

Approved: 3/19/96
Date

MINUTES OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION.

The meeting was called to order by Vice-Chairman Gene Shore at 3:30 p.m. on March 5, 1996 in Room 519-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except:

Committee staff present: Ben Barrett, Legislative Research Department
Avis Swartzman, Revisor of Statutes
Beverly Renner, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee: Representative Bill Mason
John Koepke-Kansas Association of School Boards
Bob Pollom, Topeka
Bob Kobbeman, Topeka
Mike Wilson, Superintendent-Mill Creek Valley, Alma
Ernie Price, Superintendent of Schools, Moran
Judy Lair, School Board Member-USD 366, Yates Center
Charles Edmonds, Goddard
Eliese Holt, Circle-USD 375
Kimberly Brier, Andover
Susan Summerlin, DeSoto
June Huie, Goddard
Lacey Dreyer, Goddard
Jane Stephenson, Goddard
Jason Bennett, Goddard
Judy Bennett, Goddard

Others attending: See attached list

Vice-Chairman Shore opened the hearing on HCR 5045-concurrent resolution directing the state board of education to study school district organization.

Representative Bill Mason, appearing as a proponent of **HCR 5045** explained that the resolution would ask the State Board of Education to look at district boundaries of schools across the state (Attachment 1). Something that has not been done in 33 years. This is an issue that should be examined for areas of significant savings in expenditures and improvement of the quality of education. Education expense makes up approximately 2/3 of the State General Fund in a time when the general public has had enough of public spending and it will be up to the legislature to find increased funding within the system.

John Koepke, Executive Director of Kansas Association of School Boards stated the policy of his organization in opposition to **HCR 5045** (Attachment 2). Numerous studies of the effect on educational quality and efficiency with regard to school district consolidation have been conducted in Kansas and other states with the conclusion that consolidation of school districts does not achieve significant cost savings.

Bob Pollom, resident of USD #450, Shawnee Heights, related his experience in the "unification wars" to express disfavor with **HCR 5045** (Attachment 3). The per pupil cost of Topeka USD #501 is greater than the outlying suburban districts. Additional consolidation would not result in financial savings. As an illustration of a pro-active community, a bond issue election to renovate and upgrade buildings had an 85% voter turnout, with a 78% yes vote.

Bob Kobbeman, patron of USD 450-Shawnee Heights, appeared as an opponent of **HCR 5045** (Attachment 4). He has been working within the school district on a change of school boundaries caused by uneven growth resulting in under utilization of some facilities and excess capacity in others. Decisions such as this are better done at a local level where differences can be arbitrated by patrons and families affected.

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, Room 519-S Statehouse, at 3:30 p.m. on March 5, 1996.

Michael J. Wilson, Superintendent USD 329, Mill Creek Valley, spoke in opposition to **HCR 5045** (Attachment 5). This resolution would require a large amount of funding. True definitions of "effective" and "efficient" schools must take into consideration attendance rates, graduation rates, pregnancy rates, drop out rates, Kansas Assessment Test results, achievement test results, the percentage of graduates going on to post-secondary education and the number of crimes committed in the schools. Money to be spent on a proposed study could be more "efficiently" spent in a manner which would prove much more "effective" to the school children of Kansas.

Ernie Price, Superintendent of Schools-USD 256, Moran, opposed **HCR 5045** because of local satisfaction within their school district. It is wrong to take funds from adequately funded districts to give to those that are not.

Judy Lair, Member of the Yates Center Board of Education-USD 366 appeared in opposition to **HCR 5045** and expressed concerns that the people of Kansas are not unhappy with the current configuration of school boundaries (Attachment 6). An investigation of this magnitude would involve countless man hours and thousands of tax dollars resulting in a needless waste of valuable state resources.

Charles Edmonds, Superintendent of Goddard schools spoke in opposition to **HCR 5045** for directing a study of optimal school district organization configuration which would be an unnecessary expenditure (Attachment 7). This action is in contradiction to returning decision making to local control. Statutes are already in place to adjust boundaries and dissolve districts with local patron and district action.

Eliese Holt, Director of Curriculum-USD 375, Towanda, spoke in opposition to **HCR 5045** and addressed four issues concerning the boundary study (Attachment 8). 1) Transportation costs do not equate necessarily with the size of school districts; 2) Redistribution of district's assessed wealth will change a district's tax base and a property owner's taxes resulting in some districts winning and others losing; 3) Parental choice for home location under this study could result in parents owning a home in a school system that is not of their choice; and, 4) Alliance and pride to ones school district could be affected by school boundary changes and could be very disruptive to Kansas public schools.

Kimberly Brier, Andover, spoke in opposition to **HCR 5045** and talked about choices; particularly, the choice where her family would like to live was based upon careful consideration of where they would like their children to attend school. This could all be put in jeopardy with legislation to change school districts.

Susan Summerlin, DeSoto, related her opposition to **HCR 5045** because of the plans that would be disrupted as a result of school boundary changes.

Several patrons from the Goddard School District spoke in opposition to **HCR 5045** (Attachment 9).

- 1) June Huie doubted the necessity of another study when existing information currently flows to the State Board of Education from each district and asked several questions in regard to the effect of study results on families and children's education.
- 2) Lacey Dreyer, a special education student recited her experiences and the improvement of her study skills because she was able to attend a smaller school.
- 3) Jane Stephenson spoke of efficiencies that would be realized with greater involvement in the schools and problem solving is not a by-product of a study of school district boundaries.
- 4) Jason Bennett, a student of Goddard schools since Kindergarten, spoke of the advantages of attending a small school.
- 5) Judy Bennett explained the dedication of patrons of Goddard public schools; the accountability forced upon the school board and administration by caring patrons; and the ongoing commitment for better education for all Kansas students.

Vice-Chairman Shore closed the hearing on **HCR 5045**.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

The next meeting is scheduled for March 6, 1996.

HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE GUEST LIST

DATE: March 5, 1996

NAME	REPRESENTING
Eliese Holt	Circle USD 375
Nancy Corkin	Circle USD 375
ANN GRAHAM	CIRCLE USD 375
Kimberly Brier	Andover USD 385
BOB POLLOM	SHAWNER HEIGHTS USD 450
Bob Reynolds	Kaw Valley USD 321
Larry Hill	USD 240
Bernie White	USD 307
Mike Wilson	USD # 329 - SQE
Jacque Daker	SQE
Ernie Price	USD 256
Bill Musick	ST 132 E 6
COY C ALLEN	USD 258 AT LARGE BOARD MEMBER
Bill Morris	USD # 366
Bill Kinde	Woodson Co # 366
Judy Davis	Yates Center District 366 BOE Mother, Business Person
Gene Stephenson	USD 265 + for my children Parent, Taxpayer, Educator (College level)
Jane Duvie	USD 265 Business Owner
Cathy Muebe	USD 232 DeSoto

WILLIAM G. (BILL) MASON
 REPRESENTATIVE, 75TH DISTRICT
 BUTLER COUNTY



TOPEKA

HOUSE OF
 REPRESENTATIVES

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS
 CHAIRMAN: EDUCATION
 MEMBER: FEDERAL AND STATE AFFAIRS
 BOARD MEMBER: KANSAS TECHNOLOGY
 ENTERPRISE CORPORATION

HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE
 TESTIMONY
 March 5, 1996
 HCR 545

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

I appreciate the chance to come as a proponent of HCR 5045 that would ask the State Board of Education to look at the district boundaries of schools across the state. While not popular, this is an issue that we should examine to see if there are any areas of significant savings in expenditures and in the improvement of the quality of education.

The legislature of the State of Kansas is responsible for setting school boundaries but it has been 33 years since we have even looked at that issue. The state's finance mechanism has changed drastically, population patterns, choice of schools and many other factors have changed as well. We should be looking at it with a different perspective.

I believe it is long overdue that we should have an ongoing study of districts and their boundaries for economy and efficiency. We are spending approximately 2/3 of all State General Fund budget (our taxpayers money) on Education. The general public has said that is enough to all public spending. It is going to be extremely difficult to find significant new money to fund education at a higher level. We have a real dilemma. We must find many of those dollars within the system.

We now have an inefficient system, in my opinion. In some cases we are bussing students from areas where we have adequate room in schools to schools where we pay low enrollment weighting, provide transportation and help the local district pay for new buildings. Business, industry and

families have had to look at every aspect of their activities to be more cost efficient. Should we expect no less from our schools. Many of our schools have had great success in lowering their expenditures and have few additional things that they can change on their own. There is no real incentive for districts to look at their boundary lines on their own.

There is no consistent mapping of districts across the state. Good appropriate decisions can not be made without good up to date information. There is very little available today.

How can anyone not agree that our info is outdated. The legislature has the responsibility and should live up to that responsibility-that there should be an overall study. Does anyone believe that we have the most efficient system possible? How many places are we bussing too far? How many places are we paying low enrollment weighting when other alternatives might be Better? How many times are we participating in building new school buildings when a change in boundaries might save millions?

Every person needs a medical checkup regularly. Would we wait 33 years for that checkup? If we were not feeling well or someone kept telling us that we look like we are having problems would we not take heed and have someone take a look? Should we do less for our children's education?

The whole scene changed when we changed the school finance law. Local districts had a different criteria previously. When the worth of a district was in buildings, industries, farm land and houses, the efficiency or inefficiency of a school district affected primarily the local district. Now that our taxpayers 35 mill levy is coming directly to the state, the local district valuation is not the big issue it was before the school finance law was passed.

Right now the only place to find new money for technology, teachers and administrators salary increases, increases in Special Ed funding and keeping up with the inflation rates is for the school districts to come with hat in hand asking for more appropriations or go to local taxpayers for the LOB. I believe that more and more taxpayer groups are going to stop any new LOB's or renewals. We must find new ways to make sure that our most valuable asset, our children, are getting the good quality education that we want for them.

This resolution asks for a study to be made. It does not suggest or allow any boundary to be changed. It calls for a report to be made for study in the 1997 legislative session. How can we possibly not want to have a full complete study that would help quantify any potential changes that could be beneficial.

I urge your support of HCR 5045.



Testimony on H.C.R. 5045

before the
House Committee on Education

by
John W. Koepke, Executive Director
Kansas Association of School Boards

March 5, 1996

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, we appreciate the opportunity to appear before you on behalf of the member boards of education of the Kansas Association of School Boards with regard to the important issues contained in H.C.R. 5045. The subject of school district boundaries and school district consolidation has been the focus of considerable discussion within our organization in recent years and has led to the adoption of a comprehensive policy on the issue. That policy statement reads as follows:

School District Unification

KASB believes that state law should authorize boards of education to close any attendance center or change the use of any attendance facility.

KASB opposes legislation to establish special systems of district structure within the unified school district law.

KASB believes Kansas should review school district boundaries on a regular schedule so boards of education will have reasonable security in planning attendance centers and educational programs. Boundary changes should take educational quality as well into account as well as school efficiency.

KASB opposes any legislation which would directly or indirectly result in state mandated consolidation of Kansas unified school districts.

Given the language of this policy statement, our opposition to the study proposed in H.C.R. 5045 should be clear. Numerous studies of the effect on educational quality and efficiency with regard to school district consolidation have been conducted in Kansas and other states. We do not believe that another study

House Education
3/5/96
Attachment 2

would contribute anything beyond that learned in the most recent Kansas study, the one conducted by the Legislative Division of Post Audit in 1992. That study concluded, as have the studies it cited from other states, that consolidation of school districts does not achieve significant cost savings.

Given the access to curriculum enhancement that is currently available to small school districts through technologies such as distance learning, the case for educational quality through consolidation of school districts has also been diminished.

We also believe that now is not the appropriate time to direct the staff of the State Department of Education to conduct the massive study apparently contemplated by this resolution in a relatively short time frame. The Department is already faced with potential staff reductions based on uncertain federal funding at a time when they are being overwhelmed by the final implementation of Quality Performance Education.

We continue to believe that the issue of school district boundaries and school district consolidation are best addressed at the local level. Many of the wounds inflicted as a result of the mandated unification of the 1960's have yet to heal. It seems to us a far more productive issue to address at this time would be to implement the first area addressed in the KASB policy statement, that of giving local school boards the authority to control their existing facilities.

In short, we believe that there is little to be gained by the conduct of the study outlined in this resolution and much anxiety would be needlessly generated. We appreciate the opportunity to express these thoughts and I would be happy to answer any questions.

March 5, 1996

TO: Chairman Mason and
Members of the House Education Committee

My name is Bob Pollom. I am a resident of U.S.D. 450, Shawnee Heights, in the southeast quarter of Shawnee County, Kansas. I was elected clerk of Common School District #7, Tecumseh, in May 1960 and served until unification. I was elected to the Board of Education of U.S.D. 450 and served until 1981. I am a survivor of the unification wars.

Prior to 1957, the high school students from our area attended Highland Park High School. Then, in 1957, the City of Topeka annexed Highland Park, including the school, and we were told to make our own arrangements for high school. It seems that this proves the old adage that what goes around comes around, for the same people who kicked us out now want us back some 40 years later. This action by Topeka resulted in the formation of Rural High School District 10, later to become U.S.D. 450.

Voluntary school consolidation in our area took place well before required to do so by the state. Each of the common school districts in our area at the time of unification contained more than 25 previously existing districts. This consolidation was voluntary and happened because concerned parents could see the advantages of music, library, art and many other subjects they were not able to offer on their own.

One of the reasons given for additional consolidation of schools is financial savings. I challenge that, since in our area the per pupil cost of the Topeka U.S.D. 501 district has always been, and still is, greater than the outlying suburban districts. It seems to me that there is a continuing concerted effort by some at the state level to reduce all of the districts in the state to a common level of mediocrity.

I spent 22 years on the school board in establishing a basic education foundation for my children and grandchildren, and not me only, but all of the other board members, teachers, and concerned caring parents.

We live in a pro-active community. We have been paying on bond issues continually since before unification. We were not allowed the luxury of no bond issues until ordered to by the court. Our parents have been concerned enough about their children to go the extra mile to providing the votes necessary to give them the buildings, the books, and the teaching staff required for a quality education. Just last year, we held a bond issue election to renovate and upgrade our buildings. The voter turnout was 85% and the issue was approved by a 78% yes vote.

Our schools are serving our community well. Let us alone. To paraphrase the old adage, "if it ain't broke, don't fix it." If other communities feel their children could be better served in a different school district, let them petition for a change.

Mr. Bob Pollom
6319 SE. 2nd St., Tecumseh, KS 66542

House Education
3/5/96
Attachment 3

School District Boundary Issue

First let me introduce myself, my name is Bob Kobbeman. I am a parent of three children and a patron of the Shawnee Heights U.S.D. 450 School District. Over the past six months I have been working with our school board and our school administrators in solving a very difficult issue that faces the school district, and that is the changing of school boundaries within the district. This is a very emotional and sensitive subject for the patrons of any school district, and challenges the boards and administrators within the district. Recently, our district has seen tremendous growth in one area that has created under utilization of some facilities and excess capacity in others. The re-districting within a district of school boundaries is as challenging and difficult as any task any board or administrator will face. Our group of parents have been meeting almost on a weekly basis with the representatives of the board and administration, to try to devise a re-districting plan that will maintain a high quality of education, and yet allow for the patrons to choose the school that their children attend.

In our school district, U.S.D. 450, children are considered #1. The board, administrators, teachers and the bus drivers all place the children #1. Because of this dedication to the children, I think we have the best school district in Shawnee County and possibly the best district in the State. This opinion is not founded in brick and mortar, but is founded in the quality of the educators and their dedication to the children. It is this reason that we chose to reside within the Shawnee Heights School District. Furthermore, we targeted the Berryton Elementary School to be our grade school, knowing that the staff and administrators were committed to providing the best possible educational opportunity for our children. This is the very reason that a group of us patrons banded together to assist the board in working on a plan to re-district the various elementary schools to better utilize our existing facilities, and continue the process of providing our children with a quality education.

There are a variety of factors that one considers when locating to a particular area. Most people with children, or those planning to have children chose to live in a particular area because of the educational opportunities that are or will be presented to their children. My family is a classic example of this. We chose to live in the Shawnee Heights School District because of the excellent reputation the district has in providing quality educational services. A good example of this, was the recent bond issue that was passed within the district. The district had an 85% voter turn out with almost 80% of the voters voting in favor of the bond issue. This truly demonstrated that the patrons were committed to providing quality education for their children and that it is a high priority in their everyday lives.

In today's political climate, people in general are looking for less government not more government. It is my contention that the school district boundary issues are best decided at the local level. This process as demonstrated by my personal experience, allows the district administrators, the school district board and the patrons to best decide what the issues are, and what course the district should take to solve them. The current program provides for the existing boards to arbitrate their differences and make the necessary decision at a local level with thought and input from the patrons and the families affected by the decisions. I think it is appropriate to retain this at the local level. I personally would not be in favor of a state or government agency making the decision of where my child attends school. In summary, we are addressing who should have the right to determine where the child is educated. It is my strong belief that this choice should lie with the parents and with the local school districts. As previously discussed, we are looking for less government, not more government, and these types of decisions are best made by the family, not by a bureaucratic latent government. Thank you for your time and consideration.

House Education
3/5/96
Attachment 4

TESTIMONY CONCERNING HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 5045
GIVEN TO
THE HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE BY MICHAEL J. WILSON, SUPERINTENDENT
USD #329--MILL CREEK VALLEY

MARCH 5, 1996

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

Thank you for allowing me the time to talk to you today concerning House Concurrent Resolution No. 5045. I have several reservations concerning the proposed resolution. A question which needs to be asked is how much will the study cost the tax payers of the state? We are constantly being told that there is not money available for additional funding for education, but we have a resolution proposed which would need a large amount of funding not included in the Governor's budget. There are over 1,500 school buildings in the state and over 460,000 children attending school. The study would involve reviewing where every child lives in relation to any district or adjoining district building. Also all bus routes would have to be studied because the road conditions would be an important factor to be considered. In addition, there would need to be public meetings established in every school district because the resolution asks for a review of the "communities of interest in matters such as commerce and tradition".

One area requested to be reviewed by this resolution is "pupil travel requirements including the distances pupils must travel to attend the schools of a district and the proximity of schools to adjoining districts". I'm sure you all remember this particular subject was discussed at length by this committee earlier in the session. You have already heard testimony that parents have the ability to send their children to other districts for whatever reason they choose, including living closer to another building of an adjoining school district. If new district configurations would be contingent on including every child who lives closer to a building, then the boundary of nearly every school district will have to be changed. Concerning this area of review, I would like to ask how would district boundaries be drawn if the student lives in one district, lives closer to an elementary building of another district, and lives closer still to a high school of a third district? Does this mean we need to have elementary school districts and separate secondary schools districts as is the case in the State of Nebraska? I hope the answer is a no!

House Education
3/5/96
Attachment 5

The areas of this proposed resolution I have most problems with are definitions. I believe you will have a real problem with the definition for "efficiency" and "effective", as well as the term "optimal configuration". Who will determine what these terms mean? I guarantee you that if you ask every person in this room what are their definitions for these terms, you will get as many different definitions as persons asked. Who should be determining when a school district is running "efficiently" or "effectively"? I believe that is the duty of the locally elected school boards. By statute they have been entrusted with that duty and if their interpretation is different than the voters of the district, they will know it during the next elections.

I also believe the question of these definitions is a very important question, probably the most critical question of all. I hope you, as Education Committee members, will have enough insight in education matters to know the true definitions of schools which are "efficient" and "effective" involve more than budget per pupil and how close the buildings are to all district patrons. True definitions of "effective" and "efficient" schools must take into consideration attendance rates, graduation rates, pregnancy rates, drop-out rates, Kansas Assessment Test results, achievement test results, the percentage of graduates going on to post-secondary education, and the number of crimes committed in the schools. Are you ready and willing to also complete a study which takes these factors into consideration? If your answer is no, as it probably is, then you will never know which school districts in this state are truly "effective" or "efficient". The study requested by Concurrent Resolution No. 5045 will only give you a very small part of the formula needed to find the answer.

In conclusion, I do not believe there is a big problem with district configuration of school districts in the State of Kansas. I would guess the number of patrons which have gone through the process to change boundaries over the past several years is minuscule. I believe the money that would be spent on this proposed study could be more "efficiently" spent in a manner which would prove much more "effective" to the school children of Kansas.

To: House Committee on Education

Subject: Concurrent Resolution No. 5045

From: Judy Lair, Board of Education, District 366

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee:

My name is Judy Lair. I live in Piqua. My three children attend school in Yates Center, District 366. I am currently serving on the Board of Education in our district.

I'm here today, because I am concerned about the concurrent resolution no. 5045, which proposes the State Board of Education reexamine school district boundaries and document any problems with such boundaries. In addition, the resolution proposes that enrollment data, guiding principles, student travel time, building conditions, and district valuations all be reexamined and evaluated. I do not believe such a study is warranted at this time.

As a school board member, I have attended regional meetings and the annual state school board convention. I have used these opportunities to gather and exchange ideas and information about providing quality education. I also consider myself reasonably informed through various school board publications. Frankly, I have not seen, or heard of any unhappiness among the people of our state about the current configuration of school boundaries.

I am aware of hard feelings that still exist within our county today, over boundary lines that were drawn decades ago. As a result of the School District Unification Act in the 1960's many smaller schools were closed and consolidated into larger districts. The idea of reexamining and possibly changing established district lines is certain to be highly controversial and divisive. Any changes should be made by request of the local citizenry, rather than by decree of the state.

House Education
3/5/96
Attachment 6

Changing district boundary lines will likely ignite other volatile issues. Consider the feelings of people within a newly defined district, faced with the responsibility of financing bond indebtedness which they did not choose to create. A shift in district valuations will likely become a contest between citizens demanding more or less for their districts.

Your proposed study would encompass each and every school district in our state. Not to mention, each and every school building. An investigation of this magnitude would involve countless man hours, plus thousands and thousands of tax dollars. I believe this study would be a needless waste of valuable state resources.

Respectfully submitted,

Judy Lair

RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO HCR 5045

March 5, 1996

Presented by Charles S. Edmonds
620 S. Walnut Street
Goddard, Kansas 67052

The suggestion that a study be undertaken to determine the attainment of the optimal school district organizational configuration is an unnecessary expenditure and seems to contradict the essential theme extolled by the majority party to return decision making to the lowest possible political level (local control). This position in opposition is based on the following facts:

1. As recently as 1991-92 (before the new school finance law) it was easy to determine monetary efficiency by simply reviewing the the State Report on Enrollments and General Fund Budget Per Pupil. In the last report prior to the new law the districts that were clearly the most efficient were those districts in the fourth enrollment category (2,000 - 10,000) and not the largest districts. The attached sheet reflects that of the forty-three (43) most efficient districts, none had an enrollment in excess of 8,523 or an enrollment below 1,338.
2. Kansas Statute provides remedies for both local districts, citizens and the State Board of Education to adjust boundaries and even dissolve districts if the districts do not meet expectations and do not satisfy local patrons.
 - a. KSA 72-7101-7112 gives the State Board authority to transfer territory if one district can prove better efficiency and/or quality of education. Transfer can be accomplished through the joint action of districts as well.
 - b. KSA 72-7301-7307 allows for unhappy patrons to vote to dissolve a district if it does not meet their expectations or is highly inefficient (20% petition of voters in last general election required to satisfy petition).
 - c. KSA 72-8701-8708 provides avenue for consolidating existing districts if patrons wish to do so (local control protected).

Based on the Statutes already in place, any attempt to legislate or study boundary changes seems unnecessary and contrary to the principle of local control of schools!

House Education
3/5/96
Attachment 7

DISTRICT NAME	#	1991-92 FTE ENROLLMENT	1991-92 LEGAL MAX BUDGET	1991-92 BUDGET PER PUPIL

① MULVANE	D0263	1,908.1	5,190,562	2,720.28
② PITTSBURG	D0250	2,958.0	9,187,501	3,105.98
③ GARDEN CITY	D0457	6,563.3	20,423,958	3,111.84
④ FT SCOTT	D0234	2,074.1	6,592,349	3,178.41
⑤ AUBURN WASHBURN	D0437	4,239.5	13,496,157	3,183.43
⑥ JUNCTION CITY	D0475	7,352.9	23,463,363	3,191.04
⑦ GREAT BEND	D0428	3,369.7	10,805,000	3,206.52
⑧ OTTAWA	D0290	2,281.0	7,368,000	3,230.16
⑨ AUGUSTA	D0402	2,081.1	6,726,604	3,232.23
⑩ EMPORIA	D0253	4,734.2	15,400,000	3,252.93
⑪ LIBERAL	D0480	3,542.2	11,570,287	3,266.41
⑫ DODGE CITY	D0443	4,241.0	13,870,000	3,270.46
⑬ SHAWNEE HEIGHTS	D0450	3,355.0	11,074,518	3,300.90
⑭ DEL DORADO	D0490	2,220.7	7,375,088	3,321.06
⑮ VALLEY CENTER PUBLIC SCHO	D0262	2,091.5	6,968,900	3,332.01
⑯ LEAVENWORTH	D0453	4,210.9	14,124,676	3,354.31
⑰ INDEPENDENCE	D0446	2,340.1	7,872,076	3,363.99
⑱ SEAMAN	D0345	3,299.7	11,155,725	3,380.83
⑲ MANHATTAN	D0383	6,336.2	21,448,957	3,385.15
⑳ WELLINGTON	D0353	2,030.5	6,877,743	3,387.22
㉑ SALINA	D0305	7,172.1	24,448,717	3,408.86
㉒ HAYSVILLE	D0261	3,446.0	11,768,433	3,415.10
㉓ ARKANSAS CITY	D0470	3,053.5	10,466,197	3,427.61
㉔ CHANUTE PUBLIC SCHOOLS	D0413	1,981.1	6,814,961	3,439.99
㉕ MCPHERSON	D0418	2,556.1	8,798,000	3,441.96
㉖ NEWTON	D0373	3,287.1	11,431,243	3,477.61
㉗ IOLA	D0257	1,789.5	6,243,101	3,488.74
㉘ PARSONS	D0503	1,878.5	6,606,170	3,516.73
㉙ CLAY CENTER	D0379	1,646.4	5,800,000	3,522.84
㉚ HUTCHINSON PUBLIC SCHOOLS	D0308	5,007.5	17,660,486	3,526.81
㉛ WINFIELD	D0465	2,414.0	8,537,782	3,536.78
㉜ DERBY	D0260	6,010.0	21,258,083	3,537.12
㉝ BUHLER	D0313	2,144.5	7,618,770	3,552.70
㉞ COFFEYVILLE	D0445	2,644.4	9,500,000	3,592.50
㉟ TURNER-KANSAS CITY	D0202	3,832.2	13,794,952	3,599.75
㊱ ANDOVER	D0385	1,708.5	6,167,171	3,609.70
㊲ LAWRENCE	D0497	8,523.7	30,887,500	3,623.72
㊳ WATCHISON PUBLIC SCHOOLS	D0409	1,691.4	6,156,417	3,639.84
㊴ LABETTE COUNTY	D0506	1,657.0	6,038,954	3,644.51
㊵ GODDARD	D0265	2,108.5	7,776,847	3,688.33
㊶ HAYS	D0489	3,431.0	12,704,625	3,702.89
㊷ PRATT	D0382	1,338.1	4,957,250	3,704.69
㊸ RONNER SPRINGS	D0204	2,106.0	7,813,963	3,710.33

Representatives from Circle USD 375, Towanda, KS
Ann Graham, Board of Education Member
Eliese Holt, Dir. of Curriculum
Nancy Corkins, Benton Patron

Speaking in opposition to the resolution to study school district boundary changes

We question the wisdom and practicality of directing the State Board of Education to study school district boundaries and develop a plan to reconfigure the state's school districts. We would like to address four issues concerning the boundary study:

- transportation costs
- redistribution of district's assessed wealth
- parental choice for home location
- alliance and pride to one's school district

Transportation costs are one reason being cited for moving school district boundaries, with Circle USD 375 being cited as an example. Circle district is a large school district stretching 21 miles along highway 254 from El Dorado to the eastern edges of Wichita. However, no regular education student in Circle USD 375 travels more than 16 miles to an attendance center, with primary students attending schools within 11 miles of their homes. Circle District spends 5.83 percent of its general fund budget on transportation. This falls in the median range of the nine school district's in Butler County. Size of school district does not equate necessarily with high transportation costs. We do not believe this is a valid reason for making boundary changes.

We know that any shift in boundaries will change a district's tax base and a property owner's taxes. Manipulating a district's assessed wealth will result in some districts winning and others losing. We do not believe that this is in the best interest of educating students in Kansas. Patrons have made commitments to their school district's based upon our assessed evaluation. Circle district patrons have chosen to support a 4 mill capital outlay mill levy. The district is studying options for a possible bond issue. No long range strategic plans can be made if boundaries are to change. Changing boundaries will be disruptive to many school districts which are implementing improvement and facility plans to create the best possible learning for all children in Kansas.

In Circle District many patrons have purchased homes having carefully evaluated the neighborhoods, communities and school system. These often life time purchases have been made with an understanding that their children will be educated in a certain school district. We do not support moving boundaries such that children's education is disrupted and parents find themselves owning a home in a school system that is not of their choice.

In Circle District 375 we too have the goals of Chairperson Bill Mason of spending our budget wisely, not wasting a single dollar. Circle District has worked for 30 years to develop a system for which patrons can identify with pride that they are patrons of USD 375. As we continue to improve our school system to best meet the needs of all students, we do not believe that the issue of changing district boundaries will bring about better education, but rather be very disruptive to Kansas public schools.

We urge you not to support the resolution to study school district boundary changes.

House Education
3/5/96
Attachment 8

TESTIMONY IN OPPOSITION TO 1996 HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 5045

The patrons of Goddard School District have some deep concerns about House Concurrent Resolution No. 5045 which would direct the State Board of Education to undertake a study of school district organization and to render a blueprint for attainment of the optimal school district configuration.

We cannot help but wonder who would benefit from a change in school district boundaries. We hope that you would agree that the most important elements of this equation are the children...the learners in our school districts who depend upon us. We regret that this hearing was scheduled so quickly, rendering us little time to adequately prepare for a hearing of this importance.

We do, however, ask you to consider the following:

- The majority of Goddard School District patrons chose to live within our district because they wanted their children to attend Goddard Public Schools.
- Goddard School District patrons chose to move into our district knowing that their taxes would be higher...but they believed their children's education was worth that investment.
- Goddard School District attributes much of its success to parental involvement — involvement in everything from room parents to curriculum to technology development. Our patrons want to participate because they believe in their schools.
- Goddard School District patrons believe we provide quality education for their children. They believe we offer opportunities that are not evident in larger school districts. They recognize that more than 75% of our students enroll in higher education programs, and 95% of Goddard graduates are accepted at the college of their choice because of the quality education they received.
- Goddard School District offers sports programs — even for young athletes who are not the “top” performers in their sport. Our patrons recognize that larger school districts cannot offer these opportunities.
- Special Education students receive lots of help and attention from smaller class settings. Students and parents tell us the key to the students' successes are intricately tied to these factors.
- A student with a 4.0 GPA told us the extra attention he receives has been a significant factor in his success, and he is convinced that he could not have achieved to this level in a larger school.
- Students in Goddard School District are served by counselors who know them...as individuals.
- Goddard School District patrons feel that our schools are neighborhood schools because everyone in the neighborhood attends the same school. This feeling promotes lifetime loyalty to Goddard Public Schools. It also fosters an atmosphere that encourages parental involvement — one of the keys to effective schools.
- Goddard School District patrons feel they get what they pay for. Many of the patrons testifying today will tell you that is the reason a recent \$19.8 million bond issue for a new high school was successful on the first vote.
- A local business owner recently told us that when his managers are reviewing job applications, students from Goddard School District (and other small to mid-size school districts) are given priority because they have a reputation for being hard-working, loyal employees.
- Goddard School District patrons believe there is more accountability in smaller schools, and opportunities to exercise local control to provide the best possible education for their children.
- We note with pride that all of these statements are true, while Goddard School District operates with one of the lowest per pupil costs in the state of Kansas.

House Education
3/5/96
Attachment 9

As you consider the resolution before you, please consider these questions:

- Who would benefit from a change in school district boundaries?
- Who would pay for the bond issues Goddard School District has passed to accommodate our growing school district?
 - How will the State of Kansas be impacted economically by passage of this resolution to study school district boundaries? If our district boundaries are in jeopardy, how many homes will sit on the real estate market awaiting the outcome? How will property tax values be affected? How will home values be affected?
 - If district boundaries were re-drawn to become (for example) county-wide school districts, how soon would larger districts experience urban flight to counties with smaller populations? What would ultimately be accomplished by such a plan?
 - How can a thorough study of the magnitude being considered for a “blueprint for attainment of the optimal school district configuration” be completed in such a short period of time?

Finally, if cost effectiveness is the most compelling factor for this study, we submit that recent research reveals that school districts with enrollment of 1800 to 10,000 students operate at the most cost effective level (see Attachment A).

This is obviously a very emotional issue. But, it is also a business issue and an economic issue. Most importantly, however, it is an education issue. Our schools are working hard to achieve success through effective school principles, high standards of performance, staff development and training, and development of a community learning concept. Give us an opportunity to reach the goals we have set for school improvement. Please don't put a detour on our road to success. **The effectiveness of our schools and the future of our children is at stake.**

Submitted by:
Goddard School District
P. O. Box 249
Goddard, KS 67052

Presenters:
Charles Edmonds, Superintendent of Schools
Jason Bennett, student
Lacey Dreyer, student
Judy Bennett, parent
Jane Stephenson, parent and business person
June Huie, parent and business person

RUN# R002A PROCESSED ON 02/25/92

DISTRICT NAME	#	1991-92 FTE ENROLLMENT	1991-92 LEGAL MAX BUDGET	1991-92 BUDGET PER PUPIL
MULVANE	D0263	1,908.1	5,190,562	2,720.28
PITTSBURG	D0250	2,958.0	9,187,501	3,105.98
GARDEN CITY	D0457	6,563.3	20,423,958	3,111.84
FT SCOTT	D0234	2,074.1	6,592,349	3,178.41
AUBURN WASHBURN	D0437	4,239.5	13,496,157	3,183.43
JUNCTION CITY	D0475	7,352.9	23,463,363	3,191.04
GREAT BEND	D0428	3,369.7	10,805,000	3,206.52
OTTAWA	D0290	2,281.0	7,368,000	3,230.16
AUGUSTA	D0402	2,081.1	6,726,604	3,232.23
EMPORIA	D0253	4,734.2	15,400,000	3,252.93
LIBERAL	D0480	3,542.2	11,570,287	3,266.41
DODGE CITY	D0443	4,241.0	13,870,000	3,270.46
SHAWNEE HEIGHTS	D0450	3,355.0	11,074,518	3,300.90
EL DORADO	D0490	2,220.7	7,375,088	3,321.06
VALLEY CENTER PUBLIC SCHO	D0262	2,091.5	6,968,900	3,332.01
LEAVENWORTH	D0453	4,210.9	14,124,676	3,354.31
INDEPENDENCE	D0446	2,340.1	7,872,076	3,363.99
SEAMAN	D0345	3,299.7	11,155,725	3,380.83
MANHATTAN	D0383	6,336.2	21,448,957	3,385.15
WELLINGTON	D0353	2,030.5	6,877,743	3,387.22
SALINA	D0305	7,172.1	24,448,717	3,408.86
HAYSVILLE	D0261	3,446.0	11,768,433	3,415.10
ARKANSAS CITY	D0470	3,053.5	10,466,197	3,427.61
CHANUTE PUBLIC SCHOOLS	D0413	1,981.1	6,814,961	3,439.99
MCPHERSON	D0418	2,556.1	8,798,000	3,441.96
NEWTON	D0373	3,287.1	11,431,243	3,477.61
IDA	D0257	1,789.5	6,243,101	3,488.74
PARSONS	D0503	1,878.5	6,606,170	3,516.73
CLAY CENTER	D0379	1,646.4	5,800,000	3,522.84
HUTCHINSON PUBLIC SCHOOLS	D0308	5,007.5	17,660,486	3,526.81
WINFIELD	D0465	2,414.0	8,537,782	3,536.78
DERBY	D0260	6,010.0	21,258,083	3,537.12
BUHLER	D0313	2,144.5	7,618,770	3,552.70
COFFEYVILLE	D0445	2,644.4	9,500,000	3,592.50
TURNER-KANSAS CITY	D0202	3,832.2	13,794,952	3,599.75
ANDOVER	D0385	1,708.5	6,167,171	3,609.70
LAWRENCE	D0497	8,523.7	30,887,500	3,623.72
ATCHISON PUBLIC SCHOOLS	D0409	1,691.4	6,136,417	3,639.84
LABETTE COUNTY	D0506	1,657.0	6,038,954	3,644.51
GODDARD	D0265	2,108.5	7,776,847	3,688.33
HAYS	D0489	3,431.0	12,704,625	3,702.89
PRATT	D0382	1,338.1	4,957,250	3,704.69
POWELL SPRINGS	D0204	2,106.0	7,813,963	3,710.33