

MINUTES OF THE COMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION.

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Tom Sloan at 3:30 p.m. on January 29, 2003 in Room 231-N of the Capitol.

All members were present except: Representative Neighbor, Excused
Representative Kuether, Excused

Committee staff present: Mary Galligan, Legislative Research
Paul West, Legislative Research
Jim Wilson, Revisor of Statutes
Mona Gambone, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee: Daron Jamison, Student Body President, Fort Hays State University, and Chair, Student Advisory Council
Jonathan Ng, Student Body President, University of Kansas
Adam Kice, Student Body President, Wichita State University

Others attending: See attached list

Chairman Sloan called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m..

Representative Carl Krehbiel announced that the Sub-Committee on Distance Learning would meet with the Committee on Economic Development tomorrow, January 30, at 4:00 p.m. in Room 531-N.

Chairman Sloan introduced the first speaker, Daron Jamison, Student Body President, Fort Hays State University and Chair, Student Advisory Council (Attachment 1). Mr. Jamison then introduced Jonathan Ng, Student Body President, University of Kansas (Attachment 2) and Adam Kice, Student Body President, Wichita State University (Attachment 3), who also made presentations to the Committee. The three speakers then responded to questions from the Committee. Chairman Sloan thanked them for appearing before the Committee.

Chairman Sloan then opened the hearing on:

HB 2008: Concerning proprietary schools; relating to certification and registration fees

Dr. Amanda Golbeck, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Kansas Board of Regents, appeared as the proponent of the bill (Attachment 4). She then responded to questions from the Committee, with assistance from Dr. Patricia Anderson, Director, Proprietary Schools, Board of Regents.

No one appeared in opposition to the bill.

Chairman Sloan then closed the hearing on HB 2008 and opened the hearing on:

HB 2009: Concerning general education development credentials; relating to fees

Dr. Golbeck also appeared as the proponent for this bill (Attachment 5). She then responded to questions from the Committee, with assistance from Dr. Anderson.

No one appeared in opposition to the bill.

Chairman Sloan then closed the hearing on HB 2009.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m..

The next meeting is scheduled for February 3, 2003.

House Higher Education Committee
Daron Jamison
January 29, 2003

Mr. Chairman, members of the House Higher Education Committee, I appreciate the opportunity to speak before you this afternoon on behalf of the students of the State of Kansas. At a time when the higher education system in Kansas is facing many obstacles, I believe it is important for those of you in decision-making positions to hear from student leaders about the challenges at hand.

I want to start by giving you a brief history of student representation at the Kansas Board of Regents and the State Legislature. In 1975 the Legislature created the Students' Advisory Council to the Kansas Board of Regents. The Council is comprised of each of the student body presidents from our six state institutions. The legislative purpose of the Council was to provide student representation and input to the Kansas Board of Regents and the State Legislature on any issue or proposal pertaining to students. The Council meets during the monthly meetings of the Kansas Board of Regents as well as other times throughout the year. Our mission is to facilitate communication between students and the Board of Regents as they develop policy and oversee coordination of community colleges and technical schools. Some examples of student initiatives implemented by the KBOR include teacher evaluations, student input in the tuition formulation and student fee decision process, governance of credit card solicitation, and the implementation of a fee designed to help institutions keep pace with advances in technology. But probably even more important than our initiatives is our week-to-week and month-to-month communication with Board members. The interactive and lively discussion that occurs is a major component in the development and implementation of policy by the Board.

Currently there are 86,000 students enrolled in our six state institutions and over 72,000 students enrolled in 19 community colleges and 11 technical schools. With the continued implementation of SB 345, student leaders from both the universities and community colleges are beginning to work together to address the difficult challenges of creating a unified and seamless higher education system in Kansas.

A truly unified system means students will have the ability to easily transfer course work between our community colleges and universities. It means we will have a system that augments student learning from the beginning of their freshman year to the end of their senior year. It means advising will play a critical role in decisions regarding continued education and career choice. And it means that there is a uniformed standard for determining the residency status of students.

In the past students have focused on the need for consistency in advising and transfer and articulation agreements to help minimize the lack of access to our 4-year institutions. As we move forward, I believe students from all sectors of higher education must play a key part at both the Legislative and Regent level as we attempt to integrate each sector of our system. Our technical schools, community colleges, and universities are all unique and serve a specific purpose. A seamless system will create a synergy that encourages all students to maximize their potential and eventually contribute back to the Kansas economy.

As my colleagues will point out, Kansas has traditionally been a low tuition, low financial aid state. This structure has served us well. Several years ago Kansas was ranked in the top 10 states in the nation for providing accessibility to higher education.

House Higher Education Committee

Meeting Date: 1/29/03

Attachment No.: 1

As a legislator, you will make decisions that will directly effect whether or not this structure will continue to exist. Higher tuition and negligible increases in financial aid have left some students with larger debt loads and in some cases, the inability to access post-secondary education. Students believe and will continue to articulate that a system that increases tuition at rates as large as 25% in one-year may risk destroying part of what has made higher education in Kansas distinctive among its peers.

Finally, I want to briefly discuss with you the looming budget crisis and the potential harm it may have to students. Over the last year, higher education has been forced to absorb over 7.0% in cuts as well as increases in costs such as health insurance. In many ways, our institutions have been able to protect their core mission and important student services. But the current crisis could potentially mean cuts in classes, degree programs, and vital student services.

Even though we might have some obstacles to overcome in the next six months, I can assure you that students want to be part of the solution. I am convinced we have one of the best higher education systems in the nation. I am not here this afternoon to lecture you on why we are facing difficulties that other state agencies do not have to deal with, because that is not true. I am here to educate you on the challenges that lie ahead as well as participate in the process that will decide solutions. Students in partnership with the Legislature and the KBOR can work to ensure the future stability and success of higher education in Kansas.

**REMARKS REGARDING
TUITION INCREASES AT KANSAS PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES**

Overview

Tuition increases at each of the Regents institutions have been a burden for students and their families. The rising cost of higher education is slowly affecting issues such as accessibility and the overall quality of student life while in college. Further, decreasing state appropriations to higher education are placing extra pressure on universities to increase tuition even higher. Turning to students as an alternative for financial resources is an option that has been thoroughly exhausted. Additionally, each public university has taken steps to cut its budget by laying off faculty and staff, enacting hiring freezes, phasing out research and other various academic units and more. To date, the state has cut approximately \$45 million in higher education spending, which will remain permanent into the next fiscal year unless the state steps up to fund its public universities at an appropriate level. In sum, the basic principle we as students adhere to is that if we are expected to pay more for our education, we should get more for our education.

Partnership with the students

- K-State, Fort Hays – administration works directly with the student government
- Wichita State, Emporia State, Pitt State – committee of top administrators, faculty, staff and students meet together to come up with a tuition proposal
- KU – committee of students and a committee within University governance work on tuition expenditures and future proposals
- Purpose of these committees
 - o Monitor the use of the tuition increase dollars
 - o Plan for future tuition increases

Reasons for increasing tuition varies among each university

- KU, K-State – targeting various areas such as:
 - o Technology upgrades
 - o Faculty positions
 - o Faculty salary benefits (merit based)
 - o Enhancements which directly benefit the quality of the students' education
- KU, K-State – phased out whole departments or areas such as the Anthropology Museum, laid off employees, hiring freezes
- Other schools are using the extra revenue to maintain the quality of every aspect of the University, spreading out the revenue across departments
- Each school has a different mission, which guides how much each institution raises tuition and where that additional revenue is allocated
- For example, the regional schools experienced a moderate increase in order to keep tuition as affordable as possible within its region, yet maintain its current quality; K-State strives to establish itself one of the premiere land grant institutions in the nation; KU strives to become a top 25 national public University; both strive to remain affordable in comparison to schools of similar size and mission

House Higher Education Committee

Meeting Date: 1/29/03

Attachment No.: 2

Kansas students continually face the additional challenges that fellow Kansas citizens face every day, the increasing cost of living. There are issues that students face, however, that the general public does not have to worry about. One of these issues is the continually increasing cost of higher education, without increases in financial assistance. Kansas has traditionally been proud to call itself a low-tuition, low-financial aid state, providing access to virtually every possible student in this great state. In recent years, however, the financial burdens, like inflation and tuition, have moved us closer to a much less attractive model; a high-tuition, low-financial aid model. This model, while less dependant on state and local governments for assistance, hinders the education of those who could and would have been a future part of an educated workforce. In turn, it blocks the advancement of Kansas jobs, Kansas workers, and Kansas business.

As a student in the Air Capitol of Kansas and the United States, I have the opportunity to see how an educated workforce can bring business to Kansas. I can see how both the degree bearing and degree seeking can work side-by-side for a better Wichita, as well as a better Kansas. From dealing with higher education at the state level, I know that the students I serve are not the only fortunate group in this capacity. Across the state, students, communities, and businesses contribute and benefit from higher education's accessibility.

An important component in accessibility is that tuition and financial aid fluctuate at the same rate, which has not been the trend in the past few years. As this gap between cost and assistance increases, the number of educated workers, flourishing businesses, and bustling economies decreases.

Both past and present show us that society moves to become better educated in times of trouble, in order to set themselves and others up for future success. As prospective students file to the registration lines, out of work and wanting something more, how can we justify not providing some financial assistance? Do we really want to price Kansas citizens out of furthering their education and bettering their lives?

As a student I tell you that higher education in the state of Kansas is drawing near the point of pricing itself out of a number of quality students. As a citizen I tell you that Kansas is nearing the point where we under fund ourselves out of a better Kansas. With additional assistance, we can keep quality Kansas students in Kansas throughout their educational career, and beyond.

Governor Sebelius has seen the need for accessible and affordable education. In her budget, she proposed an increase of \$750,000 for the Comprehensive Grant Program. These additional dollars would be the first step in the right direction for regaining the balance of the cost of higher education and assistance. It is important that the legislature recognize the importance of these dollars, and uphold the governor's proposal.

EMPORIA STATE UNIVERSITY**IPEDS ID: 155025****Financial aid - 2000 - 2001**

Financial aid to full-time, first-time undergraduate students

Type of aid	Percentage of students receiving aid	Average amount of aid they received
Federal grants (scholarships/fellowships)	30	\$2,235
State/local grants (scholarships/fellowships)	16	\$1,123
Institutional grants (scholarships/fellowships)	67	\$1,247
Loans to students	55	\$2,358

FORT HAYS STATE UNIVERSITY**IPEDS ID: 155061****Financial aid - 2000 - 2001**

Financial aid to full-time, first-time undergraduate students

Type of aid	Percentage of students receiving aid	Average amount of aid they received
Federal grants (scholarships/fellowships)	83	\$2,655
State/local grants (scholarships/fellowships)	10	\$760
Institutional grants (scholarships/fellowships)	26	\$720
Loans to students	7	\$2,625

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY**IPEDS ID: 155399****Financial aid - 2000 - 2001**

Financial aid to full-time, first-time undergraduate students

Type of aid	Percentage of students receiving aid	Average amount of aid they received
Federal grants (scholarships/fellowships)	24	\$1,278
State/local grants (scholarships/fellowships)	11	\$427
Institutional grants (scholarships/fellowships)	44	\$1,034
Loans to students	54	\$1,614

PITTSBURG STATE UNIVERSITY**IPEDS ID: 155681****Financial aid - 2000 - 2001**

Financial aid to full-time, first-time undergraduate students

Type of aid	Percentage of students receiving aid	Average amount of aid they received
Federal grants (scholarships/fellowships)	28	\$2,413
State/local grants (scholarships/fellowships)	10	\$1,012
Institutional grants (scholarships/fellowships)	45	\$1,581
Loans to students	42	\$3,308

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS MAIN CAMPUS**IPEDS ID: 155317****Financial aid - 2000 - 2001**

Financial aid to full-time, first-time undergraduate students

Type of aid	Percentage of students receiving aid	Average amount of aid they received
Federal grants (scholarships/fellowships)	10	\$2,774
State/local grants (scholarships/fellowships)	6	\$1,064
Institutional grants (scholarships/fellowships)	41	\$3,196
Loans to students	28	\$2,959

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY**IPEDS ID: 156125****Financial aid - 2000 - 2001**

Financial aid to full-time, first-time undergraduate students

Type of aid	Percentage of students receiving aid	Average amount of aid they received
Federal grants (scholarships/fellowships)	27	\$1,376
State/local grants (scholarships/fellowships)	13	\$596
Institutional grants (scholarships/fellowships)	31	\$1,169
Loans to students	31	\$1,586



KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS

1000 SW JACKSON • SUITE 520 • TOPEKA, KS 66612-1368

TELEPHONE – 785-296-3421
FAX – 785-296-0983
www.kansasregents.org

Testimony in Support of HB 2008 House Higher Education Committee

January 29, 2003

Dr. Amanda Golbeck
Vice President for Academic Affairs

Good afternoon Chairman Sloan and members of the committee. My name is Amanda Golbeck and I am the Vice President for Academic Affairs for the Kansas Board of Regents. I am here on behalf of the Kansas Board of Regents in support of HB 2008.

K.S.A. 72-4916 *et seq* grants the Board oversight of proprietary schools in Kansas. K.S.A. 72-4919 defines proprietary schools as “any business enterprise whether operated on a profit or not-for-profit basis, which:

- (1) Maintains a place of business within the state of Kansas, or solicits business within the state of Kansas;
- (2) is not specifically exempted by the provisions of this act; and
- (3) offers a course or courses of instruction or study through classroom contact or by correspondence, or both, for the purpose of training or preparing persons for a field of endeavor in a business, trade, technical, or industrial occupation, except as hereinafter excluded.”

A proprietary school that wishes to operate in Kansas is required to submit to the Board of Regents a written application, a bond for the purpose of obtaining and maintaining records should the school close, and supporting documents to show that Kansas standards have been met. The standards of the proprietary school law encompass curriculum, qualifications of administration and teaching staff, record keeping for administration and teaching, and the financial well being of the institution. Board staff members conduct a review of the written application, bond, and supporting documents. A certificate of approval is issued only if the school meets Kansas standards.

A person who wishes to recruit students for proprietary schools operating in Kansas must be registered with the Board of Regents as a representative of the institution. Board staff members administer this registration system, which results in issuance of certificates of registration to such representatives.

House Higher Education Committee

Meeting Date: 1/29/03

Attachment No.: 4

Proprietary school fees are set in statute. The statute directs that these fees should have limited purposes, which include the initiation and renewal of certificates of approval for proprietary schools, and the initiation and renewal of registration for representatives of proprietary schools. Currently, there is no authority to use any funding other than the revenue from fees to support the proprietary school oversight.

HB 2008 addresses three needs with respect to proprietary school fees.

First, there is a need for fees to be set at a level that will provide for a full-time professional position. Proprietary school fees set at the current level are sufficient only to support a half-time professional position. A full-time professional position is needed in order to provide thorough oversight of proprietary schools. A recent legislative post audit of proprietary schools also indicated the need to strengthen the Board's oversight of proprietary schools "...to provide better assurance that schools can meet their obligations to their students."

Second, there is a need for fees to cover more of the required oversight tasks. A task that staff must perform as they administer the Proprietary School Act is supplying copies of transcripts for students who attended a school that has closed. Currently this task does not have any fee set in statute. Fees need to be specifically set for the most time-consuming tasks.

Third, there is a need for the Board of Regents to be able to respond on an annual basis to changes in actual costs of providing oversight. Currently, any change in proprietary school fees would require that the statute be changed. Allowing the Board to set proprietary school fees over the coming years will allow the Board to be fiscally responsible by setting fees at a level necessary to cover actual costs. Further, the actions of the Board would be made with the advice and oversight of the Proprietary School Advisory Commission.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. With me today is Dr. Patricia Anderson, Director of Proprietary Schools for the Kansas Board of Regents. Dr. Anderson and I will be happy to answer any questions you may have.



KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS

1000 SW JACKSON • SUITE 520 • TOPEKA, KS 66612-1368

TELEPHONE – 785-296-3421
FAX – 785-296-0983
www.kansasregents.org

Testimony in Support of HB 2009 House Higher Education Committee

January 29, 2003

Dr. Amanda Golbeck
Vice President for Academic Affairs

Good afternoon Mister Chairman and members of the committee. My name is Amanda Golbeck and I am the Vice President for Academic Affairs for the Kansas Board of Regents. I am here on behalf of the Kansas Board of Regents in support of HB 2009.

Under K.S.A. 72-4530, the Board of Regents is authorized to charge a fee for the issuance of GED credentials and for the duplication of GED credentials. The Board may charge at most \$10.00 for each of these services. Any fee change in a given year for these services must be authorized by the Board by July 1 of that year and will become effective on January 1 of the succeeding year. The statute reads, in part, as follows:

Each application. . . for issuance or duplication of general educational development credentials shall be accompanied by a fee which shall be established by the state board of regents and shall be in an amount of not more than \$10. On . . . or before July 1 of each year . . . , the state board of regents shall determine the amount of revenue which will be required to properly administer the provisions of this section during the next ensuing fiscal year. . . Such fee shall become effective on the succeeding January 1 of each year . . .

A significant amount of staff time is spent issuing and duplicating GED credentials. In addition, staff also verify to employers, postsecondary schools and other parties whether or not a person has earned the GED credential. Note that the statute just presented does not authorize the Board to charge a fee for the verification of GED credentials. In essence, this service is subsidized by GED recipients whether or not they use the service.

The Board currently charges \$7.00 for the services of issuing or duplicating a GED credential. This fee was set on July 1, 2002 and became effective January 1, 2003. We might note that GED revenue dropped significantly and unexpectedly in 2002. The magnitude of the loss was not apparent until after the July 1 deadline for establishing fees. As of now, \$7.00 does not cover the costs of properly administering the Kansas GED program (including issuance, duplication, and verification of GED credentials).

House Higher Education Committee

Meeting Date: 1/29/03

Attachment No.: 5

Although the Board could increase the fee to \$10.00, according to statute, the increased fee could not be collected until January 1, 2004, at the earliest. Thus we are facing operating in a deficit mode during the 2003 calendar year.

HB 2009 makes two changes. It will allow the Board of Regents for the first time to charge for the time that staff members spend to verify that someone has passed the GED. It will also increase the maximum fee for issuing, duplicating or verifying GED credentials to \$15.00, thereby ensuring that the Board has the ability in future years to increase fees on an annual basis to cover actual costs.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. With me today is Dr. Patricia Anderson, Director of Proprietary Schools for the Kansas Board of Regents. Dr. Anderson and I will be happy to answer any questions you may have.