

Date of Committee Hearing: January 21, 2026

Committee Name: House Education Committee

Jill Quigley

Jill.j.quigley@gmail.com

HB 2468

Opponent

Written Only

Chair and members of the committee.

Thank you for the opportunity to voice my opposition to HB 2468.

Including provisions from the Big Beautiful Bill is a bad idea. Because there is no cap on the federal program, the true fiscal impact is unknown. Congressional estimates suggest that the program could result in as much as \$4 billion in lost revenue a year! This is NOT fiscal conservatism!

Again, inclusion of items from the Big Beautiful bill means that “private school scholarships” will be available to families making as much as 300% of their area’s median income---in Johnson County that would be \$322,000! These would NOT be focused on low income, disadvantaged students.

I ask you to vote no on HB2468. Public funds should go to public schools. Please do not undermine the constitutionally mandated education of our population. Responsibility for education rests with the states---don’t be dictated to by the feds.

Jill Quigley

Lenexa

- Follow these detailed submission instructions from the [House Education Committee page](#)
 - Email a **PDF** of your completed testimony to committee assistant Michelle Sims at H.Education@house.ks.gov

- Subject of Email: HB 2468 Written-Only Opponent Testimony
- Questions? Michelle can be reached at 785-296-7388

Interested in providing oral testimony in-person or via WebEx too? Just let Michelle know in the subject and body of your email by that NOON on Tuesday deadline. Committee hearing is on Wednesday at 1:30 pm.

To follow this bill and other education bills through the committee process, email Michelle and request to be added to the distribution list for the House Education committee agenda.

Testimony to the House Committee on Education

NAME: Phoebe Rinkel

TITLE: Kansas Parent, Grandparent, Retired Special Educator

EMAIL ADDRESS: phoeberinkel@gmail.com

BILL NUMBER: Bill HB 2468

PROPONENT, OPPONENT, or NEUTRAL: Opponent

ORAL or WRITTEN ONLY TESTIMONY: Written Only

DATE OF HEARING: January 21 2026

Chair Estes & Members of the Committee,

I am writing to voice strong opposition to bill number HB 2136. This bill would continue the legislative assault on tax dollars for public schools in Kansas by expanding the existing voucher program beyond its original intent, to help low-income (at risk) students who attend under-performing public schools. This bill would only increase the harm to rural students, families, and communities in areas where there are no private school options. It would rob Kansans of local control by requiring the state to opt in to the new federal level voucher bill. Because there is no cap on the federal program, congressional estimates suggest participation in the program could cost as much as \$4 billion in lost revenue each year.

Instead of further reducing the tax base for funding public schools, this committee needs to address the critical need for fully funding special education services at the level mandated by law. At the very least, this bill should include accountability to ensure that Kansas children who receive vouchers also receive a quality education, including children with disabilities.

Please reject this bill and any further attempt to expand private school vouchers and tax credits that threaten the quality of our public schools in Kansas.

Phoebe Rinkel, M.S.

Shawnee, Kansas

January 21, 2026

Testimony to the House Education Committee

FROM: Melissa Sabin, Shawnee, Johnson County

BILL NUMBER: HB 2468

PROPONENT, OPPONENT, or NEUTRAL: Opponent

ORAL or WRITTEN ONLY TESTIMONY: Written Only

Chair and Members of the Committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to share my opposition to HB 2468.

Education vouchers harm public schools by diverting public dollars away from the very systems required to serve all children. In a largely rural state like Kansas, vouchers often provide no real choice at all—many communities simply do not have private schools nearby. Even where private schools exist, vouchers do nothing for the tens of thousands of children who rely on special education services.

I am the mother of a child with disabilities. My son, Logan, is disabled and has limited school options as a result of his needs. Like many families, we depend on public schools not just for education, but for legally required supports and services that allow our child to learn, participate, and be included. Private schools are not obligated to accept students with disabilities, nor are they required to provide individualized services or accommodations. Only public schools carry that responsibility.

This bill would disproportionately harm children like Logan—children who already face barriers to access and inclusion. When public funds are siphoned away, the students who remain in public schools, particularly those requiring special education services, are left with fewer resources and less support.

Kansas has failed to fully fund special education for more than 15 years. Districts are forced to make up the difference by pulling from general education budgets, which affects all students. Any new investment in education should prioritize fully funding special education, not weakening public schools through voucher programs.

Our public schools are essential—to our communities, to our economy, and to children like my son. I urge you to protect them and vote no on HB 2468.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Testimony to the House Education Committee
January 20, 2026
Bill 2468 Opponent
Heather Schroer
haschroer8200@gmail.com

Chair & Members of the Committee,

I am writing in opposition to this proposed bill to increase funding for vouchers for private schools.

Our state's public schools are not adequately funded; this is not the time to divert further funding away from them. Private schools are not held to the same accountability or standard as public schools, meaning there is no way to ensure the quality of education is appropriate. A strong public education system is the reason many families move to Johnson County, and weakening that system will cost our state jobs and residents.

Private schools are not required to accept all students, which will lead to increased gaps in achievement for students with disabilities. Instead of this bill, please look into how we can better fund special education.

Please vote no on this bill.

Thank you,
Heather Schroer
Shawnee



SHAWNEE MISSION

SCHOOL DISTRICT

Dr. Michael Schumacher, Superintendent
Shawnee Mission School District
michaelschumacher@smsd.org
House Bill 2468 Scholarship program

Opponent

Written

January 21, 2026

Chairwoman Estes and Members of the Committee:

The Shawnee Mission School District is opposed to House Bill 2268, which will expand greatly scope and impact of student scholarship act beyond its original legislative intent, diverting scarce public dollars away from public schools. This will erode the ability of public schools to continue in their role as the engine that drives the success of our county and the State of Kansas.

The Shawnee Mission School District legislative platform reflects the policy priorities of our Board of Education and our District. Our approved 2026 legislative platform asserts:

- Support legislation to repeal or reduce the private education tuition tax credit program, and oppose vouchers, corporate scholarships or similar programs, and oppose any efforts to divert public, taxpayer funds to private education savings accounts.
- Advocate that all institutions receiving public money be held to the same standards of performance and accountability. <https://resources.finalseite.net/images/v1768421163/smsd.org/sw1ryofskdexabvnmmb/SM2026LegislativePlatform-Final.pdf>

The scholarship program began at the behest of legislators advocating to create the opportunities for low-income public-school student, who had no chance to escape “low performing schools.” Non-public school supporters praised the program as a means to help those the public school system had left behind. Often the students present in committee hearings and presentations were “low income.” Since the original law began, almost every legislative session that includes expansion of the scholarships. The Legislature increased income eligibility, expanded the amount of the tax credit, and raised the total program cap but also removed tax revenue available to education all students.

The goal of helping struggling students without opportunity and resources have better chance is diminished. The expansion of the program in House Bill 2468, combined with support for the federal tax credit program, are now tools of the state government supporting non-public and home schooled for a vastly different population.

The results of this bill include:

- Higher income eligible participants.
- Increased funding for non-public schools with little or no mission to serve low-income students, and by demographics are less likely to serve the original program population.



SHAWNEE MISSION

SCHOOL DISTRICT

- Tax credits in House Bill 2468 that will now reach \$500,000 per year to contributors make the program more obviously a tax shelter for high-income earners or business and corporate entities.
- Raising the total statewide cap, and possibly with a built-in accelerator annually, will increase the total amount of revenue available for the state to fund public education.
- Finally, we do not support the bills affirmation to join the federal scholarship program as well that is included in House Bill 2468.

Collectively, these changes alter the original legislative intent to provide education options for certain low-income students whose families would not otherwise have those options. These changes will funnel public dollars primarily to families who already are availing themselves of private school options as we see in other states, decreasing the resources available to the vast majority of public-school students.

Finally, public schools are held to high standards for educational outcomes and student achievement, because they are funded by the taxpayers. Publicly elected school boards are accountable to the citizens and taxpayers, and open meetings, open records, and auditing laws because they are funded by the taxpayers. Since this proposed law would allow scholarship granting agencies and “qualified schools” to receive the financial benefits of taxpayer funds, Kansas taxpayers should expect that accountability and transparency be accomplished by amending the bill to include the following provisions:

- Add provisions that would include as an eligibility requirement that “qualified schools” must adhere to antidiscrimination laws.
- Require compliance with KSDE performance accountability report that the report will include specific data reported by both public-school districts and “qualified schools” or home school programs. The annual reports beginning in 2027 should include reporting on public school districts and qualified schools by number and percentage of students with either an IEP or at-risk status, as defined in KSA 75-5232.
- All scholarship granting agencies and “qualified schools” should be statutorily identified as subject to contractual and financial audits, as are public schools per KSA 46-1114.

If I can provide any additional information or answer questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael Schumacher".

Dr. Michael Schumacher
Superintendent

January 21, 2026

Testimony to the House Education Committee

NAME: Sandra B. Sherry, parent

EMAIL ADDRESS: bsherry1030@gmail.com

BILL NUMBER: HB 2468

OPPONENT

WRITTEN ONLY TESTIMONY:

Dear Chair and members of the committee,

I'm writing to discourage expansion of the school voucher program. This expansion is not needed for several reasons, including:

- **Public dollars belong with our public schools that educate all children.** Expanding this program reduces the state budget and undermines the state's ability to adequately fund Kansas public schools.
- **Education funds should go towards fully funding special education,** not subsidizing private schools that can pick and choose which students they are willing to educate.
- **Expanding this program will continue to put low-income, at-risk kids at a disadvantage** as they continue to be skipped over in favor of students who better fit private school admission criteria.
- **We should not be expanding a program that provides no accountability for our tax dollars.** There are no requirements within the program to collect data or measure the progress of students receiving scholarships.

I'm a proud public-school parent of two children who have been educated in the Shawnee Mission School District. Please keep public dollars with our public schools.

Written-Only Testimony for Opposition -
HB 2468 House Committee on Education - January 21, 2026
Stacie Turner, Wichita, KS Grandparent and former parent in Wichita USD 259
stacieturner1@sbcglobal.net

Chair Estes & Members of the Committee:

Thank you for your service to the State of Kansas. I am writing to express my opposition to HB 2468, a bill that will irreparably harm Kansas public schools and its 450,000 students.

As a parent of two USD 259 graduates, I personally recognize and support the role that strong public schools play in every community in our state. Students in Kansas have a constitutional right to quality education supported by Kansas taxpayers, and any attempt to divert state or federal funds to private schools in the form of vouchers or tax credits or private school scholarships is a direct threat to public education, which serves the public good.

I have a grandchild in USD 259 now who receives Special Education services. It is imperative that public tax dollars go to *only public schools* to provide the vital education services my grandchild needs and every Kansas child with special needs is entitled to. The Kansas Legislature should be focusing its attention on fully funding Special Education, which is currently underfunded.

School vouchers and tax credits are a scam to taxpayers and have failed in many other conservative states, creating exponential fiscal disasters. One has merely to do a basic Google search to see that Arizona created a massive \$1.4 *billion* budget deficit in FY24 and FY25 because of their botched school voucher program. Their program was also rife with corruption and had no accountability. Kansas is in a very tight fiscal position, especially with future tax cuts on the horizon, and cannot afford to fund any additional tax credits to parents who choose to send their children to private schools (or organizations who choose to fund them). This especially applies to parents with the financial means to pay for private school tuition out of their own pockets (which they are already doing). There is a reason that voters overwhelmingly rejected school vouchers in ballot initiatives in other states in recent years, including Nebraska and Kentucky -- Americans do not want taxpayer dollars to fund private schools, including religious schools, especially not at the expense of public school funding.

Most parents in Kansas already have the choice to homeschool their kids or send them to private schools; however, private schools have never been on a level playing field with public schools. Until private schools are required to accept *any and all* students and are prohibited from discriminating against any students due to special needs, race, sexual orientation, religion, socioeconomic status, etc., they are not entitled to taxpayer revenue.

Further, rural Kansas communities will be hurt the most from the passing of any school voucher legislation, as residents in those areas have little to no other private educational options. These tax credits will unfairly benefit those in urban areas of our state. Rural taxpayers will end up subsidizing private school tuition for families in metro areas such as Johnson County, Wichita, and Topeka if this legislation is passed.

In closing, you must vote NO on HB 2468. It is our moral imperative to reject gimmicky vouchers and tax credits and, instead, fully fund and support public education in Kansas. It is the only equitable solution to continued quality of life and prosperity for every family in our state.

Stacie Turner, Wichita, KS

From: Sarah Wallbaum
To: [House Education](#)
Subject: HB 2468
Date: Monday, January 19, 2026 7:33:16 PM

You don't often get email from swallbaum@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear House Education Committee,

I am writing as a Kansas constituent to express my opposition to HB 2468.

Public schools are the backbone of our communities and deserve stable, fully funded support. Expanding voucher funding diverts limited public resources away from the schools that serve the vast majority of Kansas students, while reducing accountability and transparency for taxpayer dollars.

I respectfully urge you to oppose HB 2468 and instead prioritize policies that strengthen and fully fund Kansas public schools.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Sarah Wallbaum

January 21, 2026

Testimony to the Education Committee

NAME: Claire Walsh, Kansas Public School Parent

EMAIL ADDRESS: clairemcody@gmail.com

BILL NUMBER: HB 2468

OPPONENT

WRITTEN ONLY TESTIMONY

Chair and members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to voice my opposition to HB 2468.

As a proud graduate of KS public schools and current parent of two public school students in Kansas I adamantly oppose any legislation that would divert funds from public schools. And I know I'm not the only Kansan in opposition to vouchers for private schools- these are extremely unpopular pieces of legislation. I oppose the expansion of the current voucher program for many reasons, including:

- Public dollars belong with public schools that educate all children. Expanding the voucher program reduces the state budget and undermines the state's ability to adequately fund Kansas public education
- Education funds should go towards fully funding special education, not subsidizing private schools that can pick and choose which students they are willing to educate.
- Expanding this program will continue to put low-income, at-risk kids at a disadvantage as they continue to be skipped over in favor of students who better fit private school admission criteria.
- We should not be expanding a program that provides no accountability for our tax dollars. There are no requirements within the program to collect data or measure the progress of students receiving scholarships.

The other piece of this legislation opting into the federal voucher program is another terrible idea. I continue to be frustrated that this legislation was passed at the federal level. There is no cap on the federal voucher program, so the true fiscal impact of this program is unknown, though congressional estimates suggest the program could result in as much as \$4 billion in lost revenue per year. Additionally, the federal vouchers are available to families making as much as 300% of the area's median income, which in my area is \$322,000 annually). These families are not in need of financial support for their children's education, especially not in light of the government (both federal and Kansas) refusing to fully fund public education. Public dollars belong with public schools which serve ALL kids. Please, please join me in opposing this bill.

Claire Walsh

Kansas Public School Graduate and Parent of KS Public School Students

9307 Dearborn St

Overland Park, KS 66207

January 21, 2026
Testimony to the House Education Committee

NAME: Amanda Winch, lifelong Kansas resident
EMAIL ADDRESS: amanda.winch@gmail.com
BILL NUMBER: HB 2468
PROPONENT, OPPONENT, or NEUTRAL: OPPONENT
ORAL or WRITTEN ONLY TESTIMONY: Written Only

Chair Estes and members of the committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to voice opposition to HB 2468.

I am a Kansas parent of two public school students, one of whom has an IEP. I see firsthand how stretched our schools already are in providing special education services. Our educators do an amazing job with the resources they have, but we cannot continue to take funding away and expect them to do more. If we truly value teachers and education, we must support them; not strip resources from the schools that serve our children.

Public education dollars belong in our public schools, which are required to educate every child. Diverting these funds weakens the state's ability to adequately support classrooms, educators, and students across Kansas.

Education funding should prioritize fully funding special education, not subsidizing private schools that can pick and choose which students they are willing to serve. Expanding voucher-style programs continues to disadvantage low-income and at-risk students who are too often passed over in favor of those who better fit private school admission criteria.

Finally, this program lacks accountability. There are no meaningful requirements to track outcomes or measure student progress, leaving taxpayers without assurance that public dollars are being used effectively.

For these reasons, I urge you to oppose HB 2468.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Amanda Winch

Overland Park, KS

January 21, 2026

Testimony to the House Education Committee

From: Naomi Wood, Kansas Citizen, career educator

Wood.naomi@gmail.com

Bill # HB2468

Opponent

Written Only Testimony

To the Chair and members of the committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to voice my opposition to HB 2468, concerning expanding vouchers.

As a life-long public educator, I believe this bill compromises American commitments to fairness and equality. I have attended both public and private religious schools. Private schools can offer a fine education and a sense of belonging, but they are often limited in the resources they can offer students with learning or other difficulties, and they are liable to exacerbate class and wealth divisions already besetting our society. Notoriously, private school enrollments surged after *Brown v. Board of Education* was decided, continuing racial segregation. Vouchers are inherently un-small-d-democratic, because they support the exclusivity implied in private schools. According to my research, fewer than 1% of eligible low-income students in Kansas have been granted scholarships from private schools under the current voucher program. And there doesn't seem to be any mechanism in place to hold private schools accountable for the students they do admit, giving them access to the educational opportunities promised by ACA and other laws.

Public schools serve children from all classes and religions and ethnicities and abilities, a microcosm of the American project to bring people together regardless of their differences. While public schools certainly have their problems, they are inclusive to all children and a testimony to the American experiment. While I benefitted from my experience in private religious schools, when I did enter public schools and contexts, I found that I was disadvantaged by some of the limitations built into my education because religious precepts suppressed facts about biology, history, and other important disciplines. Public schools taught me much more about critical thinking. Were it not for public schools, my family certainly would not have had access to the educational and career opportunities we have enjoyed: my husband and I both have PhDs, and our daughter has an MFA.

I oppose increasing the voucher program cap

I strongly believe that public tax dollars belong with public institutions, including our public schools. Expanding the voucher program reduces the state budget and gives further tax cuts to the donors to public schools, who, frankly, don't need the help. Expanding the voucher program undermines our state's ability to fund Kansas public schools, which are already underpaying our teachers and inadequately supporting their facilities.

We need more—not less—funding of special education. Private schools can pick and choose which students they are willing to educate, leaving public schools with a larger proportion of students with challenges, and fewer resources to serve them. Underfunding special education is an anti-child policy.

Expanding this program aggravates the disadvantages already in play for low-income, at-risk kids. They are continually skipped over in favor of students who fit private schools' priorities.

Finally, we should not expand a program that isn't accountable to the public interest. There are no requirements within the program to collect data or measure the progress of students receiving scholarships. This is not good stewardship of public money.

I oppose opting into the federal voucher program

The federal voucher program, as far as I am able to determine, generously provides tax deductions to wealthy people and does nothing to help education beyond siphoning off public and private money to private schools. This is an existential threat to public education and by extension to public welfare.

Congressional estimates suggest the voucher program could cost 4 billion dollars in lost revenue at a time when states and cities across the country are struggling to offer the services the federal government has cut or withdrawn. Our ability to fund special education is already weak—the federal government should support funding for a law it passed in the 1990s, not make it more difficult.

I urge the committee to reject HB 2468 and instead brainstorm ways to make educational access and equity more consistent across our state rather than magnifying the inequalities we already see.

Sincerely yours,

Naomi Wood

Manhattan, KS

January 21, 2026

Testimony to the House Education Committee

NAME: Cassandra Woolworth, constituent

EMAIL ADDRESS: Cassie Woolworth

BILL NUMBER: HB 2468

PROPONENT, OPPONENT, or NEUTRAL: OPPONENT

ORAL or WRITTEN ONLY TESTIMONY: WRITTEN ONLY

Chair and members of the committee, I submit this testimony in opposition to HB 2468, which contains two separate but related proposals: expanding Kansas's existing Tax Credit Scholarship program and opting Kansas into a new federal voucher program.

Part I: Opposition to Expanding the Kansas Tax Credit Scholarship Program

The Tax Credit Scholarship program was originally promoted as a limited program to serve low-income, at-risk students. In practice, fewer than one percent of eligible students initially benefited. Only after the legislature expanded income eligibility did the program begin approaching its current \$10 million cap. Now, legislative leaders seek to double that cap to \$20 million—diverting even more public tax dollars to private schools.

Private schools are not required to serve all students and **can choose whom to admit**. Under expanded income limits, **they can more easily bypass at-risk students** in favor of applicants who better fit their admission criteria. Expanding this program further will continue to **disadvantage the very students it was purportedly created to help**.

Public dollars belong in public schools—schools that educate all children. Increasing this cap reduces state revenues, undermines the ability to adequately fund public education, and diverts resources away from critical needs such as special education. **The program also lacks meaningful accountability, with no requirements to collect data or measure student outcomes.**

Part II: Opposition to Opting Into the Federal Voucher Program

HB 2468 would also require Kansas to opt into a new federal voucher program beginning in 2027. Like Kansas's existing program, it provides tax credits for contributions to scholarship organizations—but with **even greater fiscal risk**.

Under the federal program, donors receive a 100% dollar-for-dollar federal tax credit, effectively reimbursing them in full. Unlike the Kansas program, **there is no cap on the total cost**.

Congressional estimates suggest this could result in up to \$4 billion annually in lost federal revenue, with unknown downstream impacts on states.

At the same time, the federal government continues to fall short of its obligation to fully fund special education. **Kansas should not opt into a program that sends federal dollars to private schools—many serving high-income families—while unmet special education needs persist in public schools.** Under this program, vouchers would be available to families earning up to 300% of area median income, including over \$300,000 in some Kansas counties.

Public dollars belong with public schools. Until special education is fully funded **and strong accountability is in place**, Kansas should reject further expansion of voucher programs at both the state and federal levels.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the committee to oppose HB 2468.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony.

Cassandra Woolworth
Constituent
Olathe, KS

January 21, 2026

Testimony to the House Education Committee:

NAME: Karen Wycoff, Kansas Citizen

EMAIL ADDRESS: kewycoff13@gmail.com

BILL NUMBER: HB 2648

PROPONENT, OPPONENT, or NEUTRAL: Opponent

ORAL or WRITTEN ONLY TESTIMONY: Written Only

Chair and members of the committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to voice my opposition for bill HB 2648.

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the allocation of state funds for private school vouchers. Our priority must be fully funding public education to ensure all Kansas students receive the foundation necessary for success in their professional and personal lives. Investing in public schools strengthens our communities and ensures our state's long-term financial stability by attracting profitable businesses.

Vouchers are not a solution to our educational challenges; instead, they divert essential funding away from public institutions. The Kansas vouchers were initially created to aide low income, at-risk students in affording private schools, but with less than 1% qualifying, why are we continuing to give money to students who are not the target recipients? We should not continue to subsidize private education for those who are not the target recipients when these funds could be better utilized to address the needs of the broader Kansas student population within the public school system.

Thank you again for giving me the opportunity to voice my opposition to this bill, and I am asking you to vote no on HB 2648.

Karen Wycoff
Kansas Citizen
Baldwin City



Dr. Brent Yeager, Superintendent
Olathe Public Schools
byeagerec@olatheschools.org
House Bill 2468 Scholarship program
Opponent
Written
January 21, 2026

Chairwoman Estes and Members of the Committee:

Olathe Public Schools is opposed to House Bill 2268, that expands the scope and impact of student scholarship act beyond its original legislative intent, diverting scarce public dollars away from public schools.

The Olathe Public Schools legislative platform reflects the policy priorities of our Board of Education and our District. Our approved 2026 legislative platform asserts:

- We strongly support using **public dollars to support public schools** and oppose programs, including vouchers, education saving accounts, opportunity scholarships, tax credit scholarships, tuition tax credits as well as individual tax credits and deductions allowing guardians to receive state income tax relief for approved educational expenses, that divert public funding from public education to schools that are not held to the same legal requirements as public schools.
- <https://www.olatheschools.org/discover-olathe/board-of-education/legislature>

The scholarship program began at the behest of legislators advocating to create the opportunities for low-income public-school student, who had no chance to escape “low performing schools.” Non-public school supporters praised the program as a means to help those the public school system had left behind. Often the students present in committee hearings and presentations were “low income.” Since the original law began, almost every legislative session that includes expansion of the scholarships. The Legislature increased income eligibility, expanded the amount of the tax credit, and raised the total program cap but also removed tax revenue available to education all students.

The goal of helping struggling students without opportunity and resources have better chance is diminished. The expansion of the program in House Bill 2468, combined with support for the federal tax credit program, are now tools of the state government supporting non-public and home schooled for a vastly different population.

The results of this bill include:

1. Higher income eligible participants. Tax credits in House Bill 2468 that will now reach \$500,000 per year to contributors make the program more obviously a tax shelter for high-income earners or business and corporate entities
2. Raising the total statewide cap, and possibly with a built-in accelerator annually, will increase the total amount of revenue available for the state to fund public education.



3. Finally, we do not support the bills "election" to join the federal scholarship program as well that is included in House Bill 2468.

Collectively, these changes alter the original legislative intent; funnels more public dollars primarily to families who already are availing themselves of private school options as we see in other states; and decreases the resources available to the vast majority of public-school students.

Olathe Public Schools is held to high standards for educational outcomes and student achievement, because we are funded by the taxpayers. Publicly elected school boards are

accountable to the citizens and taxpayers, and open meetings, open records, and auditing laws because they are funded by the taxpayers. Since this proposed law would allow scholarship granting agencies and "qualified schools" to receive the financial benefits of taxpayer funds, Kansas taxpayers should expect accountability and transparency.

- Eligibility for "qualified schools" and scholarship agencies must adhere to antidiscrimination laws.
- KSDE performance accountability reports include specific data reported by both public-school districts and "qualified schools" or home school programs. Their reports should now include reporting on public school districts and qualified schools by number and percentage of students with an IEP.
- All scholarship granting agencies and "qualified schools" should be statutorily identified as subject to contractual and financial audits, as are public schools per KSA 46-1114.

If I can provide any additional information or answer questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

We appreciate the opportunity to testify.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "B. Yeager", written in a cursive style.

Dr. Brent Yeager, Superintendent
Olathe Public Schools
byeagerec@olatheschools.org