

ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT FOR K.A.R. 88-28-6

1. Summary of proposed regulations, including purposes.

The overall purpose for the proposed amendments to this regulation is to lower the established rates paid by in-state private and out-of-state postsecondary institutions to receive and maintain a certificate of approval to operate in Kansas. The Board has crafted and is proposing the following amendments:

K.S.A. 74-32,181 sets the maximum and minimum fees that must be charged to private and out-of-state postsecondary institutions operating in Kansas and grants the Board authority to set the various categories of fees through regulation K.A.R. 88-28-6. The amendments lower established rates for in-state branch campuses based on projections made in a recent business study.

2. Reason or reasons the proposed regulation is required, including whether or not the regulation is mandated by federal law.

This regulation and the proposed amendments implement the Board's authority to regulate institutions under the Kansas Private and Out-of-State Postsecondary Educational Institution Act. The regulation is not mandated by federal law.

3. Anticipated economic impact upon the Kansas State Board of Regents.

The economic impact of these amendments to the Board of Regents office will be a 4% decrease in revenues for the Private and Out-of-State Postsecondary Educational Institution program. The Private Postsecondary Division anticipates that there will be enough income to pay its budgeted expenses.

4. Anticipated financial impact upon other governmental agencies and upon private business or individuals.

The economic impact to the private and out-of-state postsecondary educational institution sector will be a 4% decrease in the amount of fees paid to the Board of Regents for obtaining and maintaining a certificate of approval to operate in the state. It is not possible for us to ascertain whether this decrease will have any impact on the students enrolling in these institutions or their parents.

5. Anticipated economic impact upon private citizens.

See response to paragraph number 4, above.

6. Less costly or intrusive methods that were considered, but rejected, and the reason for rejection.

See response to paragraph number 3, above.

