

MINUTES OF THE HOUSE HIGHER EDUCATION.

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Lisa Benlon at 3:30 p.m. on January 17, 2001 in Room 231-N of the Capitol.

All members were present.

Committee staff present: Carol Rampey, Kansas Legislative Research Department
Paul West, Kansas Legislative Research Department
Stuart Little, Kansas Legislative Research Department
Avis Swartzman, Office of the Revisor of Statutes
Dee Woodson, Committee Secretary

Others attending: See attached sheet.

Chairperson Benlon opened the meeting by asking the staff to brief the Committee on SB 345 (1999), Kansas Higher Education Coordination Act, that was passed two years ago. Carolyn Rampey, Principal Analyst for the Legislative Research Department, said that SB 345 (1999) was passed after many years of studies being done, including studies of dividing the state into regions for purposes of taxes to support community colleges so the taxes weren't just confined to the counties where the colleges were located. She testified that there were also some studies to divide the Board of Regents, in which part of it would be for the universities and part for the community colleges. She further stated there were numerous studies made over several years that could possibly be made to come up with every kind of solution of how to better coordinate and better fund post-secondary education. (Attachment 1)

Ms. Rampey further explained that in the 1999 Session there seemed to be sort of the political will to get it done that year. She said SB 345 (1999) was a bi-partisan effort by both the House and the Senate, it had the support of the Board of Regents, and the support of the institutions that were affected. She described to the Committee what the bill did, so they could have a sense of how the higher education landscape presently looks. She explained the bill made some major changes which included the change in the Board of Regents, how some of the institutions were supervised and coordinated, and funding for the community colleges and Washburn University. She said in addition the legislation will institute performance funding within a few years and tie money directly to whether institutions meet established guidelines or standards for performance.

Ms. Rampey said SB 345 (1999) abolished the Board of Regents that existed prior to July 1, 1999, and in its place created an almost identical Board, as this was a constitutional Board and the statutes then add further specifications about its composition and so on. She further explained that what that meant was the terms of the current Board members ended, and in order to insure continuity the Governor re-appointed those members whose terms were not up. Ms. Rampey clarified that the bill gave additional duties to the new Board, but it did not change the relationship between the Regents to the state universities in so far as how they are governed. She said that what did change was the supervision of the community colleges, the area vocational schools and the technical colleges; which all have their own local governing boards and had previously been under the supervision of the Board of Education. They were transferred to the Board of Regents, and that was in an effort to move all post-secondary schools under one Board so that coordination would be enhanced. She referred the Committee to the organizational chart in her handout, and explained the chart for responsibility areas and supervision breakdown.

Ms. Rampey went over the three commissions into which the new State Board was divided and consists of one for community colleges, area vocational schools, and technical colleges; one for the six state universities; and one for higher education coordination. She referred the Committee to Attachment 1 within her written testimony which outlined the specific duties of the three commissions. She also reviewed the history of funding and state aid for community colleges, and how it was changed with the passage of SB 345 (1999). She referred the Committee to Attachment 2 of her written testimony, and said that this bill was a property relief bill, and that was how it was promoted and why it was supported. Ms. Rampey had various tables included in her written testimony relating to the community colleges for

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE, Room 231-N of the Capitol at 3:30 p.m. on January 17, 2001.

their mill levies, property tax revenues, and state funding for FY 2000 and FY 2001. She pointed out that the mill levies had been reduced in 14 of the community colleges, and eight of them reduced them by more than two mills. The five that didn't reduce their mill levies kept the increase to under one mill. She also clarified the table showing the increased assessed valuations, and said that of the 14 community colleges that reduced their rates, five actually generated more property tax revenue than the year before. Ms. Rampey explained the table on State Funding for Community Colleges FY 2000 and FY 2001. She said that the basis for Washburn University operating grant was the same as that for community colleges, and will increase from 50% of the State General Fund appropriation for an FTE lower-division student at the regional universities in FY 2001 to 65% in FY 2004. She also stated that the out-district tuition from counties and townships in Shawnee County outside the City of Topeka would be phased out beginning in FY 2001 and ending in FY 2004, and will be replaced by state aid as part of the operating grant.

Ms. Rampey related that the Regents' faculty salaries will increase by the same amount that the community colleges will receive from operating grants, excluding state aid replacement for county out-district tuition. She said this enhancement would end in FY 2004 when the community college operating grant was fully implemented. She referred the Committee to Attachment 3 of her written testimony, and asked Paul West from the Research Department staff to explain the table in regard to the Governor's recommendation. Mr. West went over the figures in the table, and said that Columns 2 and 4 should be corrected to read FY 2001. Questions and discussion followed regarding the faculty salary increases, history of the bill, and Johnson County's concession on the funding in order to be fair with other community colleges.

Ms. Rampey continued with her overview by referring the Committee to page 5 of her written testimony, and explained performance funding and the statutory charge to the Legislative Educational Planning Committee to monitor the Kansas Higher Education Coordination Act and make annual reports to the Legislature.

The Chair opened the meeting up for general questions and discussion. Representative Kuether asked Ms. Rampey about **SB 08** regarding the operating grant bill for Washburn University. Ms. Rampey referred the Committee to page 3, middle of the last paragraph, concerning the community college funding mechanisms, and Washburn wants to make it the higher of the two prior years instead of the current and prior year. She said the community colleges have a provision that lets the Board of Regents do an adjustment at the very end of the year when they finally know what the enrollment was for that year. She stated Washburn didn't like the fact a college would have to wait till the end of the year to find out what they are going to get so they want to use the enrollment of the two prior years that are known numbers and that way the college knows going into the year which year was the higher. She added that in terms of state aid it really has no long term effect, and it's an administrative thing. She said the Regents did not oppose it, and the community colleges are not interested in making a change in their funding formula because they like theirs the way it is now.

Representative Storm asked for clarification regarding the difference between the vocational technical colleges' two year associate's degrees and the Certificates of Completion awarded at area vocational technical schools. Ms. Rampey responded that the four technical colleges were previously area vocational technical schools that got comprehensive, and those are Manhattan, Flint Hills, Wichita, and Beloit. She added that Goodland would be added to that list after passage of **HB 2001**. She explained that the area vocational schools did not offer the general education part that would entitle them to be an associate degree institution, and they awarded Certificates of Completion. These schools had articulation agreements with community colleges and four year institutions so their students could start with them and have to transfer to get a degree.

Questions continued from Committee members regarding the merging of Pratt Community College with Fort Hays State University which is being handled by the Commission on Coordination, funding for area vocational schools not resolved in the 1999 bill, SB 345, (the institutions report that they are presently in a crisis situation due to enrollment growth), and the vocational adjustment that shifted money from Johnson County to the community colleges as explained in Ms. Rampey's written testimony on page 4.

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE, Room 231-N of the Capitol at 3:30 p.m. on January 17, 2001.

Chairperson Benlon announced that the next meeting would be on Monday, January 22, and the Committee would be having hearings on three bills which were shown on the copied agendas handed out to each Committee member.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 4:30 p.m. The next meeting of the House Higher Education Committee will be Monday, January 22, Room 231-N at the Capitol.

HOUSE HIGHER EDUCATION COMMITTEE GUEST LIST

DATE 1-17-01

NAME	REPRESENTING
Joseph Emmons	KBOR
Haye Shaw	KADCT
Andy Shaw	Kearney Law Office
Greg Watt	Emporia State
John Scott	Emporia State Univ.
MARK DESETTI	KNEA
John D. Pinga	Washburn Univ.
Bob Vancouver	Jo County Community College
Barb Reavis	KWIP Council
Rebecca Reed	KDA
Robin Lehman	Individual
SUE PETERSON	K-STATE
Claire Frisbie	Div. of Budget
DICK CARTER, JR	KBOR
Jim Sexton	W S U
Debra Prideaux	FHSU
Jacob Lurisher	Rep. Mary Cook
Aurica Balmas	intern

January 16, 2001

To: House Committee on Higher Education

From: Carolyn Rampey, Principal Analyst

Re: Overview of the Kansas Higher Education Coordination Act

The Kansas Higher Education Coordination Act was enacted by the 1999 Legislature as SB 345 and made major changes in the role of the State Board of Regents and how postsecondary institutions were supervised and coordinated. It changed the way community colleges and Washburn University were funded and, beginning in FY 2003, provides for all public postsecondary institutions to receive funding on the basis of performance indicators.

The State Board of Regents—Governance, Supervision, and Coordination

1999 SB 345 abolished the State Board of Regents that existed prior to July 1, 1999, and replaced it with a new nine-member Board appointed by the Governor that had the same statutory responsibilities as the old Board. In order to ensure continuity, the Governor reappointed members of the old Board whose terms were not up. The chairperson of the old Board also continued to serve as chair during the first year of the new Board. SB 345 made no change to the relationship between the State Board of Regents and the six state universities that it governs.

What SB 345 did change was the relationship between the State Board and the community colleges, area vocational schools, and technical colleges that had been under the supervision of the State Board of Education. These institutions, which are under the **governance** of locally-elected boards, were placed under the supervision of the Board of Regents. Washburn University, which also has its own governing board, already was under the Board of Regents for budgetary and coordination purposes. The administration of adult basic education and adult supplementary education programs and the regulation of proprietary schools also was transferred from the State Board of Education to the State Board of Regents.

The distinctions among governance, supervision, and coordination are important. Governance is the strongest level of control and involves selecting the institutional head and being responsible for the operation and management of the institution. Supervision is a lesser form of control and generally involves establishing or administering guidelines, procedures, and standards, which may be statutory, within which an institution operates.

House Higher Education
1-17-01
Attachment 1

Coordination usually is a lesser form of control and may even be voluntary on the part of the institution.

Changes to the State Board of Regents

In addition to making the State Board of Regents the supervisory board for the community colleges, area vocational schools, and technical colleges, SB 345 added a coordinating component which gives it the ability to do statewide planning and to develop a statewide database encompassing all of postsecondary education, including Washburn University and the private colleges and universities. The new State Board is divided into three commissions—one for community colleges, area vocational schools, and technical colleges; one for the six state universities; and one for higher education coordination. Each commission has three members and, upon appointment to the Board, each member of the Board is assigned to one of the commissions. The commissions are advisory to the Board, which is, by virtue of the *Kansas Constitution* and state statutes, the policymaking body. When SB 345 was under consideration, dividing the State Board into commissions was thought to be a way for the State Board to handle its greatly-increased workload, although in practice the entire Board has met when the commissions meet. But, more importantly, the commissions were viewed as a way to guarantee that the interests of community colleges, area vocational schools, and technical colleges would be represented before the State Board and that the new coordination function would have the same prominence and visibility as governance and supervision. The duties of the commissions are shown in Attachment 1.

The State Board of Regents is charged with the following specific duties:

- Adopt and administer a comprehensive plan for coordination of higher education;
- Determine institutional roles and review institutional missions and goals;
- Develop articulation procedures among and between postsecondary institutions;
- Approve or disapprove for state funding purposes existing and proposed educational programs, courses of instruction, and program and course locations;
- Review budget requests and present a unified budget for higher education to the Governor and to the Legislature each year;
- Approve core indicators of quality performance for postsecondary educational institutions;

Attachment 2

Three-Year History of Community College Mill Levies*

	<u>1998</u>	<u>Change from Prior Year</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>Change from Prior Year</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>Change from Prior Year</u>
Allen County	22.18	0.96	22.34	0.16	19.51	(2.83)
Barton County	33.11	1.28	34.67	1.56	30.75	(3.92)
Butler County	20.32	(0.76)	19.76	(0.56)	17.13	(2.63)
Cloud County	28.30	(1.66)	28.37	0.07	27.24	(1.13)
Coffeyville	37.80	1.59	38.37	0.57	37.53	(0.84)
Colby	24.86	1.44	27.42	2.56	25.03	(2.39)
Cowley County	21.86	2.89	22.76	0.90	19.97	(2.79)
Dodge City	25.56	0.01	25.56	0.00	25.99	0.43
Fort Scott	20.39	(0.05)	22.14	1.75	19.64	(2.5)
Garden City	16.74	(0.10)	18.57	1.83	18.53	(0.04)
Highland	17.26	(6.54)	17.26	0.00	14.84	(2.42)
Hutchinson	21.60	2.29	23.47	1.87	21.49	(1.98)
Independence	34.71	1.41	35.95	1.24	36.82	0.87
Johnson County	7.75	(0.79)	7.18	(0.57)	7.65	0.47
Kansas City	16.86	(0.31)	17.42	0.56	18.35	0.93
Labette	23.15	(0.66)	24.97	1.82	24.47	(0.50)
Neosho County	30.44	(1.87)	29.96	(0.48)	27.84	(2.12)
Pratt County	38.35	(0.51)	39.28	0.93	39.86	0.58
Seward County	26.85	1.21	27.40	0.55	26.92	(0.48)
Low	7.75		7.18		7.67	
High	38.35		39.28		39.86	
Average	24.64	(0.01)	25.41	0.77	24.19	(1.22)

* Does not include county levies for out-district tuition.

Source: State Board of Regents.

The table shows that 14 community colleges reduced their millage rates for 2000, with eight of the institutions reducing their rates by 2 mills or more. The five community colleges that increased their mill levies kept the increases to under 1 mill. In comparison to prior years, three community colleges lowered their levies in 1999 and ten lowered them in 1998.

The following table shows the actual amounts of revenue generated by community college mill levies in 1999 and 2000.

Board with respect to the approval or disapproval of such programs, courses, and locations;

- Review requests of community colleges, area vocational schools, and technical colleges for state funding and formulate recommendations thereon;
- Identify core indicators of quality performance for community colleges, area vocational schools, and technical colleges;
- Develop an annual policy agenda for community colleges, area vocational schools, and technical colleges;
- Conduct continuous studies and make recommendations concerning ways to best use resources available for institutions under its jurisdiction; and
- Make reports on the performance of its functions and duties together with any proposals and recommendations at each regular meeting of the Board of Regents.

Commission for Higher Education Coordination

- Conduct continuous review and evaluation of the comprehensive plan for coordination of higher education and make recommendations for amendment, revision, or modification of the plan;
- Review existing and proposed educational programs, courses of instruction, and program and course locations and make recommendations to the Board with respect to the coordination of programs, courses, and locations;
- Collect and analyze data and maintain a uniform postsecondary education database;
- Formulate recommendations for the resolution of conflicts among and between postsecondary educational sectors and institutions;
- Compile core indicators of quality performance for all of the postsecondary educational institutions under the Board's jurisdiction;
- Broker affiliations and mergers of postsecondary educational institutions;
- Coordinate with Washburn University and the private colleges and universities in developing a state system of higher education; and
- Make reports on the performance of its functions and duties together with any proposals and recommendations at each regular meeting of the State Board of Regents.

- Resolve conflicts among and between postsecondary educational institutions;
- Develop and implement a comprehensive plan for the utilization of distance learning technologies;
- Develop each year and recommend to the Governor and the Legislature a policy agenda for higher education that assesses priorities among proposals for policy change, programmatic recommendations, and state funding requests;
- Conduct continuous studies of ways to maximize the utilization of higher education resources and of how to improve access to postsecondary education;
- Receive and consider reports, proposals, and recommendations of commissions that are advisory to the Board and take such actions thereon as are deemed necessary or appropriate; and
- Make annual reports on its functions and duties to the Governor and the Legislature.

Community College Funding

Until the passage of SB 345, community colleges received most of their state aid on the basis of payment for each credit hour generated. Counties were assessed "county out-district tuition" for each credit hour taken by a county resident who took a course from a community college located in another county, a payment which the state matched. Beginning in FY 2001, community college funding is on the basis of operating grants equal to 50 percent of the appropriation from the State General Fund for a full-time equivalent (FTE) lower-division student at the regional state universities (Emporia, Fort Hays, and Pittsburg) multiplied by the higher of the community college's FTE enrollment the current or prior year. The community college funding mechanisms existing at the time SB 345 was enacted were abolished and a hold-harmless provision ensures that no community college gets less in FY 2001 than in FY 2000. The operating grants will increase by 5 percentage points each year until FY 2004, when the grants will equal 65 percent of the State General Fund appropriation per lower division student at the regional state universities. County out-district tuition is being phased out in even increments over the four-year period beginning in FY 2001 and ending in FY 2004. State aid will replace the lost revenue and will be included in the operating grant for each community college. Beginning in FY 2001, community colleges have to use at least 80 percent of increased state aid, excluding state aid replacement for out-district tuition and adjustments for vocational education payments, to reduce their mill levies.

The vocational education adjustment referred was an amendment to SB 345 made by the 2000 Legislature. When SB 345 was enacted, the Legislature was aware that the legislation needed to be fine tuned and included in the bill the requirement that the State Board of Regents conduct an analysis of the funding mechanisms for community colleges and Washburn University and make a report of its findings to the Governor and the Legislative Educational Planning Committee by December 1, 1999.

The community colleges and the State Board worked out an adjustment to the community college state aid distribution formula that basically shifts money among the institutions so that more money goes to relatively poorer institutions. (The proposal was contained in HB 2996, which was enacted by the 2000 Legislature.) With the adjustment, those schools that, prior to the enactment of SB 345, received vocational funding at the rate of 1.5 times the rate for academic courses will receive, over the four-year period from FY 2001 to FY 2004, payment for vocational courses equal to 1.75 times the academic course rate. This change shifts money from those community colleges that received vocational funding at 2.0 times the academic hour rate because they were designated area vocational schools to institutions that received vocational funding at the lower rate and was viewed by the community colleges as an equalizing measure that made SB 345 more palatable. (The basic operating grant mechanism that makes community college funding a percentage of funding for the regional universities was not changed by the vocational adjustment.)

Attachment 2 consists of two tables that show the impact of SB 345 on community college mill levies and a table that compares funding for community colleges for FY 2000 and FY 2001, the first year of the new funding mechanism.

Washburn University

The basis for the Washburn University operating grant is the same as that for community colleges and will increase from 50 percent of the State General Fund appropriation for an FTE lower-division student at the regional universities in FY 2001 to 65 percent in FY 2004. Out-district tuition from counties and townships in Shawnee County outside the City of Topeka will be phased out beginning in FY 2001 and ending in FY 2004 and will be replaced by state aid as part of the operating grant.

Regents Faculty Salary Increases

Whatever the dollar amount of the increase community colleges will receive from operating grants, excluding state aid replacement for county out-district tuition, the same amount will be given to state universities for faculty salary increases over and above normal operating budget increases. This enhancement will end in FY 2004 when the community college operating grant is fully implemented.

Attachment 3 shows the Governor's recommended FY 2002 funding for SB 345 for community colleges, Washburn University, and the faculty salary enhancement pool for state universities.

Performance Funding

Beginning in FY 2003, all public postsecondary institutions under the jurisdiction of the State Board of Regents (state universities, community colleges, area vocational schools, technical colleges, and Washburn University) will be eligible for state funding based on performance indicators selected and approved by the State Board of Regents for each institution. In FY 2002, the institutions will implement institutional improvement plans and show how they will measure their performance on each indicator. Institutional improvement plans have to be revised at least every three years. Beginning in FY 2003, and annually thereafter, the Legislature will make an appropriation for performance funding to the State Board. The Board will allocate the funding on the basis of the indicators. An institution could receive a performance funding grant of up to 2.0 percent of its State General Fund appropriation the prior year. (Funding for area vocational schools and technical colleges will be based on total funding for the postsecondary state aid program the prior year.)

Legislative Monitoring

The Legislative Educational Planning Committee has a statutory charge in SB 345 to monitor the Kansas Higher Education Coordination Act and make annual reports, including any recommendations and proposed legislation to the Governor and the Legislature.

Commission for the State Universities

- Propose rules and regulations to the State Board concerning the operation and management of the state universities;
- Initiate plans for institutional advancement and new educational programs and courses of instruction;
- Formulate budget requests for the state universities;
- Make recommendations to the Board with respect to the appointment of chief executive officers of the state universities;
- Review existing educational programs and courses of instruction at the state universities and make decisions with respect to the educational and economic justification for the programs and courses;
- Develop an annual policy agenda for the state universities;
- Conduct continuous studies of ways to best use resources available for state universities;
- Make reports on the performance of its functions and duties together with any proposals and recommendations at each regular meeting of the State Board of Regents; and
- Identify core indicators of quality performance for state universities.

Commission for Community Colleges and Vocational/Technical Education

- Propose for adoption by the State Board rules and regulations for supervision of the community colleges, area vocational schools, and technical colleges;
- Initiate plans for institutional advancement and new educational programs and courses of instruction;
- Provide for statewide planning for community colleges, area vocational schools, and technical colleges;
- Review existing and proposed educational programs, courses of instruction, and program and course locations and make recommendations to the

Property Tax Revenues Generated by Community Colleges

	1999			2000			Changes in Revenue Generated From Prior Year
	Mill Levy	Assessed Valuation	Revenue Generated	Mill Levy	Assessed Valuation	Revenue Generated	
Allen County	22.34	\$ 63,830,932	\$ 1,425,983	19.51	\$ 67,207,233	\$ 1,311,213	\$ (114,770)
Barton County	34.67	143,432,223	4,972,795	30.75	155,824,756	4,791,611	(181,184)
Butler County	19.76	306,925,001	6,064,838	17.13	333,953,071	5,720,616	(344,222)
Cloud County	28.37	55,329,691	1,569,703	27.24	57,638,016	1,570,060	357
Coffeyville	38.37	95,771,735	3,674,761	37.53	104,956,920	3,939,033	264,272
Colby	27.42	63,666,311	1,745,730	25.03	68,253,874	1,708,394	(37,336)
Cowley County	22.76	162,764,937	3,704,530	19.97	175,594,895	3,506,630	(197,900)
Dodge City	25.56	181,380,038	4,636,074	25.99	185,666,703	4,825,478	189,404
Fort Scott	22.14	63,144,612	1,398,022	19.64	66,774,837	1,311,458	(86,564)
Garden City	18.57	336,069,484	6,240,810	18.53	357,488,391	6,624,260	383,450
Highland	17.26	48,849,686	843,146	14.84	54,517,125	809,034	(34,112)
Hutchinson	23.47	377,851,302	8,868,170	21.49	398,435,188	8,562,372	(305,798)
Independence	35.95	87,510,972	3,146,019	36.82	88,037,006	3,241,523	95,504
Johnson County	7.18	4,840,592,440	34,775,454	7.65	5,472,074,811	41,861,372	7,085,918
Kansas City	17.42	749,227,552	13,051,544	18.35	758,855,352	13,924,996	873,452
Labette	24.97	93,048,630	2,323,424	24.47	98,418,540	2,408,302	84,878
Neosho County	29.96	69,254,683	2,074,870	27.84	71,597,036	1,993,261	(81,609)
Pratt County	39.28	75,690,939	2,973,140	39.86	74,800,000	2,981,528	8,388
Seward County	27.40	191,884,503	5,257,635	26.92	197,106,855	5,306,117	48,482
TOTAL		<u>\$ 8,006,225,671</u>	<u>\$ 108,746,648</u>		<u>\$ 8,787,200,609</u>	<u>\$ 116,397,258</u>	<u>\$.7,650,610</u>

Source: State Board of Regents and Kansas Association of Community College Trustees.

As the table shows, almost all the community college districts went up in assessed valuation. Thus, a reduction in the mill levy rate might not necessarily mean that less revenue was generated. In spite of an average mill levy rate reduction of 1.22 from 1999 to 2000 for the institutions overall, the amount of revenue generated in 2000 is estimated to be about \$7.7 million more than in 1999. (A large part of the increase is attributable to Johnson County.) In fact, of the 14 community colleges that reduced their rates, five actually generated more property tax revenue than the year before.

01-10

State Funding for Community Colleges FY 2000 and FY 2001

	FY 2000	Estimated FY 2001							
	Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 3	Col. 4	Col. 5	Col. 6	Col. 7	Col. 8	Col. 9
		Vocational Funding Phase In	State Operating Grant	Total State Aid	Increase Over Prior Year	25 Percent County Out-District Tuition	Net Increase in State Aid	Property Tax Relief*	Enhancement Funding**
Allen County	\$ 2,172,806	\$ 13,039	\$ 2,579,142	\$ 2,592,181	\$ 419,375	\$ 87,933	\$ 331,442	\$ 254,722	\$ 76,720
Barton County	4,320,563	55,006	5,128,551	5,183,557	862,994	118,431	744,563	551,646	192,917
Butler County	7,558,940	69,681	8,972,536	9,042,217	1,483,277	501,357	981,920	729,791	252,129
Cloud County	2,979,389	24,444	3,536,564	3,561,008	581,619	215,769	365,850	273,125	92,725
Coffeyville	1,139,070	17,141	1,352,087	1,369,228	230,158	40,374	189,784	138,114	51,670
Colby	2,082,657	24,629	2,472,134	2,496,763	414,106	145,542	268,564	195,148	73,416
Cowley County	4,183,415	0	4,965,755	4,965,755	782,340	256,692	525,648	420,518	105,130
Dodge City	1,964,255	0	2,331,590	2,331,590	367,335	61,863	305,472	244,378	61,094
Fort Scott	2,034,866	25,664	2,415,406	2,441,070	406,204	114,246	291,958	213,035	78,923
Garden City	1,879,502	44,986	2,230,987	2,275,973	396,471	88,641	307,830	210,275	97,555
Highland	2,801,434	10,607	3,325,330	3,335,937	534,503	198,690	335,813	260,165	75,648
Hutchinson	4,022,490	0	4,774,735	4,774,735	752,245	173,259	578,986	463,189	115,797
Independence	1,110,917	9,415	1,318,669	1,328,084	217,167	40,710	176,457	133,634	42,823
Johnson County	12,647,396	0	15,012,884	15,012,584	2,365,188	247,480	2,117,708	1,694,166	423,542
Kansas City	4,288,036	55,528	5,089,941	5,145,469	857,433	158,454	698,979	514,761	184,218
Labette	1,743,363	26,192	2,069,389	2,095,581	352,218	47,682	304,536	222,675	81,861
Neosho County	1,371,948	14,879	1,628,516	1,643,395	271,447	67,578	203,869	151,192	52,677
Pratt County	1,508,159	0	1,790,200	1,790,200	282,041	86,322	195,719	156,575	39,144
Seward County	1,126,074	21,853	1,336,661	1,358,514	232,440	53,118	179,322	125,975	53,347
TOTAL	\$ 60,935,280	\$ 413,064	\$ 72,330,777	\$ 72,743,841	\$ 11,808,561	\$ 2,704,141	\$ 9,104,420	\$ 6,953,084	\$ 2,151,336

* 80 percent of net increase, minus vocational funding phase in.

** 20 percent of net increase, minus vocational funding phase in.

Source: State Board of Regents.

Attachment 3

SB 345 Funding

<u>Item</u>	<u>Agency Request FY 2002</u>	<u>Change From FY 2001</u>	<u>Governor's Rec. FY 2002</u>	<u>Change From FY 2001</u>
Community College Operating Grants	\$ 85,174,486	\$ 11,087,568	\$ 85,174,486	\$ 11,087,486
Municipal University Operating Grant	11,567,972	2,297,561	10,594,032	1,323,621
Faculty Salary Enhancement Pool	8,383,427	8,323,427	8,383,427	8,383,427
TOTAL	<u>\$ 105,125,885</u>	<u>\$ 21,708,556</u>	<u>\$ 104,151,945</u>	<u>\$ 20,794,534</u>

KANSAS POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

