

MINUTES OF THE HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Kathe Decker at 9:00 on February 1, 2005 in Room 313-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except:  
Valdenia Winn- excused

Committee staff present:  
Kathie Sparks, Kansas Legislative Research  
Carolyn Rampey, Kansas Legislative Research  
Art Griggs, Revisor of Statutes Office  
Ann Deitcher, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee:  
John Koepke, Exec. Dir. KASB  
Ed Schulte, Baldwin, School Board President  
Jennifer Foster, CARES  
Mike Kastle, Supt. USD 245  
Steve Adams, Supt. Highland/Midway Dist.  
Bruce Pinkall, Pratt School Board Member

**HB 2135 - Kansas school board development program.**

John Koepke addressed the Committee in support of **HB 2135**. (Attachment 1).

Questions and answers followed.

Offering testimony in favor of **HB 2135** was Ed Schulte. (Attachment 2).

The hearing on **HB 2135** was closed.

Representative Colloton requested the Committee to introduce a bill concerning the pupil to teacher ratio in grades K-3 at 20 to 1 and in grades 4-12 at 25 to 1. The motion was seconded by Representative Horst and passed on a voice vote.

**HB 2134 - Kansas state high school activities association; board membership; joint teams; post-season play after district consolidation.**

Testimony in support of **HB 2134** was offered by John Koepke. (Attachment 3).

Jennifer Foster spoke in favor of **HB 2134**. (Attachment 4).

Mike Kastle spoke in opposition of **HB 2134**. (Attachment 5).

Steve Adams addressed the Committee as an opponent of **HB 2134**. (Attachment 6).

Bruce Pinkall offered testimony opposing **HB 2134**. (Attachment 7).

James Menze, Executive Director of the United School Administrators of Kansas, offered written testimony only in opposition of **HB 2134**. (Attachment 8).

A question and answer session followed.

The hearing on **HB 2134** was closed.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 a.m. The next meeting of the regular committee will be a joint meeting with the select committee on Thursday, February 3, 2005.



Testimony on **HB 2135**  
before the  
**House Education Committee**

by

**John Koepke, Executive Director**  
Kansas Association of School Boards

**February 1, 2005**

Chairman Decker and members of the Committee:

I appreciate the opportunity to appear in front of you today to support **HB 2135**, a measure that will assist and enhance the operation of unified school district boards in Kansas. According to the Kansas Constitution, "*local public schools under the general supervision of the state board of education shall be maintained, developed and operated by locally elected boards.*" While the education of Kansas's children remains a vital state and local issue, the operational process of school districts is becoming more challenging and complex.

KASB has had, for many years, a position that supports mandated inservice training for local school board members. This position has been approved by the organization's Delegate Assembly. A similar measure passed both houses in the early 1990s and was then vetoed by the late Governor Finney. Several legislative, or quasi-legislative groups that met during the past years have continued to bring this issue to light once again. Most recently, this was a recommendation that came out of a preliminary report of the Governor's Education Policy Team and that same summer, the School Building Based Budget Workgroup emphasized the need for such training, particularly in school finance. The measure in front of you today provides for the process and regulation of such programs.

Elements of **HB 2135** that I highlight are:

- The Kansas State Board of Education shall adopt rules and regulations for administration of the Kansas school board development program;
- The State Board shall prescribe and adopt standards and procedures for accreditation of sponsors of courses, programs or other school board development activities;
- The State Board may establish reasonable fees to offset the cost of administering the program;
- Each member of a school board shall earn a minimum of 10 credit hours of board development in each year;
- The State Board may grant waivers or extensions of time to complete development program requirements because of hardship, disability or other good cause;
- The State Board may reevaluate, at any time, an accredited sponsor; and
- A school board member may attend an educational activity which was conducted by a non-accredited sponsor and still receive credit.

I have added as an attachment to this testimony a matrix showing what other states do with regard to board training.

I thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today and would be happy to answer questions you might have.

**House Education Committee**

**Date:** 2-1-05

**Attachment #** 1-1



## School Board Training

State	Required Training	Length	Type	Enforcement	Commentary
Alabama	No				
Alaska	No				
Arizona	No				
Arkansas	Yes [§ 6-13-629]	6 hours		None	
California	No				
Colorado	No				
Connecticut	No				
Delaware	No				
District of Columbia	No				After June, 2000, the Board of Education will regain full authority and probably authorize required training.
Florida	No				
Georgia	Yes [§ 20-2-230]	1 day (proposed legislation of 12 hours)	Annual	Some (negative publicity)	Board is in violation of state standard if required training is not met.
Hawaii	No				
Idaho	No				
Illinois	No				
Indiana	No				
Iowa	No				
Kansas	No				Legislative attempts at requiring training have occurred over the past decade, but nothing has yet been passed.
Kentucky	Yes [§ 160.180(5)]	Scaled requirements: 12 hours for members with 0-3 years experience; 8 hours for 4-7 years; 4 hours for 8 or more years.	Annual	Yes	State Board may remove member based upon report of deficient training from Board Association. Attorney General may file ouster proceeding in circuit court (less likely than State Board removal, but possible).
Louisiana	Yes [R.S. 17:53] [1998 Session, Act 66, H.B. No. 71]	6 hours	First year only	No	Enforcement is a current topic of debate.



Maine	No				
Maryland	No				
Massachusetts	No				Association's Board of Directors will propose a resolution to the legislature to require training November, 1999.
Michigan	No				
Minnesota	Yes [§ 123B.09]	About 3 hours	First year only	No	Required training for the subject of school finance only.
Mississippi	Yes [§ 37-7-306]	6 hours		Yes	Removal
Missouri	Yes [§ 162.203]	16 hours	First year only	Not specifically	A school district whose board members were not trained was marked down on its accreditation. However, the state board had not followed administrative rulemaking procedures, and a court ruled against the accreditation repercussion.
Montana	No				
Nebraska	No				
Nevada	No				
New Hampshire	No				
New Jersey	Yes [§ 18A: 12-33]	Training program with unspecified hours	First year only	No	
New Mexico	No				Association's Board of Directors will probably propose legislation requiring 5 hours of training in September, 1999.
New York	No				Some legislative interest in mandating training.
North Carolina	Yes [N.C.G.S. § 115C-50]	12 hours	Annual	No	Various sources of training, subjects include law, finance, duties and responsibilities.
North Dakota	Yes [§ 15-29-01.1]		First year only	No	
Ohio	No				

Oklahoma	Yes [Title 70 O.S. § 5-110, §§ 57, 58. Title 51 O.S. § 8, §727.]	Scaled requirements for 5 year term: <u>New members</u> - 15 hrs within 1 <sup>st</sup> year and 12 hours over the next 4 yrs; <u>Incumbents</u> - 6 hrs within 1 <sup>st</sup> year and 12 hours over next 4 yrs.		Yes	Removal by local board
Oregon	No				
Pennsylvania	No				Unsuccessful attempts to require training in past 2 yrs
Rhode Island	No				
South Carolina	Yes [§ 59-19-45]	Unspecified	First year only	No	Subjects include policy development, personnel, superintendent relations, finance, law, ethics and community relations
South Dakota	No				
Tennessee	Yes [§ 49-2-202(a)(5)]	1 day	Annual	Yes	Commissioner may withhold funding or remove member. State department monitors training attendance.
Texas	Yes [§ 11.159]			Not explicit	Some enforcement through accreditation sanctions. Also, local board sends report of non-compliance to media prior to elections.
Utah	No				
Vermont	No				
Virginia	Yes [§ 22.1-253.13:5]	1 event/year		Some	An extra event is required and there is a possibility of removal.
Washington	No				
West Virginia	Yes [§ 18-5-1a]	7 hours	Annually	Yes	Removal (district attorney prosecutes and court removes from office)
Wisconsin	No				
Wyoming	No				

TESTIMONY ON HB 2135  
HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

By

Dr. Ed Schulte, President, USD 348 Board of Education  
Baldwin City, Kansas

1. Good intentions to serve on the Board of Education are not enough.
2. Attendance at Board of Education meetings is not enough.
3. An uninformed Board member is more likely to have a negative impact on Board function and therefore on outcomes for kids, than an informed Board member.
4. An informed Board member will make better decisions on behalf of their constituents than an uninformed member.
5. There are numerous opportunities and avenues available for “continuing education” for Board members.
6. An appropriate expectation for continuing education should not deter good candidates from running and participating as Board members.
7. There are few if any “consequences” for Board members who do not do their “homework” (recall election, no re-election).
8. An “uninformed” Board member is much more likely to create a situation with serious negative consequences for the District, it’s patrons, and kids, than an informed Board member. (Examples include financial consequences of Board actions related to mishandling of issues related to students or personnel.)
9. An uninformed Board member is much less likely to provide the leadership necessary to foster and support positive gains in student achievement.
10. Being a Board member is an important responsibility, and candidates need to know that they are expected to “step up” to that responsibility on behalf of the children of Kansas.

House Education Committee

Date: 2-1-05

Attachment # 2





Testimony on **HB 2134**  
before the  
**House Education Committee**

by

**John Koepke, Executive Director**  
Kansas Association of School Boards

**February 1, 2005**

Chairman Decker and members of the Committee:

I appreciate the opportunity to appear in front of you today to support **HB 2134**, a measure that will address one obstacle that school districts currently must address when attempting to consolidate high schools. In addition, the bill also addresses a concern that locally elected school board members do not have adequate representation on the board of the Kansas State High School Activities Association (KSHSAA).

In addition to my specific comments on **HB 2134**, I am sure the members of this Committee are aware that the KSHSAA is a unique organization that is created by Kansas statute. In other words, the Legislature has a role in determining the governance of this organization.

When school districts look at consolidation, one of the issues which most often arises is that of student activities. Some of you might be thinking that this question comes up because school districts are saying, "Let's consolidate so we can win a championship." Many of the consolidations that have already taken place in Kansas and will take place in the future are between districts that have skirmished on the fields or courts so the likelihood of this as a reason for consolidation is extremely remote. The circumstance which poses the most concern occurs if two schools decide to consolidate in the middle of the two-year cycle established for setting state football championships. In this case, the new school formed from the consolidation will be ineligible for participation in football playoffs. The reason given by the KSHSAA for this is a matter of fairness, or simply put, you can't have a school that is larger than one playing another smaller school. We find it interesting the same issue of fairness doesn't apply to a school that grows naturally (community/business/other) as they are not restricted from participation in post season play.

Also in the area of activities, KSHSAA rules limit to two the number of school districts going together to form joint teams. We believe when the Legislature is asking schools to look for ways that they can cooperate more with others that the Legislature needs to assist them by assuring that rules like this don't impede action that might be taken.

Finally, we believe a majority of the membership of the board of directors of the KSHSAA should be members of boards of education of member schools. Board members, like you, are responsible to an electorate.

I thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today and would be happy to answer questions you might have.

**House Education Committee**

**Date:** 2-1-05

**Attachment #** 3-1



January 18, 2005

Dear Committee Members:

I appreciate this opportunity to address what I feel is a very important element in the conversation about school consolidation. I am a school board member and at the time of my district's reorganization process, I was a parent of a student involved. My district's situation called for an efficiency decision within the district that is comprised of four towns and their communities. The BOE held community meetings to address the situation of inefficiencies of two high schools, three junior high schools, and three elementary schools within the district in the reality of declining enrollment over the entire district. The solution after more than 10 months of research and heart-wrenching decisions was a district-wide high school, one junior high, one middle school, and two K-3 elementary schools. This has been an excellent decision for the education of USD #272's students. They are the winners, as so often in the discussion the topic of who would "win" as one community over another was debated.

As you can imagine, part of the volatile discussion centered around what would happen to each high school's football team. During the school year of this discussion both high schools' teams were in a two-year contract together with a third KSHSAA district team, and a dissolution of the two teams, making a new team, would necessitate foregoing any district game. Even though the two teams merging left the KSHSAA district with two teams for a play-off, this was not allowed, and the third team stood alone in the district. To complicate the issue, our new team jumped into a 2A designation because of the consolidation and higher numbers of students in the new high school. This forced a decision about 8-man vs. 11-man teams and further 2-year contract dilemmas as enrollment would continue to decline over the next few years. In many respects this situation left the BOE with the impression that we were "on the bubble" and a slight variation in enrollment, either up or down, could jeopardize the play-off probability for several years.

Justification of the KSHSAA rules was that it would be unfair to other schools involved if our new, larger high school was allowed to play in the original contract district. (As a side note - one of the original contract teams in the USD #272 district was already playing under a cooperative agreement with a third school to bring up their numbers. This agreement was dissolved with the merger of the two USD #272 high schools.) To me, a glaring inconsistency in the KSHSAA rule is the exception to the rule when two high schools grow "naturally" as a result of population increases. Those high schools are given allowances so that their two-year contracts are not disrupted. I believe that the same consideration is due to high schools under any circumstances. **I would support some flexibility in the rules so that allowances would be considered in the case of schools growing "un-naturally" in response to fiscal issues.**

I am proud of the communities in USD#272. They were able to move beyond the football discussion and talk about the real concerns for the students – an improved educational opportunity for all. When the schedule for the high school students that



could be implemented with the reorganization was shown to the public, the support from both students and parents was overwhelming. That was the turning point in the whole discussion.

I would suggest that other communities around the state would venture to talk about consolidation if the rules in place did not jeopardize what they see as their "school" – the very visible Friday night football game.

Sincerely,  
Glennys Doane  
USD #272 Board Member



# Kaw Valley CARES

**Kaw Valley Citizens Alliance for Reformed and Excellent Schools**  
 P.O. Box 25, St. Marys, KS 66536-0025      kawvalleycares@yahoo.com

Testimony on **HB 2134**  
 Before the  
**Committee on Education**

By

**Jennifer K. Foster**  
 of Kaw Valley CARES

**February 1, 2005**

Madam Chairperson, and Members of the Committee:

My name is Jennifer Foster and I live on our family farm near Rossville, Kansas which is part of the Kaw Valley Unified School District No. 321. I am the Advocacy Chairperson for Kaw Valley CARES, Inc., the Citizens Alliance for Reformed and Excellent Schools, a Kansas non-profit organization focused on improving education in our local district and also statewide. Thank you for the opportunity to appear here today in support of House Bill No. 2134.

In 2002, the USD 321 School Board passed a motion to reorganize the structure within our school district. The restructuring plan would have reorganized our district from its' current structure of two high schools and four K-8 grade schools into a district with one high school, one middle school, and four K-5 grade schools. This would have resulted in an estimated savings for our school district of over \$500,000 per year while increasing educational opportunities to our students by adding or regaining 26 courses to the high school curriculum and allowing the more appropriate education of our students who are of middle school age in a facility which would have required very little modification. In addition, the middle school would have offered many enhanced opportunities for various classes, better utilization of existing staff, greater access to advanced technology, and an increased ability to properly prepare students for career and post secondary opportunities.

As you can image some patrons were outraged that their town would no longer be hosting Friday night football games and the reorganization became the key issue in the 2003 school board member election. Actions taken by these opponents included filing for an injunction in District Court in an attempt to stop the reorganization. Testimony presented during the trial included a parent who listed her son's possible-inability to play in district and state competitions due to KSHSAA rule, as one of the reasons the reorganization should be stopped.

**House Education Committee**

**Date:** 2-1-05

**Attachment #** 2-1



In USD 321, the issue was not consolidation of two school districts but rather the combination of two high schools into one, and the creation of one district wide middle school, in order to provide a more efficient and effective education system for the children of the district. The proposal had many critics, and many of those critics were bolstered considerably by the attitude and rules of KSHSAA concerning the status of the to be created "Kaw Valley High School" with respect to playoff competition within their existing rules and their interpretations of those rules.

Both the classification system, and the student eligibility system were issues in our case. According to KSHSAA's interpretation of the student eligibility rules, students of the high school to be converted to a middle school in this combination would have been able to transfer out of the district and play sports immediately at another school.

**For these reasons we support the changes proposed in HB 2134 with the following amendments:**

**Subsection 4, line 35**

**After the word "consolidation" insert:**

**"... of two or more school districts, or the combination of two or more high schools within a school district,..."**

**Subsection 4, line 36**

**Insert a new sentence immediately following the sentence ending "...becomes effective.":  
"No rules regarding student eligibility shall be interpreted as to allow a student of a high school closed due to consolidation of districts or combination of high schools within a district, to be eligible to compete for another member high school, other than the new consolidated or combined high school which he or she would normally attend."**

**Subsection 5, line 40**

**After the word "attendance" insert:**

**"... not to exceed three separate classifications, with no subdivisions among those classifications."**

We believe that activities and the KSHSAA could be used as a way to assist in creating more efficient and effective secondary education in Kansas. If you believe that consolidation will do this, then one of the possible ways to encourage consolidation would be to have fewer classifications and let the local citizens decide just how important being competitive in a class is to their communities. There is no magic whatsoever in allowing six classifications, and even more if you consider 8-man football. There is no question that the ability to be competitive in activities is a major factor weighing for and against consolidation. Switching to 3 classes would have, from top to bottom in each class, the same relative percentage of enrollment variation (over 100%) that now occurs within Class 4A.

Making these changes will remove one of the barriers to school district change via consolidation or internal reorganization. Thank you for the opportunity to appear here today. I would be happy to respond to any questions.

Chair Decker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House Education Committee

I come before you today to speak in opposition of House Bill 2134. This bill pertains to the Kansas State High School Activities Association. The proposed changes in this bill from current statute concern me in several areas. I am the Superintendent and Pre K-4 and 9-12 principal of the LeRoy-Gridley Unified School District Number 245. We are a member of KASB and have received many benefits and lots of good advice from the Association over the year. However, on this issue I am in opposition to them.

First of all, the KSHSAA Rules have been beneficial in consolidation and re-organization of school districts. Yes, the rule concerning football play-offs may have caused concern in some school districts, but I have personal experience where this rule was beneficial in the consolidation of two school districts in Western Kansas.

Prior to moving to LeRoy-Gridley this year, I had been involved in a true school consolidation between the Ransom USD 302 and Bazine USD 304. We began the process with a football cooperative agreement and then moved to volleyball and basketball. With foresight and planning we were able to let this rule, KSHSAA Rule 29, work in our favor. When the cooperative agreement began between the two schools, Bazine did not have enough students to play football, so we formed a cooperative agreement to allow those students the opportunity to play. Following several successful years of this arrangement, the next step was consolidation into USD 106, Western Plains. That took place on July 1, 2004.

When I arrived in the LeRoy-Gridley district USD 245, the high schools in LeRoy and Gridley had been reorganized to become one high school, Southern Coffey County, and again through foresight and planning on the part of the Board of Education and administration, the schools were able to continue to play football in the play-offs.

KSHSAA Rule 29 did not hinder either of these school districts from playing football in the play-offs, but helped to ease the schools into a new configuration, both in USD 106 (former 302 and 304) and USD 245.

The Association has a proposed rule change on the agenda for this spring, which is similar to the proposed language in the first part of this legislation. I ask you to let the process established by Statute run its course and let the schools of the state, through their representatives on the Board of Directors, be the ones who make any changes in the rules that govern the Association.

**House Education Committee**

Date: 2-1-05

Attachment # 5-1



Second, allowing more than two schools to participate as a cooperative team may seem like a good idea. However, the KSHSAA rules now allow for music groups to form cooperative teams of more than two schools and thus far no schools have asked to be allowed to do this. Logistics are a problem in most cases and a concern of teams that would not be conducive to the spirit of the rules. The idea that this would give teams a competitive advantage is always out there. Discussions that took place when Rule 29 was implemented alluded to this concern, and when cooperative agreements first began, schools had to present

Let me give you a little history on this portion of the rule. When Ransom, Bazine, and Ness City were in discussions concerning what could be done in Ness County to maintain our schools and better serve our students, it was decided that a step in the direction of cooperation in the county might be in combining music programs. This would allow us to enter KSHSAA Regional and State competitions as a single group. We asked the KSHSAA Board of Directors for a rule change which would allow more than two schools to go together to form one cooperative team in music. The Board of Directors approved the rule change, however, because of the logistical problems that we encountered as we tried to put this into practice stopped us from continuing. This was a good idea that just did not work for us.

Thirdly, requiring the KSHSAA Board of Directors to be made up of a majority of Board of Education members smacks of micro-management and a lack of trust in the people who the boards have hired to do their jobs. As a former member of the KSHSAA Board of Directors, I recall many meetings where a majority of the Board of Education members on the Board of Directors were not present when meetings were held. Principals and superintendents have a great command of what is going on in the schools and what it takes to administer an activity. They are the ones in the trenches and should be the ones who have a say in the governance of our Association. Local Board of Education members have the opportunity every year to make changes at the local level if they do not feel that their administrators are doing the job they want done, and this includes voting at the state level on KSHSAA rules and regulations. In addition, when the Board of Directors' agenda is published, local Board of Education presidents receive a copy. They have the ability to instruct their principal to ask the league representative to vote a certain way. That league representative may not vote that way because a majority of schools in the league may feel differently. But, the democratic process has been used.

We have one of the most highly respected Activity Associations in the nation and one of the most progressive. Please allow the schools to govern themselves as they have in the past through the democratic process established so many years ago. With a Board of Directors made up of practitioners and rules established through this process, the rules of the Association have served the schools of our state very well.

Any principal, superintendent, or Board of Education member now has the ability to implement rule changes through the process outlined in KSHSAA by-laws. As a matter of fact, I have proposed numerous rule changes over the years. Some changes have been accepted by the Board of Directors and some have not, but I have always felt like I had been given a fair hearing and opportunity to present my proposals. I have a proposal on the agenda for this spring, which amends a rule that I proposed and had passed several years ago.

I ask you to not pass this bill out of committee, which I feel would not be good for the schools and more importantly to the students of the state of Kansas.

I thank you for your time today and for your interest in the schools and students of this great state.



2/1/05

To: House Education Committee

From: Steve Adams, Joint Superintendent  
Highland USD 425 & Midway USD 433

RE: HB 2134

I am Steve Adams, Joint Superintendent of School for Highland USD 425 and Midway 433 of Doniphan County, Kansas. I respectfully submit this as testimony regarding HB 2134.

Both of the school districts that I serve have entered into an inter-district contractual arrangement to share educational services. To be more specific, the two Boards of Education I serve formally closed Highland and Midway Jr./Sr. High Schools and created a shared Doniphan West High School in Highland and a shared Doniphan West Middle School at Midway. Each district maintains a K-5 elementary school. The Boards of Education entered into this contractual arrangement to improve the quality of educational services and experiences for the children they serve. In addition, both USD 425 and USD 433 are members of the Kansas State High School Association.

My testimony regarding HB 2134 is limited to my experience with the merger of the two high school programs into one. In the fall of 2003, play-off districts were determined by KSHSAA. Because our boards were considering consolidating the two schools, I contacted KSHSAA and advised them of our situation. I found the KSHSAA staff to be cooperative and helpful in the facilitation this merger. Communication of the timelines for establishing football districts were clear, concise, logical, and posed no obstacle to our consolidation. In fact, KSHSAA staff offered to grant time extensions if necessary. Our students have not been denied any opportunities due to KSHSAA requirements.

Proper planning is essential to a successful consolidation and it takes time. Meeting the KSHSAA requirements and timelines is not problematic. Curriculum alignment, program and course development, staffing programs, scheduling, arranging for transportation, creating school identity, orienting students and patrons, and facility modifications all take time and must be done if consolidation is to be successful. Due to these time requirements, the KSHSAA re-districting requirements weights-out to be a non-issue

HB 2134 may offer attractive and/or undesirable benefits. However, I do not speak in support for these reasons:

1. The current KSHSAA rules and regulations pose no real obstacle in consolidation for districts that plan ahead.
2. The potential disruption to many school sport schedules and programs would out-weight the good it would bring to a few schools the bill would benefit.
3. The issues effecting the 2005 legislative session are of great and historic magnitude. The legislature can make better use of time and resources by addressing issues relative to providing suitable funding for our schools. Cast away HB 2134 aside as a non-issue.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

**House Education Committee**

**Date:** 2-1-05

**Attachment #** 6

# KANSAS • STATE • HIGH • SCHOOL ACTIVITIES ASSOCIATION, INC.



601 SW Commerce Place, Box 495 □ Topeka, KS 66601-0495 □ PH: 785 373-5329, FAX: 785 271-0236 □ E-Mail: [kshsaa@kshsaa.org](mailto:kshsaa@kshsaa.org) □ [www.kshsaa.org](http://www.kshsaa.org)  
GARY P. MUSSELMAN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR  
Assistant Executive Directors: Victor R. Siak, Cheryl Gleason, Rick Bowden, David Cherry, Francine Martin; Karen Ruder, Personnel & Information Services  
Member of the National Federation of State High School Associations

October 4, 2004

TO: Board of Education Presidents & Superintendents

FROM: Bruce Pinkall, local BOE Representative to the  
KSHSAA Executive Board

RE: Football Play-off Classification Rule Proposal

During the past year there have been numerous discussions with the Kansas Association of School Boards (KASB) and its members concerning the KSHSAA rules as they pertain to play-off football classification. KASB has stated that these rules inhibit and in many ways discourage cooperation and consolidation of school districts.

As the local board of education representative to the KSHSAA Executive Board, I would like to share with you that the KSHSAA has also been concerned with this issue and felt the rule was established to provide a fair and competitive play-off system. As a board, we have only been aware of two instances where this rule appeared to be a concern. However, with continued discussions, the KSHSAA Executive Board voted unanimously at the September meeting to put the following rule modification on the April Board of Directors Agenda. In addition, it will be a discussion topic at the October Regional Administrator and Board of Education Meetings.

#### Modification to Football Rule 35-2-3b:

- b. If two or more schools consolidate after the two-year assignments are made and the resulting school has a change in its classification, it will be considered a new school and shall ~~not~~ be eligible to compete in post-season play. ~~until the next opportunity for assignment. However, if no classification change takes place,~~ . The Executive Board will decide which district assignment will be assumed by the new school. The other district(s) will have a bye.

As you can see, the KSHSAA Executive Board is being proactive in their attempt to assist schools in a manner that will still allow students to participate in activities. Please share this information with your board and high school administration. I also encourage you to share this information at the upcoming Regional KASB Meetings and make a special attempt to attend the KSHSAA Regional Administrator and Board of Education Meetings with your administrator for discussion of this topic.

KSHSAA bylaws provide more local board of education member involvement than any other state association in the nation. We should be proud to be a part of a dynamic and democratic organization. If you have any questions or would like to share your ideas with me, you can contact me:

Bruce Pinkall  
PO Box 206  
Pratt Kansas 67124  
1-620-672-5787 (h)  
1-620-672-3261 (w)  
[bruce@prattrecreation.com](mailto:bruce@prattrecreation.com)

EXECUTIVE BOARD: President: Melvin Ormiston, Cunningham; Vice-President: Reggie Romine, Ellis; Secretary: Douglas Bolden, Kansas City-Schlagle; Ardith Dunn, Satanta; Rick Johnson, Hiawatha; Tamie Preston, Dodge City; Ron Tra

House Education Committee

Date: 2-1-05

Attachment # 7



James L. Menze  
Executive Director  
jmenze@usa-ks.org

M. Katharine Weickert  
Director of  
Administrator Services  
kweickert@usa-ks.org

**HB 2134: Relating to the Kansas State High  
School Activities Association**

**A written statement opposed to this Act  
By James Menze**

**Executive Director of the United School Administrators of  
Kansas**

**Madame Chairman and  
Members of the House Education Committee:**

The members of the United School Administrators of Kansas are opposed to this effort to interfere with an organization that is representative of its members and conducts business in an open and democratic manner.

The Kansas State High School Activities Association has always encouraged cooperation of its member institutions through the development of its rules and proper planning of its members. We see no need to change how the association operates or the makeup of its delegates to the board of directors. Members of boards of education are now included in the KSHSAA board of directors and representatives from all size and types of schools are required as per the KSHSAA rules.

Quite simply, there is no need for change.



Kansas Association of  
Elementary  
School Principals  
(KAESP)

Kansas Association of  
Middle School  
Administrators  
(KAMSA)

Kansas Association of  
School Administrators  
(KASA)

Kansas Association of  
School Business  
Officials  
(KASBO)

Kansas Association for  
Supervision and  
Curriculum Development  
(KASCD)

Kansas Association of  
Special Education  
Administrators  
(KASEA)

Kansas Association of  
Secondary School  
Principals  
(KASSP)

Kansas Council of  
Career and Technical  
Education Administrators  
(KCCTEA)

Kansas School  
Public Relations  
Association  
(KanSPRA)

House Education Committee

Date: 2-1-05

Attachment # 8