 97% of the employees in Kansas businesses are graduates of Kansas institutions of higher education, have attended one or more of the institutions or will attend or take course work provided by the institutions after they are hired.

The Kansas Chamber of Commerce and Industry (KCCI) is a statewide organization dedicated to the promotion of economic growth and job creation within Kansas, and to the protection and support of the private competitive enterprise system.

KCCI is comprised of more than 3,000 businesses which includes 200 local and regional chambers of commerce and trade organizations which represent over 161,000 business men and women. The organization represents both large and small employers in Kansas, with 47% of KCCI's members having less than 25 employees, and 77% having less than 100 employees. KCCI receives no government funding.

The KCCI Board of Directors establishes policies through the work of hundreds of the organization's members who make up its various committees. These policies are the guiding principles of the organization and translate into views such as those expressed here.

*Senate Education
Attachment 5
3-11-99*

With this in mind, Kansas must have a system of higher education coordination that meets the demands of those, that in the end, will provide the work opportunities being sought. With this statement I am not saying that our current system is broke. I am saying though that change in business is as common as are monthly financials. These changes must be met with changes in support structures if we expect our economic engine to continue to run strong. This proposal and the changes it makes must be viewed as the ones needed for this time and place. Will other changes need to be made down the road? Well, unless the system of higher education in the state is unlike every other facet of life, there will be other changes that need to be made down the road. The phrase that "the only constant in life today is change" has more meaning today than yesterday but most likely, less than it will tomorrow.

We believe the following items should also be kept in mind when addressing this issue.

- Any measure dealing with the coordination and or governance of higher education should protect the role and responsibilities of local governing boards
- This measure should be considered as a separate issue from the financing of higher education
- Initially, this measure should be addressed with statutory changes rather than constitutional change

We are supportive of the concepts embodied in SB 345 and urge your support. I would be happy to field questions that you might have.