

## **MINUTES**

### **LEGISLATIVE EDUCATIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE**

October 24-25, 2001  
Room 519-S—Statehouse

#### **Members Present**

Senator Dwayne Umbarger, Chair  
Representative Jo Ann Pottorff, Vice Chair  
Senator Christine Downey, Ranking Minority Member (October 24)  
Senator Lynn Jenkins  
Senator Bob Lyon (October 25)  
Senator Lana Oleen  
Senator John Vratil  
Representative Barbara Ballard (October 24)  
Representative Lisa Benlon  
Representative Ralph Tanner  
Representative Jonathan Wells

#### **Members Absent**

Representative Kathe Lloyd  
Representative Bill Reardon

#### **Staff**

Ben Barrett, Kansas Legislative Research Department  
Stuart Little, Kansas Legislative Research Department  
Carolyn Rampey, Kansas Legislative Research Department  
Paul West, Kansas Legislative Research Department  
Theresa Kiernan, Revisor of Statutes Office  
Renaë Jefferies, Revisor of Statutes Office  
Jill Wolters, Revisor of Statutes Office

#### **Conferees**

Dr. Kim Wilcox, President and Chief Executive Officer, Kansas Board of Regents  
Dr. Betty Stevens, President, Highland Community College

Dr. Ronald Wasserstein, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Washburn University  
Dr. Duane Dunn, President, Manhattan Area Technical College; President, Kansas Association of Technical Schools and Colleges  
Dr. John Schwenn, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Emporia State University  
Lynne Owen, Education Program Consultant, State Department of Education  
Joyce Cussimano, Executive Director, Kansas Children's Cabinet  
Diane Lindeman, Associate Director of Fiscal Affairs for Student Financial Aid, Kansas Board of Regents  
Dr. David Shulenburger, Provost, University of Kansas  
Don Rau, Assistant to the Vice Chancellor, Kansas University Medical Center  
Jason Bennett, Student Government President, Wichita State University  
Greg Watt, President, Associated Student Government, Emporia State University  
Debra Prideaux, Executive Director, Alumni and Governmental Relations, Fort Hays State University  
Dr. Mary Carol Pomatto, Assistant to the President, Pittsburg State University  
John M. Struve, University Budget Director, Kansas State University (written testimony only)  
I. B. "Sonny" Rundell, Chair, State Board of Education  
Val DeFever, Vice Chair and Legislative Coordinator, State Board of Education  
Emile McGill, USD 259, Wichita  
Jackie Lugrande, USD 259, Wichita

### **Wednesday, October 24**

#### **SB 345—The Higher Education Coordination Act**

The staff presented two memoranda related to 1999 SB 345 as part of the Committee's activities to monitor implementation of the Higher Education Coordination Act. The memoranda are entitled *Overview of the Kansas Higher Education Act (Attachment 1)* and *State Financial Support for Community Colleges and Municipal Universities (1999 SB 345) (Attachment 2)*. The first memorandum summarized the content of 1999 SB 345, presented funding information about the various higher education sectors, including information about community college property tax revenues, and concluded with a list of items that could be addressed by the Committee as part of its statutory charge to monitor implementation of the Act. The second memorandum compared estimates made during the 1999 Session of the fiscal impact of the legislation with current estimates and examined reasons why the earlier estimates now appear to have been too low.

Dr. Kim Wilcox, State Board of Regents, discussed efforts to develop a unified budget submission for postsecondary institutions under the jurisdiction of the State Board of Regents—a duty imposed by the Higher Education Coordination Act (Attachment 3). Dr. Wilcox explained difficulties involved, including the fact that different educational sectors under the State Board all have different funding formulas. Dr. Wilcox said that, not only must these formulas be synthesized, but needs of individual sectors and institutions and their constituencies must be met within revenue constraints imposed by the state.

Dr. Wilcox told the Committee the process of developing the FY 2003 unified budget submission began with hearings from January 2001 to June 2001, during which institutions had the opportunity to submit proposals to the State Board. After receiving input from the sectors, the Board developed “unifying budget themes,” such as operating grant increases for the state universities, full funding of SB 345, full funding of the postsecondary aid formula for area vocational schools and technical colleges, enhanced technology funding for all sectors, enhanced need-based student financial aid, and enhanced funding for Board Office infrastructure.

The increase for FY 2003 initially reviewed by the Board totaled \$108 million, but the Board reduced the increase to \$80.6 million in light of a realistic appraisal of the state’s financial condition. Components of the increase are the following:

- Community college operating grants—\$16.1 million;
- State university faculty salary enhancements—\$13.4 million;
- Washburn University operating grant—\$1.6 million;
- First year of performance funding—\$13.9 million;
- Annualization of state university salaries and fringe benefits—\$6.2 million;
- State university 4.5 percent operating grants—\$25.7 million;
- Funding of technical college and area vocational school postsecondary aid formula deficit—\$1.1 million;
- Technical college and area vocational school 4 percent operating budgets—\$1.1 million;
- Board Office operating budget and infrastructure needs—\$0.5 million;
- Comprehensive Grant Program—\$0.5 million; and
- Adult Basic Education matching grant and other items—\$0.5 million.

In addition, Dr. Wilcox said the State Board is trying to develop a web-enabled, relational Kansas postsecondary education database that will include modules containing student demographic and enrollment information, faculty and student financial aid data, information about fiscal reporting and staffing, information about core indicators, and information about federal vocational programs. Dr. Wilcox said the database, when complete, will enhance policy analysis and decision making and will reduce unnecessary reporting requirements. Currently, an advisory committee comprised of sector representatives is working to identify and define data elements in the database. Appropriations for the development of the database were \$350,000 in FY 2001 and \$250,000 in FY 2002. Two staff positions associated with the database have been filled and recruiting is underway to fill two additional positions.

A copy of a memorandum from the State Board of Regents prepared for presentation to the Legislative Budget Committee was distributed to the Committee and is included as Attachment 4. The memorandum outlines proposed reductions in the State Board's FY 2003 request.

In discussion with Committee members, the matter of student tuition was raised and Dr. Wilcox noted that, while Kansas is a low-tuition state, it also provides a low level of funding for student assistance programs. Senator Oleen asked if any consideration has been given to charging a user fee to students who apply for student assistance.

### **Development of Performance Indicators**

Dr. Betty Stevens, President of Highland Community College, detailed the history of the development of "Core Indicators of Mission Effectiveness" by community colleges and the adaption of these indicators to performance funding as provided for by 1999 SB 345 (Attachment 5). She explained that the community colleges adopted Core Indicators of Mission Effectiveness in 1998 to be used by each institution to identify areas for improvement and to measure change. At that time, the institutions were under the supervision of the State Board of Education and the State Board determined that the 13 indicators also should be applicable to area vocational schools and technical colleges. The indicators were piloted in the 1999-00 school year and all institutions made the effort to develop the extensive databases necessary to implement the system and to collect and analyze the information.

When SB 345 was passed and performance funding was statutorily implemented beginning in FY 2003, the State Board of Regents identified indicators for the state universities in the areas of teaching and learning, research and development, service and outreach, and leadership and management. Dr. Stevens explained that other institutions under the jurisdiction of the Board sought to conform to the public university indicators, but, in the case of community colleges, adapted the indicators to more closely fit their own missions. Specifically, the "research and development" indicator was deemed to be inappropriate for community colleges and "workforce development" was substituted. Dr. Stevens said each college has defined specific areas for improvement under each indicator and local boards of trustees have approved institutional improvement plans for their colleges. The plans have been submitted to the State Board and institutions that demonstrate improvement on the basis of the plans will receive performance funding equal to 2 percent of their prior year operating grants, minus certain adjustments spelled out in SB 345.

Dr. Stevens stressed that Core Indicators adopted in 1998 are not necessarily the same as performance indicators, although they may be similar. She explained that full implementation of databases necessary to evaluate Core Indicators will take several more years for many of the institutions and the need to have performance indicators in place by FY 2003 requires a different set of measures. She also explained that community colleges may submit improvement plans to the Board that cover up to three years, but, for purposes of receiving performance funding each year, measures must be in place to evaluate progress on an annual basis.

In response to questions, Dr. Stevens said that institutional improvement plans flow from the missions of the institutions. Each community college has its own mission statement. (There is no mission statement for the community colleges as a whole, although formerly there was a community college state plan that posited a list of attributes of community colleges as a whole, which generally was considered to constitute a mission statement for the system.)

Dr. Ronald Wasserstein, Washburn University, described performance funding as it relates to Washburn University and said a guiding principle is that performance measures have to be significant, measurable, and controllable. He said continuous improvement is important and the process at Washburn involves both input and output measures. He said the University considered measures used in other states, consulted staff in the Office of the State Board of Regents, and worked with its own staff. The result is a list of 35 measures which have been approved by the Washburn University Board of Regents and are applicable to the four indicators used by the Board for the state universities—teaching and learning, research and development, service and outreach, and leadership and management. According to Dr. Wasserstein, the process of collecting data for the measures will be valuable even if no funding is forthcoming.

Dr. Duane Dunn, President of Manhattan Area Technical College, spoke as a representative of technical colleges and area vocational schools not affiliated with community colleges and noted that the only direct financial benefit for those institutions provided for in 1999 SB 345 is performance funding ([Attachment 6](#)). Performance funding is estimated to be \$540,000 for the institutions and Dr. Dunn emphasized that area vocational schools and technical colleges are operating under financial constraints that are imposing hardships on the institutions, in the face of rising enrollments, increasing costs, and unmet needs for job training.

Regarding performance indicators, Dr. Dunn told the Committee technical schools and colleges developed performance goals that reflect the unique missions of the schools, missions that have been developed by local governing boards with input from advisory committees. The indicators include quantitative items, such as retention, enrollment, and graduation rates, and qualitative items, such as student satisfaction.

Dr. Dunn cited the advantages of developing performance indicators, but again noted that staff and other resources are necessary to measure and attain goals and the institutions must be assured of adequate funding before the goals can be met. He called attention to differences between technical schools and colleges and other postsecondary institutions, in particular the fact that technical colleges and area vocational schools must enter into agreements with other postsecondary institutions in order to offer the full array of general education courses necessary to attain two-year degrees. For this reason, there is a lack of comparability among the institutional sectors with regard to assessment and accountability standards.

Dr. John Schwenn, Emporia State University, discussed performance indicators as they relate to the state universities ([Attachment 7](#)). He said the indicators vary among the universities based on individual roles and missions and include both quantitative and qualitative measures. They fit into the four general areas identified by the Board (teaching,

research, service, and management) and include the following common elements for all the universities:

- Professional development of faculty and staff;
- Economic development as a function of each university;
- Teaching effectiveness, including advisement;
- Strategic planning and its relationship to institutional improvement;
- Research and scholarly activity as it meets the mission of the university;
- Institutional role and the quality of life;
- Effective use of technology; and
- Increasing the diversity of the student body.

Dr. Schwenn told the Committee the state universities currently are working to gather data and to establish baselines relating to the indicators.

Dr. Kim Wilcox discussed performance funding from the perspective of the State Board and said the question revolves around how to quantify and measure things that are valued about an education. He said Kansas' efforts to develop performance indicators have impressed an accreditation team from the North Central Association that visited Kansas State University.

In addition, Dr. Wilcox called attention to a recently-completed report on post-secondary governance and mission conducted by the Northwest Education Research Center (NORED). A draft of the report was released October 22 and the consultants will be present on November 14 to present the report at the joint meeting of the Legislative Educational Planning Committee and the State Board of Regents.

### **Early Childhood Indicators**

Lynne Owen, State Department of Education, told the Committee a group of agency and organization representatives has been meeting during the last ten years to address issues relating to program guidelines for young children ([Attachment 8](#)). She explained that the group, called the Early Childhood Quality Standards Group, has developed program guidelines that are used to identify quality standards for early childhood programs. The Group now is working on core competencies that will be used to set requirements for personnel who work in various early childhood positions.

In 2000, a leadership summit was held to craft a definition of school readiness. Bolstered by research documenting the benefits of early childhood programs, including savings of money that otherwise would be spent on welfare costs, special education, and

judicial and crime victim costs, early childhood leaders concluded that school readiness involves both the condition of children when they enter school and the capacity of schools to educate all children whatever each child's condition might be. An outgrowth of the summit was the formation of the "Next Steps Committee" which has as its purpose the provision of a framework for families, schools, and communities to assess their ability to prepare children for success in school. Identified factors leading to success in school are the following:

- A safe, healthy, nurturing learning environment from birth to school age.
- Strong public support for programs that address school readiness and a commitment of adequate resources.
- An integrated, comprehensive system of programs for families and children, including early education, health care, quality child care, parent support, and intervention.

Ms. Owen explained that the approach being taken in Kansas is to involve multiple state agency and community groups in the development of child readiness indicators and to develop evaluation tools to measure the success of programs. Ms. Owen introduced members of the audience who are involved in early childhood programs in Wichita. Jackie Lugrande, Parent Education Program Coordinator for USD 259 (Wichita), told the Committee that early intervention is critical and that parents are important teachers of their children. She said there is an unmet need for the Parent Education Program in Wichita and the program is serving only 3 percent of the population with home visits and other assistance. She said the program helps ensure that children are ready to learn when they go to school and that support for families with high needs has paid off in benefits to children.

Emile McGill, Director of Early Childhood Services for USD 259 (Wichita), touted benefits of early childhood programs, but said lack of funding is resulting in two-thirds of potential program participants being turned away. She said increasing numbers of families experiencing poverty make providing early childhood services even more important. Ms. McGill told the Committee that more money is needed and the Parent Education Program needs to be expanded to include children who are four years old.

Joyce Cussimano, Executive Director of the Kansas Children's Cabinet, participated by means of a conference call (Attachment 9). She traced the development of the Children's Cabinet and noted its emphasis on current research and the use of data to evaluate programs so that available funds are used only for programs that produce the best results. Ms. Cussimano described Smart Start Kansas, a major initiative of the Cabinet, and explained that several factors that influence school readiness have been adopted as core services associated with the Smart Start program. The factors that influence school readiness are the following:

- Quality of early childhood care and education;
- Affordability of early childhood care and education;
- Availability of early childhood care and education;

- Children's health services; and
- Family support services.

Ms. Cussimano was asked to comment on the fact that many of the Cabinet's recommendations to the Governor and to the 2001 Legislature were not adopted. Ms. Cussimano said Cabinet members were disappointed but are committed to moving forward with recommendations for FY 2002. She said the Cabinet will continue to stress its interest in developing indicators to evaluate children's programs.

### **Committee Minutes**

Upon a motion by Senator Vratil, seconded by Representative Tanner, the minutes of the October 8-9 meeting were approved.

**Thursday, October 25**

### **Student Assistance Programs**

Diane Lindeman, State Board of Regents, presented information on the 20 student assistance programs administered by the State Board of Regents. (A copy of Ms. Lindeman's report is available in the Kansas Legislative Research Department.) In discussion with Committee members, she noted that the Kansas Comprehensive Grant Program is applicable only to students who are enrolled at the state's public and private four-year universities and does not provide assistance to students at community colleges, technical colleges, and area vocational schools. Regarding the Kansas State Scholarship Program, Ms. Lindeman said efforts during the 2001 Session to amend the law to increase the award amount were not successful. (The current limit is \$1,000.)

Ms. Lindeman informed the Committee that awards made under the Ethnic Minority Graduate Fellowship Service Program have been suspended pending the outcome of a complaint filed with the Office of Civil Rights during the 2000-01 school year. The complaint was filed by a majority graduate student who is questioning the legality of the program. Currently, the Office of Civil Rights and the State Board of Regents are conducting a review of the program and only renewal awards have been made during the 2000-01 school year.

Ms. Lindeman told the Committee that, in FY 2001, a total of \$15,792,010 has been spent on state financial assistance programs, of which about \$13.0 million is from the State General Fund. Senator Oleen suggested to Ms. Lindeman that the State Board of Regents should consider charging a service fee for the Comprehensive Grant Program, which would provide funding either to expand the program to other postsecondary institutions or to add staff to the Board Office to assist in administering student assistance programs.



## **“Two for One” Technology Equipment Program**

Representatives of Regents universities discussed how they have used additional funding from increased student tuition and state appropriations for technology equipment. At an earlier meeting it had been explained that the program was begun in FY 1999 to address the need for technology-based instructional equipment at the state universities and had been funded for three years by a student tuition increase of \$1 per hour that had been matched with \$2 in state funding for each tuition dollar. The Governor did not continue the program for FY 2002, but the Legislature provided partial funding and determined that a review of the program should be conducted during the 2001 Interim and a decision made as to whether the program should be continued.

Dr. David Shulenburger, University of Kansas, told the Committee the University of Kansas received \$1.9 million in two for one funding in FY 2001 and \$1.3 million in FY 2002 when the state match was \$1 for each tuition dollar (Attachments 10 and 11). Dr. Shulenburger said the University’s annual replacement need is about \$5.5 million and a backlog of equipment needs exists that totals more than \$36 million. He said the University of Kansas is funded at 61.2 percent of its peer universities on the basis of funding for other operating expenditures.

Don Rau, University of Kansas Medical Center, said student technology fee expenditures at the Medical Center total \$643,376 for the period FY 1999 through FY 2002 and include \$350,413 for the student instructional technology center, \$108,550 for the student center and library study areas, and \$145,775 for classroom technology (Attachment 12). He told the Committee two for one funding has been used exclusively for student technology needs and expenditures are reviewed by a student technology committee. He said technology must be replaced every three to five years and projected needs of \$145,800 in FY 2003, \$198,300 in FY 2004, and \$209,800 in FY 2005 will only be adequate to maintain the status quo.

Jason Bennett, Student Government President from Wichita State University, said the money allocated to Wichita State University has been used for computers and laboratories and to make it possible for all classes to have access to the Internet. Upgrades also have been made to the library, such as a printer on each floor and overhead projectors. He said stickers are placed on each equipment item that has been purchased with two for one funding so that students can see how their increased tuition money has been used. He said recent expenditures have been for software purchases, laptop computers for classroom use, and access to the Internet without the need for conventional hookups (“wireless Internet”). As an example of the importance of nontraditional ways of teaching, Mr. Bennett said Wichita State now has a Regents Distinguished Professor in the area of global learning who occupies a chair partially endowed by the Boeing Aircraft Company.

In response to a question, Mr. Bennett said student reaction to the program generally has been positive and students have noticed an improvement in technology equipment.

Greg Watt, President of Associated Student Government at Emporia State University, told the Committee that, while traditional lecture classes still are offered, the information age has changed the way students are taught and the way they learn (Attachment 13). He said students are making it clear that they value access to computers. In information presented

to the Committee, Mr. Watt noted that the two for one program is the only significant increase in funding for other operating expenditures in the last ten years and that the cost of technology has been increasing at a time when overall funding for other operating expenditures has been going down. Two for one funding at Emporia State University for FY 1999, FY 2000, and FY 2001 has been mainly for student computer laboratories, classroom equipment, and local area networks.

Debra Prideaux, Fort Hays State University, told the Committee Fort Hays State University has spent \$399,000 each year in FY 1999, FY 2000, and FY 2001 in two for one funding, most of which was for computers and computerized laboratories (Attachment 14). She described efforts the University is making to extend learning by use of technology and said the need for equipment far exceeds the amount of money available.

Dr. Mary Carol Pomatto, Pittsburg State University, said two for one funding has been the most important funding program to enhance student learning, with the exception of the Crumbling Classrooms Program (Attachment 15). She said all programs at the University have benefitted from the program and that the program enjoys support from University administrators, faculty, and students.

Written testimony was submitted by John M. Struve, University Budget Director at Kansas State University, which stated that the University has allocated more than \$4.5 million for instructional and technology equipment over the three-year period FY 1999 through FY 2001 (Attachment 16). He said a comprehensive equipment needs study for all academic areas at the University that was done in 1996 documented total instructional equipment needs of more than \$54 million.

### **State Board of Education FY 2003 Budget Request**

Sonny Rundell, Chair of the State Board of Education, and Val DeFever, Vice Chair, presented the State Board's FY 2003 budget request (Attachments 17 and 18). Mr. Rundell explained that the State Board approached its budget request for FY 2003 differently from past years by adopting strategic goals and identifying specific ways to measure whether the goals are being attained. Specific programs to attain the goals were identified and funding to implement or expand the programs over the next three years became the basis for the State Board's budget request. Mr. Rundell said the total funding increase envisioned over the three-year period is \$1.16 billion.

Ms. DeFever told the Committee the strategic goals for the next century include helping all students meet or exceed academic standards, having a qualified teacher in every classroom, and redesigning Kansas schools and learning environments. Specific performance goals are the following:

- The average achievement on state assessments will increase by 5 percent in reading, 7 percent in writing, and 10 percent in mathematics, science, and social studies.
- The percent of students scoring in the basic and unsatisfactory performance levels on state assessments will decrease by 25 percent.

- The achievement gap between majority and minority students, as well as between advantaged and disadvantaged students, will decrease by 25 percent.
- The percent of students reading at their instructional level by the second grade will increase by 10 percent.
- The graduation rate will increase by 5 percent.
- The average teacher salary will increase to the national average, the percent of teachers not qualified to teach the classes they are assigned will decrease by 10 percent, and the percent of teachers leaving the profession within the first five years of practice will decrease by 20 percent.

To achieve these goals, Ms. DeFever said the State Board is recommending that all-day kindergarten be phased in, at-risk programs be expanded, extended learning time be provided for, Parents as Teachers be expanded, special education excess costs be fully funded, and outstanding schools be rewarded. Recommended initiatives for teachers include bringing the average teacher salary in Kansas up to the national level, providing mentors for new teachers, fully funding teacher inservice programs, and providing professional development opportunities. In addition, the State Board of Education is recommending that the State Board of Regents scholarship program to encourage prospective teachers to enter the profession be enhanced, financial rewards to teachers who achieve National Board Certification be provided along with incentives to schools that hire the teachers, and single premium health insurance coverage with a dollar-for-dollar match from the local district be provided.

The increased cost each year to implement these strategies is estimated to be \$352.8 million in FY 2003, \$372.5 million in FY 2004, and \$432.8 million in FY 2005, for a total increase over three years of \$1.16 billion.

In discussion with Committee members following their presentation, Mr. Rundell and Ms. DeFever admitted the State Board's request could be viewed as unrealistic in light of revenue constraints, but said the State Board wants to be visionary and fulfill its role as an advocate for excellence in education. They explained that the State Board has been criticized for a lack of leadership in the past and now is taking the initiative to identify steps that are needed to reach goals that can be measured and are attainable in the next several years.

Senator Oleen asked the State Board members to consider ways its budget request can be reduced, much as the State Board of Regents has done in response to a request from the Legislative Budget Committee. Representative Benlon and Senator Vratil commended the State Board for its efforts to identify specific education goals and to recommend programs to attain the goals.

The meeting was adjourned.

Prepared by Carolyn Rampey

Approved by Committee on:

December 10, 2001

35048(12/20/1{11:42AM})