

Approved: 1-11-01

Date

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION.

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Senator Dwayne Umbarger at 9:00 a.m. on January 10, 2001 in Room 313-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except:

Committee staff present: Carolyn Rampey, Legislative Research
Ben Barrett, Legislative Research
Avis Swartzman, Revisor of Statutes
Judy Steinlicht, Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee:

Others attending:

A Joint Education Committee to explain the new boundary study report for school districts was called to order by Representative Ralph Tanner. Opening remarks were made by Representative Tanner, Senator Umbarger and Sonny Rundell, State Board of Education.

The study was prepared by the consulting firm, Augenblick & Myers, Inc. Dr. John Augenblick gave a detailed explanation on how data was gathered, what sources were used and how the information was compiled to complete the report titled, "A Comprehensive Study on the Organization of Kansas School Districts." (Attachment 1) Dr. John Myers explained the charts and maps within the report.

Questions were answered for attendees.

Representative Tanner added closing remarks and adjourned.

The next regular Senate meeting will be January 11, 2001 at 1:30 p.m.

A Comprehensive Study on the Organization of Kansas School Districts

**Prepared for
The Kansas State Board of Education**

in response to
RFP Number 00241

by

Augenblick & Myers, Inc.

Dr. John Augenblick, John Myers, and Justin Silverstein

January 10, 2001

*Senate Education
1-10-01
Attachment 1*

January 10, 2001

Mr. Harold Voth, Chairman
Kansas State Board of Education
120 South East 10th Avenue
Topeka, KS 66612-1182

Dear Chairman Voth:

Attached is the report prepared by Augenblick & Myers, Inc. (A&M) in regard to the organization of school districts in Kansas, which was completed under a contract with the Kansas State Board of Education. The report summarizes our findings and recommendations based on: (1) a statistical evaluation of enrollment, pupil performance, per pupil spending, and other data for school districts and schools; (2) a review of the relevant literature related to school district organization and school size; and (3) on-site visits and interviews with representatives of 64 school districts throughout the state. The report identifies three alternative approaches that could be taken to identify both school districts that might benefit from reorganization and the districts with which they might be merged and includes lists of "target" districts for reorganization, characteristics of their neighboring districts, and lists and maps displaying the proposed reconfigurations. The report also includes recommendations for possible statutory changes that might facilitate reorganization and suggests that the State Board of Education play an important role in the process in the future.

Our work was completed over a long period of time and we appreciate the patience of interested parties in waiting until the end of the process to review the entire study rather than requiring us to report progress in piecemeal fashion. Given the controversial nature of the issue, the need to obtain data that was not routinely available, and our evolving thoughts about how to proceed, we needed all the time that was given to us. We have tried to take a logical and orderly approach, one driven by both data and analysis *and* the realities of history, geography, and economics.

We want to thank several individuals who provided assistance to us during the last 15 months, including Mr. Rod Bieker, Mr. Dale Dennis, Ms. Tamara Milligan, and Mr. Veryl Peter of the Department of Education, and Mr. Ben Barrett, Ms. Mary Galligan, and Mr. Kenneth Hughes of the Legislative Research Council. These people provided tremendous amounts of background information, provided access to school district level pupil performance and fiscal data, undertook surveys of districts and schools to obtain additional data, advised us about statutory references to reorganization, and met with us on several occasions throughout the course of the work.

1-2

We also want to recognize the assistance we received from individuals at A&M whose names do not appear as authors of the study, including Ms. Anne Barkis, Dr. Michael Lacy, and Ms. Jennifer Sharp, who helped us in conducting interviews, summarizing the literature, resolving software issues, gathering background data, and preparing the final report.

The report expresses the views of the authors and none of the people named above are responsible for any of its findings or recommendations.

We hope that the State Board of Education is able to build on the study in order to help those school districts that know they need to reorganize and to push those who may resist such change to undertake a thorough process of review in order to better understand their options.

Sincerely,


John Augenblick


John L. Myers


Justin Silverstein

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In October 1999, Augenblick & Myers, Inc. (A&M), a Denver-based consulting firm that works with state policy makers on education finance and governance issues, was selected by the Kansas State Board of Education to conduct a study of school district organization. The study was mandated by the Kansas Legislature in Section 10, 1999 Senate Bill 171.

A&M created an advisory panel for the study, consisting of Dr. Richard King of the University of Northern Colorado, Dr. Chris Piphon, formerly with the Education Commission of the States, Dr. Paul Nachitgal, former director of the Rural Challenge, and Mr. Terry Whitney, formerly with the National Conference of State Legislatures. We then undertook five key tasks.

1. We completed a review of the literature related to school district reorganization.
2. We developed two approaches to selecting "target" districts that might benefit from reorganization.
3. We conducted on-site visits and interviews with representatives of 64 school districts located throughout the state.
4. We developed three alternative ways to reorganize school districts.
5. We identified areas where statutory changes would be needed to implement our recommendations.

School districts are important governmental entities in this country. At the discretion of the states, most of them have been delegated the authority to levy taxes, incur bonded indebtedness, hire key employees, and set curriculum. Kansas, like the other states, determines how many school districts shall exist and where their boundaries shall be. Over time, the number of school districts has decreased dramatically from over 120,000 nationally, to fewer than 15,000, and from over 9,000 in Kansas, to 304. The importance of their boundaries has also diminished somewhat, particularly in states such as Kansas that have modified their school finance procedures so that the wealth of each district is far less critical in determining that district's total revenue and property tax rates. This is also true in states that have promoted open enrollment (so that pupils can enroll in schools in districts other than the one in which they reside). Kansas currently has 1.00% of the nation's pupils, 1.62% of the nation's schools, and 2.10% of the nation's school districts.

While the states have delegated certain powers to school districts, they maintain both a constitutional responsibility to provide adequate and equitable education services and an interest in assuring that pupils achieve certain education objectives. A state's economic and democratic future hinges on whether such objectives are met. Because

the state pays for a significant portion of educational services, it also has an interest in assuring that the cost of providing these services is reasonable. These days, a state's interest in elementary and secondary education primarily reflects its interest in pupil performance and per pupil spending. Little else justifies changing school district boundaries.

The literature about school district reorganization is rather thin, consisting mostly of economic studies of school and school district optimum size, and the arguments that are made for and against changing the numbers of school districts in a state. While the literature is less than definitive about school and school district size, there has long been the view that schools, particularly high schools, need to be large enough to provide an adequate array of academic services and extra-curricular activities. More recently, there are those who advise that schools be small enough to assure a safe, nurturing environment and that school districts are not so large that they become unmanageable. While technology facilitates the provision of broader opportunities in small, isolated schools, there is little evidence that it can fully substitute for the hands-on presence of well-trained adults. And while evidence exists that some graduates of small high schools go on to become very successful, that evidence tends to focus on very few people, much the same way large schools publicize a small number of pupils who become Merit Scholars.

A&M used two basic approaches to identify "target" school districts that might benefit from reorganization. The first approach focuses on districts with relatively low levels of pupil performance and relatively high levels of per pupil spending. We used a statistical technique, regression analysis, to predict both expected levels of pupil performance (based on combining 1998 composite reading, math, and writing scores for Kansas statewide achievement tests) and expected levels of per pupil spending (for instruction, administration, and plant maintenance and operation). Some people suggested that the use of the tests was inappropriate. Because our purpose was to focus only on some districts, the tests provide the only basis for evaluating the relative performance of school districts, and the information is already being used to hold districts accountable, we feel that it is appropriate to use them as the basis of identifying those school districts where state action might be required. While there are many other kinds of information that individual districts use to evaluate their own performance, none provide comparable information for all districts. We used per pupil spending as the basis for evaluating relative spending levels. Some people suggested that, since the state controls the level of spending of school districts, and no district exceeds the level specified by the state, it is logically impossible to identify high spending districts. Our feeling is that, given the variation in spending that exists, some districts may be spending more than necessary relative to the spending of other districts. The state's formula for distributing state aid may also permit higher spending than is necessary.

Using regression analysis allows us to see how pupil performance and per pupil spending are influenced by the proportion of pupils eligible for free and reduced price lunches and the wealth or enrollment level of a school district. The regression equations accounted for 73 percent of the variation in per pupil performance and 80

percent of the variation in per pupil spending. Given that those levels are high but not perfect, we established confidence intervals around predicted levels of performance and spending to be sure that appropriate districts were identified as being low in performance or high in spending. Based on our analysis, we identified 28 districts that had a combination of low pupil performance and high per pupil spending. They are listed below in three categories.

Districts that have low pupil performance and high per pupil spending based on regression results: Moscow Public Schools (209), West Solomon Valley Public Schools (213), Elkhart (218), Washington Schools (222), Hanston (228), Nes Tre La Go (301), Belle Plaine (357), Chase-Raymond (401), Hillcrest Rural Schools (455), and Udall (463).

Districts with higher than expected per pupil spending and lower than average pupil performance for two years: Fowler (225), Triplains (275), Elk Valley (283), Cedar Vale (285), Herndon (317), Eastern Heights (324), Wathena (406), and Chetopa (505).

Districts with lower than expected pupil performance in 1998, lower than average performance in 1997, and per pupil spending above the predicted level excluding the use of the confidence interval: Turner-Kansas City (202), Bonner Springs (204), Mankato (278), Pleasanton (344), Oxford (358), Caldwell (360), Marysville (364), Madison-Virgil (386), Neodesha (461), and South Haven (509).

The second approach to identify districts that might benefit from reorganization focuses on districts that are either too small or too large given what researchers and practitioners believe, to offer an appropriate curriculum, extra-curricular opportunities, and a safe, nurturing environment. This approach assumes that a high school should serve between 100 and 900, pupils and that a district should have an enrollment of at least 260 pupils per high school but no more than 2,925 pupils per high school in order to be at those levels. Looking at the total enrollment of school districts and the number of high schools they operate, we found 50 districts that are too small and 24 districts that are too large based on these guidelines. We also identified two districts as being so large that they might need to be reorganized by breaking them into smaller, more manageable districts. These 76 districts have been grouped into four categories and listed below.

Districts that are too small with only one high school: Cheylin (103), White Rock (104), Moscow Public Schools (209), Northern Valley (212), West Solomon Valley Schools (213), Rolla (217), Ashland (220), North Central (221), Fowler (225), Hanston (228), West Smith County (238), Weskan (242), Palco (269), Triplains (275), Jewell (279), West Graham-Morland (280), Elk Valley (283), Cedar Vale (286), Grinnell Public Schools (291), Wheatland (292), Prairie Heights (295), Sylvan Grove (299), Nes Tre La Go (301), Smoky Hill (302), Bazine (304), Brewster (314), Golden Plains (316), Herndon (317), Eastern

Heights (324), Logan (326), Burrton (369), Montezuma (371), Hamilton (390), Paradise (399), Chase-Raymond (401), Mullinville (424), Midway Schools (433), Hillcrest Public Schools (455), Healy Public Schools (468), Dexter (471), Haviland (474), Copeland (476), Pawnee Heights (496), Lewis (502), and Attica (511).

Districts that are too small with more than one high school: Barnes (223), Leroy-Gridley (245), Southern Cloud (334), Rural Vista (481), and Axtell (488).

Districts that are too large relative to the number of high schools they operate: Turner-Kansas City (202), Blue Valley (229), Olathe (233), Emporia (253), Derby (260), Haysville (261), Goddard (265), Maize (266), Salina (305), Hutchinson Public Schools (308), Seaman (345), Newton (373), Manhattan (383), Great Bend (428), Auburn Washburn (437), Dodge City (443), Leavenworth (453), Garden City (457), Geary County Schools (475), Liberal (480), Hays (489), Lawrence (497), and Kansas City (500).

Districts that are too large: Wichita (259) and Shawnee Mission Public Schools (512).

Some of the most important activities we undertook in this study were the on-site visits to a large number of school districts where we interviewed many district representatives. We did this not only because it was required by contract, but also to better understand the dynamics within the districts we identified as targets and in their neighboring districts, which might also be involved in reorganization. We used several criteria to select districts for on-site visits or interviews. First, every one of the 28 districts we identified using the first approach described above was placed on the list. Second, we selected some neighboring districts of those 28 target districts. Third, we obtained additional information about 90 school districts, including the age of their buildings and enrollment projections, and selected some districts based on those factors. Finally, we selected some districts based on being too large, using the second approach to identify target districts described above. In all, we had contact with 64 districts.

We learned a number of things from our on-site visits and interviews: (1) there is substantial resistance to consolidation because of historical, cultural and financial reasons; (2) there is support for state reorganization in extreme cases, where there are declining enrollments and high spending; (3) district officials justified and defended low student performance and high spending; and (4) technology, distance learning, building projects and innovative superintendents were considered essential for surviving consolidation.

Once the on-site visits and interviews were completed, we began to develop reorganization scenarios, ultimately creating three alternative approaches: (1) an approach based on pupil performance and per pupil spending; (2) an approach based on enrollment levels relative to number of high schools; and (3) an approach that took

into consideration both of the first two approaches and resolved differences between them based on a variety of practical considerations, including distance between schools, school capacity (which we obtained through a survey carried out by the Department of Education), and the information we obtained through the on-site visits and interviews.

Tables in the report show the characteristics of target school districts and their neighboring districts, as well as the mergers of districts associated with the three alternative approaches to reorganization. The figures below summarize the results of each approach for the entire state.

- (1) For the approach based on pupil performance and per pupil spending, we identified 28 target districts. We examined all neighbors of those districts for possible reorganization with target districts based on their pupil performance, their per pupil spending, and their distance from the target districts. We were unable to reorganize eight of the target districts using those criteria. We found 22 neighboring districts that could be merged with the 20 remaining target districts to create 20 new districts. The result is 282 districts statewide.
- (2) For the approach based on school district size, we identified 76 target districts. We examined all neighbor districts for the 74 districts that we felt had high schools that were either too small or too large based on enrollment relative to number of high schools, excess capacity of schools, and distance between schools. We were able to reconfigure 45 of the 50 districts with high schools that are too small by merging them with 29 neighbor districts and creating 34 new districts. We were able to reconfigure six of the 24 districts with high schools that are too large by merging them with seven neighbor districts and creating five new districts. In total, 51 target districts are merged with 36 neighbor districts to create 39 new districts and a total of 256 districts in the state. Some other approach would need to be taken to address the issue in 20 of the 26 districts with large high schools and in the two large districts.
- (3) For the combined approach, we were able to reconfigure 56 target districts with 36 neighboring districts to create 43 new districts and a total of 255 districts statewide. As with the second approach, we were unable to resolve concerns in 21 districts by reorganization, which would require other approaches to be taken.

In order to facilitate reorganizing school districts in Kansas, a number of changes need to be made to the state's statutes. A&M recommends that the legislature delegate to the State Board of Education the power to change school district boundaries more easily than is currently allowed. The State Board should consider boundary changes by using three processes to assess alternative: (1) Emergency dissolution, (2) Required boundary change planning, and (3) Review of boundary options. The emergency

dissolution is required for those districts that are less than 80 students in 2000, or less than 100 students in 2001 and have declining enrollment. Those districts are required to have a public hearing and report the results to the State Board. The State Board shall take action to accept the district report or implement one of their own. The required boundary change planning is for all of the other districts identified as part of the 28 original targets on Map 1 in this report. Districts would have three years to work on improvements or recommendations, than if they are still targets would follow the emergency dissolution process. The review of boundary options would be for all of the other districts identified as targets in this report. They would follow the same process as the required boundary change planning districts without the final requirement of dissolution.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction	I-1
II. School District Boundaries: An Overview	
An Overview of the Literature	II-1
School Districts in Context	II-1
Historical Evolution of School Districts	II-1
District Consolidation	II-3
The Case for Large School Districts	II-3
The Case for Small School Districts	II-4
The Small Schools Critique and the Diseconomies of Scale	II-5
Sher's Critique of Large District Size	II-6
Optimal Size	II-7
Monk's Test for District Consolidation	II-7
The Current Environment	II-9
Bibliography	II-10
III. Alternative Procedures for Identifying Districts that Might Benefit from Reorganization	
Introduction	III-1
Identifying Target Districts Based on Pupil Performance and Per Pupil Spending	III-1
Pupil Performance	III-2
Per Pupil Spending	III-4
Selecting "Target" Districts	III-6
Identifying Districts Based on Size of School	III-7
Selecting "Target" Districts	III-8
IV. Interview Procedures	
The On-Site Visit and Interview Process	IV-1
Selecting Districts for Analysis	IV-1
KASB School Board Meetings	IV-2
The Research Teams	IV-2
On-Site Visits	IV-2
School Districts Selected	IV-3
Phone Interviews	IV-3

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

IV. Interview Procedures (continued)

Large School Districts	IV-4
Conclusion	IV-4
Results: A Summary of the Interviews	IV-4
Resistance to Consolidation	IV-4
A Call for State Help	IV-5
Explanations for Low Student Performance	IV-6
Explanations for High Spending	IV-7
Responses to Consolidation	IV-7
The Reorganization Process	IV-9
Conclusion	IV-9

V. Alternative Approaches to Reorganizing School Districts in Kansas

Introduction	V-1
The First Approach to School District Reorganization (Map 1)	V-2
The Target Districts	V-2
Identifying Appropriate Neighboring Districts	V-3
The Second Approach to School District Reorganization (Map 2)	V-3
The Target Districts	V-3
Identifying Appropriate Neighboring Districts	V-4
The Third Approach to School District Reorganization (Map 3)	V-5

VI. Recommendations for Statutory Changes

Current Statutes	VI-1
Recommendations	VI-3
Emergency Dissolution	VI-4
Required Boundary Change Planning	VI-4
Review of Boundary Options	VI-5
Other Statutory Issues	VI-5

Appendix Tables

LIST OF TABLES

- III-1 District-Weighted Kansas Statewide Statistics for Variables Related to Per Pupil Spending and Pupil Performance in 1998-99
- III-2 Pupil-Weighted Kansas Statewide Statistics for Variables Related to Per Pupil Spending and Pupil Performance in 1998-99
- III-3 District-Weighted Averages for Variables Related to Per Pupil Spending and Pupil Performance in 1998-99 by Quintile of Per Pupil Performance for School Districts in Kansas
- III-4 Pupil-Weighted Averages for Variables Related to Per Pupil Spending and Pupil Performance in 1998-99 by Quintile of Per Pupil Performance for School Districts in Kansas
- III-5 District-Weighted Averages for Variables Related to Per Pupil Spending and Pupil Performance in 1998-99 by Quintile of Per pupil Spending for Instruction, Administration, and Plant M&O for School Districts in Kansas
- III-6 Pupil-Weighted Averages for Variables Related to Per Pupil Spending and Pupil Performance in 1998-99 by Quintile of Per pupil Spending for Instruction, Administration, and Plant M&O for School Districts in Kansas
- III-7 Pupil-Weighted Averages for Variables Related to Per Pupil Spending and Pupil Performance in 1998-99 for Three groups of Kansas School Districts Identified as Low Performing and High Spending
- V-1 Data Related to the Selection of Neighboring Districts to Merge with the Target Districts Associated with Map 1
- V-2 Districts Involved in Reconfiguration Where Target Districts are Those with Relatively Low Performance and Relatively High Spending (Map 1)
- V-3 Data Related to the Selection of Neighboring Districts to Merge with the Target Districts Associated with Map 2

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

- V-4(A) Districts Involved in Reconfiguration Where Target Districts are Those with Schools Considered to be Too Small Based on Enrollment Relative to Number of High Schools (Map 2)
- V-4(B) Districts Involved in Reconfiguration Where Target Districts are Those with Schools Considered to be Too Large Based on Enrollment Relative to Number of High Schools or Where the District Itself Is Considered to be Too Large (Map 3)
- V-5 Districts Involved in Reconfiguration Where Target Districts are Those Identified in Map 1 and Map 2 and Some Issues that Arose in Making Those Maps are Resolved (Map 3)
- V-6 Numbers of Districts that are Reconfigured in Association with Map 1, Map 2, and Map 3
- Appendix 1 Enrollment Data for All Districts
- Appendix 2 Performance Data for All Districts
- Appendix 3 1998-99 Spending Data for All Districts
- Appendix 4 Enrollment, Capacity and Year Built for Schools
- Appendix 5 Self Reported Condition of Buildings for the 90 Districts that Were Asked to provide Additional Information

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

In October 1999 Augenblick & Myers, Inc. (A&M) signed a contract with the Kansas State Board of Education to conduct an analysis of school district organization. The study was undertaken pursuant to Section 10 of 1999 Senate Bill No. 171, which mandated that a consultant be employed to gather and analyze information, conduct on-site visits in school districts, and develop a comprehensive plan for the organization of school districts so that the school system could operate efficiently and effectively. We spent the last 15 months studying school districts in Kansas in order to comply with the requirements of the State Board of Education and the Legislature. The purpose of this report is to describe our work, including the procedures we used to collect and evaluate information, the alternative approaches we developed to address some of the issues we identified, and the statutory changes that would need to be made in order to implement those approaches.

School districts play an important role in American society. Although the states have the constitutional responsibility of providing public elementary and secondary education, they have delegated the authority to manage the way education services are delivered to school districts, which they can create or dissolve as they see fit. School districts have specific powers, which vary from state to state, that range from levying taxes and incurring bonded indebtedness to hiring staff and setting curriculum. Over time, however, the roles of school districts have changed somewhat as states, including Kansas, have placed constraints on the ability of school districts to generate revenue and have permitted students to enroll in schools in districts other than the ones in which they reside.

Over the last 100 years, the number of school districts has decreased dramatically, from more than 120,000 to less than 15,000. This change reflects a variety of trends, including the creation of unified, K-12 districts, rather than elementary or high school districts, and the desire to have entities that provide a broad array of instructional and ancillary services in an efficient manner. As anyone knows who has even contemplated changing the way school districts are organized, the topic is a controversial one. The states have approached the organization of school districts in very different ways with some states having only a few and some making them co-terminal with counties while others have large numbers of districts that may be independent of any other government entities. School districts are symbols of localism and they play an important role in the economies of some communities. When change occurs, it tends to cause great consternation and, as we discovered working in Kansas, people remember those changes for a long time after they have taken place.

There are a variety of reasons for why a state might choose to change the way its school districts are organized. The state might decide that some schools or school districts are too small, or too large, to provide services efficiently. It might decide that

school districts should share their boundaries with other political jurisdictions, such as towns or counties, in order to strengthen the relationship between the way education services and other social services are provided. The state might decide that some of the boundary lines of school districts are so "odd" that they should be changed so that they are straight, or follow natural landmarks, or so they do not cross county lines. We have heard all of these, and other reasons, as possible justifications to reorganize school districts in Kansas. In fact, in 1998-99, Kansas enrolled 1.00 percent of the pupils in the nation but had 1.62 percent of the schools and 2.10 percent of the school districts in the United States.

In our view, the ultimate responsibility of the state is to assure that education services are provided effectively. Effectiveness could mean a lot of different things. It might mean that pupils, schools, or school districts are performing at a high level. It might mean that school districts are spending at a reasonable level, that schools are not so small or so large that they incur extremely high costs, and that school facilities are being utilized appropriately. And it might mean that school districts provide an appropriate array of services so that pupils are exposed to both a broad curriculum and appropriate extra-curricular activities. If a state found that education were not being provided effectively in certain school districts, the state would be justified in examining the situation carefully and possibly reorganizing school districts to produce the desired results. In fact, we believe that there are few other justifications for school reorganization.

Therefore, we viewed the purpose of our work as identifying situations in which education is not being provided effectively in Kansas — that is, pupil performance is relatively low while per pupil spending is relatively high or schools are smaller or larger than what practitioners believe to be appropriate — and determining whether school district reorganization could reasonably be expected to change the situation under circumstances where it would be practical.

We completed a variety of tasks in order to gather background information, obtain and analyze data, and organize findings and recommendations.

1. We created an advisory panel to review our progress. The panel included Dr. Richard King, professor of education administration at the University of Northern Colorado; Dr. Chris Piphon, former Senior Fellow at the Education Commission of the States; Dr. Paul Nachtagal, former National Director of the Rural Challenge; and Mr. Terry Whitney, former Senior Policy Specialist at the National Conference of State Legislatures.
2. We undertook a thorough review of the literature about school size and school district consolidation.
3. We conducted an analysis of pupil performance and per pupil spending in order to identify those districts that should be targets of state scrutiny due to lower than expected performance and higher than expected spending.

4. We identified other criteria, such as district size, change in enrollment, and age of buildings, that might serve as the basis of identifying other districts that could be the target of state scrutiny and that were used to select districts from which we needed to gather more data than were routinely available or that we wanted to contact.
5. We collected additional data, including enrollment projections and information about the condition of school buildings, from target districts and some of their neighbors.
6. We conducted on-site visits to some school districts and held meetings with representatives of other school districts and, in conjunction with those meetings, made presentations to every regional meeting of the Kansas School Boards Association in the Spring of 2000.
7. We worked with the Kansas Department of Education to collect data on the capacities of school buildings.
8. We obtained mapping software that allowed us to plot schools, school district boundaries, and county lines for Kansas. The software also made it possible for us to measure distances between any pairs of schools.
9. We conducted additional on-site visits in several school districts -- some with large high schools, one that we considered to be a very large district, and one with a group of districts that were all target districts in the same county.
10. We met with representatives of several state level education associations to discuss our progress.
11. We created three alternative approaches to reorganize school districts based on different ways of selecting target districts, reviewing data for neighbor districts, and taking into consideration some of the information we gathered from visits and meetings.

This report is organized as follows: Section II is the review of the literature. In Section III, we describe the various procedures we used to select target districts. Section IV discusses the on-site visits and interviews. In Section V, we present three alternative ways of reorganizing school districts. The statutory changes required to implement the recommendations are discussed in Section VI. A series of appendices present data for every school district in the state.

Chapter II

SCHOOL DISTRICT BOUNDARIES: AN OVERVIEW

This section of the report describes how school districts in the United States have evolved into governing bodies and why they have changed over time. In doing so, the report will offer a review of the research and current trends for reorganizing school districts.

An Overview of the Literature

This section offers a brief overview of the research literature on school district organization. This is not a literature review the traditional sense. Most of the research concerning school districts is interwoven within (1) broad philosophical educational issues, (2) individual schools and what goes into them, (3) people's likes and dislikes for various approaches, (4) discussions of ideal class and school size, and (5) the finance and governance of schools. Instead, the primary focus of this section will be the organizational structures and optimal size of school districts. In doing so, we will highlight historical developments, influential research, authors, popular writings, case studies and the structural forces that have affected school districts.

School Districts in Context

A school district is one of four types of governmental entities that exists below the state government in the U.S. that provide general and specific services to people in a geographic region. It is not unusual for people to be served by overlapping government entities and jurisdictions simultaneously. In 1992, there were 3,043 counties and 35,962 municipalities, townships, or towns that provided general government services. At the same time, there were 33,131 special district governing bodies, focusing on the availability of higher education (through community colleges), recreation service, control of natural resources, fire protection and other services. 14,556 school districts oversaw education services for elementary and secondary schools (Bureau of the Census, 1993, Table 466).

Historical Evolution of School Districts

School districts have evolved as the public interest in education has expanded in the last 300 years. It is often expressed as a Jeffersonian ideal, that (state) government is primarily responsible for providing education for its citizens; however, in American colonies, education was primarily the function of the family or church. 18th Century education was characterized by enormous variation:

... there were individual teachers of reading, writing, ciphering, grammar, bookkeeping, surveying, navigation, fencing, dancing, music, modern languages, embroidery, and every conceivable combination of these and other subjects; teachers taught part time and full time, by day and by evening, in their homes, in other people's homes, in rented rooms, in churches and meetinghouses, in abandoned buildings, and in buildings erected especially for their use; (teachers) were self-employed and employed by others (acting as individuals or though self-constituted, self-perpetuating, or elected boards; and they were paid with funds obtained from employers, patrons, subscriptions, lotteries, endowments, tuition rates, and taxes (Cremin, 1970, pp. 499-500).

As early as 1642, a Massachusetts statute required towns to make "some provisions for giving the rudiments of learning to those children who did not get them at home" (Beard, 1944, p. 64). In 1692, the Massachusetts general court required that all towns of 100 families or more have a grammar school; and a few years later, the court required a full-time instructor (Cremin, 1970, p. 524).

As the country expanded, conflicts arose between towns and families that demanded access to schools in the precincts and wards where they lived. Cremin (1970) observes:

such disputes were indicative of the extent to which the school was looked upon as integral to an orderly community, and the right to maintain one essential to community integrity. Indeed, petitions to the general court for the right to form new towns often based their appeal on the need for better services (p. 525).

Education developed differently in different regions of the country, reflecting their particular economic, social, geographic, and fiscal characteristics. What worked in New England communities, for example, did not work on the plantations in the South. As states were established, they wrote their own constitutions specifically mentioning education, even though the U.S. Constitution did not mention education.¹ Although some state constitutions were more explicit than others (about the expectations for public education), most required that their state provide "thorough," "uniform," efficient," or "free" education services.

State legislatures eventually delegated their authority and constitutional responsibility to school districts, which governed, and in some cases, maintained the fiscal responsibility for public schools (e.g., eleven states refer to local school boards in their constitutions; see Education Commission of the States, June 1999). Many school districts were established coterminous with counties and municipalities, while others were created with a different set of boundaries. Some school districts were "independent," with the authority to collect tax revenues, while others were "dependent," or fiscally controlled by some government entity. The states eventually replaced the

¹ Although the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 declared that "schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." The ordinance required that a section of land in every township be devoted to the support of schools.

laws permitting states, cities, counties and towns to levy taxes for schools (with voter approval), with state and local boards of education that were required to provide free and compulsory education, at least at the elementary level (Beard, 1944, p. 219). By the middle of the 19th Century, educational governance was in the hands of locally elected boards, which established curriculum, hired employment staff, selected textbooks, located physical space, and granted diplomas to graduates.

In the 20th Century, the modern model for resolving complex and political education issues, such as who should be educated, how education should be organized, and who should pay for it (particularly in urban high schools) is the "incipient bureaucracy" model, says Michael Katz (1971). Bureaucracies emerged as a way of providing a consistent set of services by qualified experts to pupils at a low cost. As school boards decreased, ward and precincts were abolished, the reliance on "experts" increased, and the role of state departments of education grew, particularly in terms of professional certification (Education Commission of the States, Nov. 1999, pp. 9-11). In sum, school districts emerged as a way of providing educational services that were conveniently located near pupils (in elementary schools), thereby fulfilling state constitutional requirements.

District Consolidation

The number of school districts has decreased sharply in the last century. Since the beginning of the 1900's, the number of school districts, nationwide, has declined by 87 percent from 117,108 school districts to 15,367 in 1992 (Walberg, 1993).²

As of the United States, Kansas has decreased dramatically its number of school districts. In 1896 Kansas had 9,284 school districts (Kansas Biennial Report, 1964); by 1966-67, this number of school districts had dropped to 348. There are 304 school districts in Kansas presently.

The Case for Large School Districts

The decline in the number of school districts can be explained by a major ideological shift in the U.S. after World War II, toward industrialized, economically efficient, highly productive organizations. Hence, corporations served as models for school reorganization and consolidation, with a decidedly bureaucratic bent (Education Commission of the States, Jan. 1999). The proponents of the rapid consolidation movement argued that large schools could use their resources more efficiently and achieve "economies of scale," a theory that focuses on the increased savings through reduced redundancy and increased resource strength as schools and school districts get bigger (e.g., one large school can operate more cheaply and efficiently than two smaller ones). Economies of scale were further applied to the cost of "producing" a given level of student achievement. The logic was that savings would accrue as costs were spread over a larger pupil base. These savings could then be applied toward

developing a more comprehensive and specialized programs of instruction, with greater quality, for more students with differing interests and abilities.

Early research supported the idea that larger school districts could operate more efficiently than small districts. One of the leading proponents of larger schools and economies of scale theory was former Harvard President James Bryant Conant. In his influential 1959 book (financed by the Carnegie Corporation of New York in 1957), *The American High School Today*, Conant indicated that larger high schools (those over 750 students) were more efficient and could offer a more comprehensive curriculum of greater quality and lower cost than smaller schools. Larger schools could afford more specialized teachers, counselors, classes and activities. Students attending large schools could benefit from increased course offerings and participate more in extracurricular activities. Thus, Conant called for the elimination of high schools having fewer than 100 students in the graduating class (Sher, 1986, p. 29), favoring larger units for "comprehensive" schools. Conant's conclusions reinforced a 1948 study by the National Commission on School District Reorganization, which favored large school districts because small school districts had difficulty attracting and retaining qualified teachers (Hughes and Bass, 1994, p. 9).

From the beginning of the century to the early 1960s, research supporting large schools and districts (and the economies of scale theory) dominated the education research and popular writings. This research focuses on educational "inputs" (e.g., the number of teachers, professional staff, salary levels, availability and materials). Since the 1960s, support for the economy of scale theory would lead policymakers and educators to favor the rapid consolidation movement.

The Case for Small School Districts

By 1964, the rapid consolidation movement was challenged by an insurgent movement for smaller schools and smaller school districts. In *Big School, Small School: High School Size and Student Behavior*, published in 1964, Barker and Gump found that only a few students actively participated activities in large schools; by contrast, students in small schools engaged in extracurricular activities in a greater proportion (see Swenson & King, 1997 p. 367). Although large schools offered more varieties of subjects, Baker and Gump found that pupils in large schools took fewer electives proportionally than students in smaller schools. Barker and Gump were not explicit as to the ideal size of a given school, but their book began challenging the conventional wisdom and popular ideology of the time, that "bigger is better." Specifically, they challenged the economies of scale theory, and placed more emphasis on the "outputs" of school districts, such as student achievement, participation and social relationships. After conducting a nationally comprehensive study, in *A Place Called School* (1964), Goodlad concluded that it is not impossible to have a good large school, but it is difficult; the burden of proof on large schools is to show what curricular benefits they have that small schools do not.

Barker and Gump's analysis spawned a growing reform movement for smaller schools, which has gained support presently in research and popular writings. The small schools literature began with large-scale qualitative studies in the 1980s and 1990s, reinforcing a number of literature syntheses and reviews establishing the effectiveness of small schools. These studies built an "impressive case for "smallness"(Raywid, 1996). In their reviews of the literature, Raywid (1997) and Cotton (1996) found smaller schools to be more personal, equitable, participatory, "community-oriented" (see Nachitgal, 1992), safer, and conducive to student learning. By contrast, Klonsky (1995) and Raywid (1995) found that large schools have lower grade averages, lower test scores, higher dropout rates, and more problems with violence.² In his review of the literature, Klonsky (1998) found a compelling body of research showing that female, minority (especially, African American and Latino students), low socioeconomic, and special needs students benefit from smaller school units (charters, minischools, houses) than larger ones.

The Small Schools Critique and The Diseconomies of Scale

Small school reformers typically cast their arguments in "big" versus "small" schools, but almost always ignore or diminish the costs of maintaining small schools and districts. Further, they fail to address the central question: when is a school or district too small to produce effective student learning. Lee and Smith (1997) warn that the ideological shift toward "smallness" is proceeding without research to support it, which might result in a number of schools (and school districts) that are too small to produce effective student learning, particularly for minority and disadvantaged students.

As for cost, most proponents of small schools acknowledge that spending increases per pupil in small school districts, at least initially. However, they argue that spending should not be based on per pupil spending, but on the number of graduating students, which they argue is higher than large school districts.

In addition, they argue that empirical evidence supporting the economies of scale theory is weak. The savings projected by the school consolidation movement has not materialized because large schools often expand their administrative staff to manage bureaucratic needs and transportation costs (particularly in rural areas), thereby offsetting savings (Chambers, 1981). When states give more funding to schools, they also increase the regulations and legislation, resulting in a bureaucratic system of education complete with inefficiencies (Walberg, 1993, p. 123). Walberg refers to this condition as "diseconomies of scale," which occur when the per unit costs increase as a greater number of units are served. Like Walberg, Coleman and LaRocque (1984) argue that it is not clear that the economies of scale theory applies to school districts (in British Columbia) because the administrative costs are a relatively small portion of a district's overall costs (p. 22). Moreover, the relationship between district size and the

² Raywid (2000) and other scholars have suggested that the large "alienating" size of Columbine High School, over 1600 students, might well have been a factor in the school shooting tragedy.

resource availability is inconsistent across socioeconomic communities (Friedkin & Neocochea, 1988). Although districts in low income areas have access to more resources than smaller school districts, critics point out that in such populations there is a higher incidence of "exceptional problems" that contribute to lower achievement (Lee & Smith, 1997, p. 207).

An additional body of literature argues that bigger districts lead to bureaucracies, which negatively impact student performance. In his review of student test scores among states, Walberg (1993) found that higher achieving states have smaller districts, smaller schools, and smaller state shares of school costs (p. 115). Carnoy and MacDonnell (1990) found that large organizational structures limit local control for teachers and principals to make decisions to improve student performance.

Sher's Critique of Large District Size

In spite of the rapid consolidations throughout the 1900s, there was little evidence that school districts actually operate more efficiently presently (Management Analysis and Planning Associates, 1996, p. 21). Yet a 1986 report by the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction sparked criticism after it recommended that states consolidate, so that there was no more than one school per district per county, and all districts had at least 5,000 students (Sher, 1986, p. 8).

In response to the North Carolina recommendations, in 1986 researcher Jonathan Sher examined student achievement in large and small districts, specifically analyzing the student performance data (SAT, ACT, and graduation rates) that was available at the time nationwide. (Today the flaws in using these indicators of student performance are well known.) Students' scores on the SAT were compared among states. The study found that on average, states that had districts smaller than 5,000 students scored higher on the tests than states with larger districts (Sher, 1986 p. 21). States that ranked in the top ten percent on SAT scores, were in the top ten percent of per pupil expenditures (*ibid.*).

Sher's study also examined how students in comparative states performed on the ACT. The study found that four of the five states whose students scored the highest on the ACT had districts averaging less than 2,000 pupils, and none had an average school district size above 3,000 (Sher, 1986, p. 22). Conversely, the average district size of states whose students performed poorly on the ACT were five times greater than that of the top-ranked states (*ibid.*).

Sher also compared graduation rates among states. States that had the highest graduation rates had far smaller schools and school districts than states that had the lowest graduation rates (Sher, 1986, p. 23). Sher cautioned that these results did not prove that having small, sub-county school districts produced better student learning. But Sher's evidence directly challenged the validity of the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction's recommendation that school districts having at least 5,000 students

were necessary to achieve the best student outcomes (Sher, 1986, p. 24).

In another study, Sher also compared student performance among large and small districts in Nebraska. This study similarly found that on average, larger districts had higher dropout rates than smaller districts (Sher, 1988, p. 22). The ACT scores were also higher in small districts than in large districts (Sher, 1988, p. 24).

A study of student performance among school districts in Colorado found similar results. Student average test scores on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills in smaller districts outperformed those in larger districts, with the difference even more pronounced the higher the grade levels (Colorado Department of Education, 1995, p. 9). Furthermore, in 1994, the Colorado graduation rate for the 25 smallest school districts was 95.1 percent, while the graduation rate for the entire state was 78.8 percent (Colorado Department of Education, 1995, p. 10). Thus, students in smaller school districts are performing better and graduating at a higher rate than those in larger school districts in Colorado.

Optimal Size

Rather than defining an ideal size for schools and districts (often degenerating into debates between large versus small, or specialization versus dehumanization), recently researchers have attempted to define the optimal school district size. Optimal school size has been an enduring issue for educational policy, and meaningful and influential distinctions for policymakers (See Lee & Smith, 1997, p. 219). Optimal school district size refers to (1) how the school district size produces optimum economic efficiency (an economic criteria, or inputs) and (2) how the size of the district affects student performance and the equity of student learning (a sociological criteria, or outputs).

Researchers have attempted to define the optimal school district size, but the numbers vary widely. For example, studies have recommended districts as large as 50,000 pupils while others have targeted districts as low as 500 (Monk and Kadamus, 1995, p. 30). Some argue that districts and schools could never be too small; good school districts come in all kinds and sizes (Sher, 1988, p. 25); or, it depends on the situation and circumstances. Such ambivalence led some researchers to conclude that there is no optimal school district size.

Monk's Test for District Consolidation

In determining whether school districts should be consolidated, Monk (1992) describes the indicators of a quality of education offered by a school or a district. These factors include: learning outcome indicators (i.e., standardized tests given to students to measure their abilities) and schooling process indicators, i.e., measuring inputs such as teacher experience, training, class size, and courses offered (Monk, 1992, p. 39). These

factors can be used to examine and evaluate how well a district is doing, and whether consolidation is necessary. As for economies of scale, like Conant, Monk argues that larger districts and schools are less expensive to operate and offer more courses for student learning. For Monk, however, size alone does not determine the quality of courses offered (Monk, 1992, p. 41).

Monk and Kadamus (1995) outline conditions or indicators that a district may not be performing at the desired level. These conditions include: a district is spending more than is necessary to achieve a given result (that is, higher test scores), a district is producing the "wrong" mix of results; a district is producing results at the "wrong" level. According to Monk and Kadamus (1995), states must define a set of indicators that can identify districts with these types of productivity problems. States must also establish benchmarks so that judgments can be made about the educational outcomes that are observed (Monk and Kadamus, 1995, p. 34).

In addition to Monk's test, the literature on optimal school size may provide additional guidelines in determining optimal school district size, although the relationships of school and district size are often confused, particularly for high schools (many districts operate as a single high school).

A widely held assumption is that elementary schools should be smaller than middle and high schools because elementary schools provide intimate relations and supportive environments for young children. (High school students desire more course offerings.) Based on a review of 103 studies, Cotton (1996) found the optimal size for an elementary school is between 300 and 400 students.

The research focusing on optimal school size for middle schools is in its infancy; but a 1992 survey of middle school principals reported that the optimal school size for middle schools is 400 to 599 students.

After analyzing the NELS data base of 9,812 students, (8th through 12th graders), Lee and Smith (1997) found that schools were most effective for student learning and equitable learning (across differing socioeconomic levels and concentration of minority students) when they enroll between 600 and 900 students. Importantly, in schools smaller than 600, students learn less. This is an important finding because, the authors conclude, there are schools too small to produce effective student learning.

Similarly, *Turning Points*, an influential report on school reform, written in 1989 by Carnegie Foundation, as well as the National Association of Secondary School Principals recommended that high schools enroll no more than 600 students. The ideal high school of 600 students seems to be a very popular recommendation, but close scrutiny of these readings reveals little empirical report for these recommendations.

The Current Environment

Today schools are under more pressure to improve against a backdrop of funding. Improvement is expected regardless of whether funding keeps up with inflation. This places the future of school districts in question.

First, most of the school improvement literature points to the importance of schools, their expectations and how they use their resources, as critical elements — almost nothing has emerged in research that focuses on school district level leadership or management that is associated with helping pupils perform at higher levels; states are already organizing pupil performance information by school site.

Second, much of the discussion about how to improve school funding suggests that whatever authority school districts currently have over the amount of resources available to them is likely to diminish as states take more control over gross taxing and spending decisions; there is talk in some quarters of states distributing most, if not all, state aid directly to schools, bypassing districts.

Third, while school districts may be given more control over how they spend their resources, policymakers toward placing spending decisions in the hands of schools, principals and teachers. In this scenario, school board spending would be relegated to administration, plant maintenance and operation, or ancillary services including personnel, accounting, and food services. School districts might even be forced to compete with other districts to provide such services. Moreover, the expansion of smaller educational units (charter schools, schools-within-schools, minischools, and others), and possible school vouchers (even if only in urban districts) may further reduce school district authority.

School districts are unlikely to disappear. However, as this overview of school boards suggests, the role and function of school districts will change. They may look more like current multi-district cooperative service boards in the future, providing technical assistance, comparative information, and administrative services done more efficiently by a central agency.

Bibliography

- Barker, R. and Gump, P. *Big School, Small School: High School Size and Student Behavior* (1964).
- Beard, C. and Beard, M. *Basic History of the United States* (1944).
- Bureau of the Census. *Statistical Abstract of the United States*, (1993).
- Carnoy, M. and MacDonnell, J. *School District Restructuring in Santa Fe, New Mexico* (1990).
- Carnegie Foundation. *Turning Points: Preparing American Youth for the 21st Century* (1989).
- Chambers, J.G. "An Analysis of School Size Under a Voucher System." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*. (1981).
- Coleman, P. and LaRocque, L. "Economies of Scale Revisited: School District Operating Costs in British Columbia, 1979-82." *Journal of Education Finance* (Summer 1984), pp. 22-35.
- Colorado Department of Education. "A Report on Colorado School District Organization." (1995).
- Conant, J.B. (1959). *The American High School Today*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Cotton, K. "Affective and Social Benefits of Small-Scale Schooling." ERIC Digest (December 1996).
- Cremin, L. *American Education, The Colonial Experience, 1607-1783* (1970).
- Education Commission of the States [1]. "The Invisible Hand of Ideology: Perspectives from the History of School Governance" (January 1999).
- Education Commission of the States [2]. "State Constitutions and Public Education Governance" (June 1999).
- Education Commission of the States [3]. "Governing America's Schools: Changing the Rules: Report of the National Commission on Governing America's Schools." (November 1999).
- Friedkin, N. and Neocochea, J. "School System Size and Performance: A Contingency Perspective." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* (Vol. 10, 1988).

Goodlad, J. I. *A Place Called School* (1984).

Hughes, M.F. and Bass, G. R. "Multi-phased Study of an Economy of Scale Weight Factor for Low Enrollment School Districts in the State of Kansas." (1994).

Kansas Biennial Report (1964).

Katz, M. B. *Class, Bureaucracy & Schools* (1971).

Klonsky, M. (1998). *Small Schools: The Numbers Tell a Story*. Third Ed. Chicago: University of Illinois at Chicago.

Klonsky, M. (1995). *Small Schools: The Numbers Tell a Story*. University of Illinois.

Lee, V.E. & Smith, J.B. "High School Size: Which Works Best and for Whom?" *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* (Vol. 19 1997).

Management Analysis and Planning Associates. "Nevada School District Organization and Control: Meeting the Challenges of Growth and Diversity." (1996).

Monk, D. H. "Modern Conceptions of Educational Quality and State Policy Regarding Small Schooling Units." *Center for School Change: Source Book on School and District Size, Cost and Quality* (1992), pp. 35-49.

Monk, D. H. and Kadamus, James A. "The Reform of School District Organizational Structure." *Advances in Educational Productivity* (Volume 5, 1995), pp. 27-44.

Nachtigal P. "Remapping the Terrain: School Size, Cost, and Quality." *Center for School Change: Source Book on School and District Size, Cost, and Quality* (1992), pp. 53 -71.

Raywid, M. and Oshiyama, L. "Musing in the Wake of Columbine: What Can Schools Do?" *Phi Delta Kappan* (Vol. 81, 6, 2000).

Raywid, M. "The Current Literature on Small Schools." *ERIC Digest* (1997).

Raywid, M. "Taking Stock: The Movement to Create Mini-Schools, Schools-Within-Schools, and Separate Small Schools." *ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education*. (1996).

Raywid, M. "The Subschoools/Small Schools Movement—Taking Stock." Paper commissioned by the Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools. (1995).

Rogers, B. "Small is Beautiful" *Center for School Change: Source Book on School and District Size, Cost, and Quality* (1992), pp. 97-116.

Sher, J. P. [1] *Heavy Meddle: A Critique of the North Carolina Department of Public Instructions Plan to Mandate School District Mergers Throughout the State* (1986).

Sher, J. P. [2] *Class Dismissed: Examining Nebraska's Rural Education Debate*. (1988).

Swenson, A.D. and King, R.A. *School Finance: It's Economics and Politics* (1997).

Walberg, H. J. "On Local Control: Is Bigger Better?" *School and District Size, Cost, and Quality* (1993).

Chapter III

ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURES FOR IDENTIFYING DISTRICTS THAT MIGHT BENEFIT FROM REORGANIZATION

Introduction

Based on our view of the state's role in establishing school districts, and our review of the literature about school district organization, we feel that the most appropriate rationale for state action must be based on three factors: (1) the level of pupil performance, in which the state is explicitly interested, because it is the foundation of democratic government and the state's economic development; (2) the level of per pupil spending, in which the state has an interest because it provides state aid that accounts for a significant portion of those expenditures; and (3) the ability of school districts to provide an appropriate curriculum and ancillary activities, in which the state has an interest primarily because of the nexus with pupil performance.

We developed two primary approaches to identify school districts in Kansas that should be reorganized. The first approach is based specifically on analysis of both pupil performance and per pupil spending and is designed to identify districts that are relatively low in performance and relatively high in spending. The second approach is based on the relationship between the size of schools and districts and the ability of districts to provide services when they are either too small or too large.

Identifying Target Districts Based on Pupil Performance and Per Pupil Spending

The first approach is designed to focus attention on a set of "target" districts in which performance is relatively low and spending is relatively high. In order to examine relative performance, we use the results of the statewide tests that have been developed in the past few years even though several people told us that their understanding was that those tests were not developed for the specific purpose of comparing one district to another. Our feeling is that, since the tests provide the only basis of evaluating the relative performance of school districts, the information is already being used to hold districts accountable (given that results are published), and because our purpose is to focus only on some districts, it is appropriate to use them as the basis for identifying those places where state action is required. While there are many other kinds of information that individual districts use to evaluate their own performance, none provide comparable information for all districts. We used per pupil spending for instruction, administration, and plant maintenance and operation (M&O) as the basis of evaluating relative spending levels even though some people suggested that since the state controlled their level of spending, and no district exceeds the level specified by the state, it is logically impossible to identify high spending districts. Our feeling is that, given the variation in spending that exists, some districts may be spending more than they need to relative to the spending of other districts and/or the

state's formula for distributing state aid may permit higher spending than is necessary.

Pupil Performance

We were able to obtain average pupil performance data for 1997 and 1998 for all 304 school districts in Kansas -- data were for the composite reading index, the math power composite, and the writing composite. We combined the average scores for each district into a single score by transforming district average raw scores for each test into "standard" scores (sometimes called "z-scores"), which indicate how many standard deviations the district average raw score is from the statewide average score for a particular test. The use of standard scores allowed us to add the scores of the three tests together despite the fact that the raw scores use different scales for measurement (the assumption in adding the standard scores together is that each test is valued equally). These scores generally range from -4.0 to +4.0; a district with the statewide average score on all three tests would have a standard score of 0.0; if a district had an unusually high or low average score for all three tests, the combined standard score could be lower than -4.0 or higher than +4.0.

We found some variation across all school districts in raw scores and standard scores, which are shown in Table III-1 (where they are district weighted) and Table III-2 (where they are pupil weighted). We show figures weighted in two different ways, by district or by pupils, because it can make a difference and because there are reasonable justifications for looking at the data using either approach to weighting. We tend to favor the pupil-weighted approach, meaning each pupil is weighted equally. Looking at Table III-2, where scores have been weighted by enrollment, it is clear that there was not much variation across districts in composite scores: two thirds of all pupils were enrolled in districts where reading scores varied from 59.8 to 68.6, where math scores varied from 45.1 to 56.3, and where writing scores varied from 3.22 to 3.60.

To better understand the relationship between pupil performance and district characteristics, we created five groups of districts, called quintiles, based on pupil performance, which are shown in Table III-3 (where quintiles have similar numbers of districts) and Table III-4 (where quintiles have similar numbers of pupils). Looking at quintiles with similar numbers of pupils (Table III-4), there were 27 districts, enrolling 87,113 pupils, in the lowest performance quintile (where the combined standard ["z"] scores were less than -2.50) while there were 43 districts, enrolling 89,133 pupils, in the highest performing quintile (where the combined standard ["z"] scores were greater than +2.58). The average performance of each quintile is shown in row (8), rising from -3.716 in the lowest performing quintile to +3.531 in the highest performing. In general, higher performance was associated with higher total spending [see row (1)] and with higher spending for instruction [see row (2)]. There was no obvious relationship between pupil performance and either spending for administration [see row (3), where spending varied across the quintiles but not in a systematic way] or spending for plant M&O [see row (4), where spending was about the same across the quintiles].

Quintiles that had higher combined standard scores had higher raw scores for all three composites [see rows (5), (6), and (7)] and higher standard ("z") scores for all three composites [see rows (9), (10), and (11)]. While higher performing districts tended to have lower proportions of pupils from low-income families [see row (16)], there was no clear relationship between performance and district wealth (although the highest performing districts had greater wealth than the lowest performing districts). There was also no relationship between performance and local tax effort (which was highest in both the lowest and highest performing quintiles) or school district size (where the highest and lowest performing districts were larger than those with middle levels of performance). Size of attendance center also showed no strong correlation to performance (where the lowest and highest performing districts had slightly larger attendance centers than districts performing in the middle range).

There are three major approaches that could be taken to identify districts that have low performance: (1) an approach based on absolute levels of performance, in which districts that are low performing do not meet a particular standard; (2) an approach based on the change in performance over time, in which districts that are low performing are those that do not improve their level of performance at a specified rate; and (3) an approach that compares actual performance to expected performance, in which low performing districts are those whose actual performance is lower than expected performance. We used the third approach because a large proportion of the variation in performance across school districts tends to be explained by the demographic characteristics of pupils, which can be controlled by comparing actual to predicted levels of performance.

In order to implement the third approach, we developed a prediction model for performance (using the combined standard ["z"] scores for the three composite indicators) based on a statistical technique, linear regression, that is designed to identify those factors that predict performance and explain the variation in performance across all districts.

The regression equation: (1) explained about 73 percent of the variation in performance across all school districts; (2) suggested that the strongest predictor of performance was the proportion of pupils from low-income families; (3) indicated that density, tax effort, wealth and the proportion of pupils from low-income families were negatively related to spending (that is, districts with higher density, higher tax effort, higher wealth and higher proportions of pupils from low-income families had lower performance); and (4) resulted in the following equation to predict performance:

combined standard ("z") performance on reading, math, and writing tests.	=	-9.122 - (12.895 X percentage of pupils eligible for free/reduced lunch) - (.0289 X density) - (42.113 X tax effort [mills]) - (.00000269 X assessed value per pupil) + (.985 X natural log of enrollment) + (.00204 X per pupil spending for instruction).
--	---	---

When this equation is used to predict the actual pupil performance of districts, there is a standard error across all districts of 1.367 per pupil. Because this error exists (and differs for each district), we created a range of pupil performance for each district within which we could be 90 percent confident that the predicted performance was correct. We then compared each district's actual performance to the low end of this range and identified districts with actual performance below the low end as having unusually low performance. We found 36 districts that had unusually low performance, relative to what would have been expected, given their circumstances, in 1998-99.

Per Pupil Spending

We were able to obtain per pupil spending data for 1998-99 for all school districts in Kansas, which was disaggregated for several functions. We chose to examine: (1) instruction; (2) plant maintenance and operation (M&O); (3) administration (school and district combined); and (4) transportation. We chose to exclude transportation in our analysis since, in our view, spending for that purpose alone should not serve as the primary basis of changing school district boundaries.

We found some variation across all school districts in their per pupil spending for the three spending functions, as shown in Tables III-1 and III-2. Using pupil-weighted data (Table III-2), in 1998-99 school districts in Kansas spent \$3,162 per pupil, on average, for instruction, with two-thirds of all pupils enrolled in districts that spent between \$2,713 and \$3,611 for that purpose. On average, school districts spent \$568 per pupil for administration and two-thirds of all pupils were enrolled in districts spending between \$343 and \$793 for administration. Finally, districts spent \$646 per pupil, on average, for plant M&O — two thirds of all pupils attended schools in districts that spent between \$486 and \$806 per pupil.

When the three functions are combined, districts spent an average of \$4,376 per pupil, although the range in spending was from \$3,504 to \$10,928. In order to identify districts that spend at unusually high levels we had two choices: (1) we could simply inspect per pupil spending and identify high spending as being above a specified amount or (2) we could develop a predictive model designed to take into consideration those factors, such as district enrollment, that might legitimately explain spending differences. Since many studies of school district spending suggest that different school districts spend at different levels because they face cost pressures beyond their control, we used the second approach since it is designed to control for those factors. The factors that might influence spending level decisions include such things as: (1) district wealth as indicated by property value per pupil; (2) district tax effort; (3) district enrollment level; (4) the proportion of pupils from low income families; and (5) the average size of each attendance center. The figures in Tables III-1 and III-2 indicate the statewide average values for these factors as well as statistics about their distribution across all districts. Looking at Table III-2, where figures are weighted for

pupil enrollment, the figures indicate that statewide average property value per pupil was \$41,988, although the range was from \$612 per pupil to \$537,214. Average tax effort (imputed by dividing local revenue by property wealth) was 34.5 mills and two-thirds of all pupils were enrolled in districts in which tax effort was between 28.1 and 40.9 mills. Average district enrollment was 1,477 pupils (although enrollments ranged from 76 to 44,925 pupils) while the average size of attendance centers was 387 pupils (although the range was from 38 to 816 pupils). The proportion of pupils from low-income families (measured by the percentage of pupils eligible for free lunches) was 24.2 percent on average; two thirds of all pupils attended schools in districts with between 9.1 and 39.3 percent of all pupils coming from low income families.

In order to understand the relationships between spending, pupil performance, and these factors, we organized districts into five groups, or quintiles, with different levels of spending, as shown in Table III-5 (district weighted) and Table III-6 (pupil weighted). Focusing on spending quintiles (and looking at quintiles with similar numbers of pupils, as shown in Table III-6) there were nine districts, enrolling 91,399 pupils, in the lowest spending quintile (with those districts with spending below \$3,757 per pupil) while there were 198 districts, enrolling 89,712 pupils, in the highest spending quintile (with districts spending more than \$4,931 per pupil). The average spending of each quintile is shown in row (1), rising from \$3,695 in the lowest spending quintile to \$5,572 in the highest spending quintile.

In general, higher total spending was associated with higher spending for the three spending components (instruction, administration, and plant M&O) -- but that was not always true. Despite an almost \$300 per pupil difference in spending for instruction between the second to lowest spending quintile and the middle spending quintile, there was almost no difference in spending for administration between the two quintiles [see row (3)] and spending for plant M&O was actually lower in the higher spending quintile [see row (4)]. While higher spending districts tend to have higher test scores than lower spending districts, the relationship is not strong because the highest test scores were in the middle spending quintile. Higher spending districts also tend to have higher property wealth [see row (12)]; but tax effort was similar across all spending groups [except for the highest spending, wealthiest quintile — see row (13)]. Higher spending districts tended to be smaller than lower spending districts [see row (14)] but the average size of attendance centers was similar across all spending quintiles other than the highest group, where they were smaller [see row (15)]. Finally, spending tended to be higher in districts that had lower proportions of pupils from low-income families [see row (16)].

In order to develop a prediction model for spending (the sum of instruction, administration, and plant M&O), we used a statistical procedure, linear regression, to determine the mathematical relationship between spending and wealth, effort, enrollment level of districts and attendance centers, and proportion of pupils from low-income families. Since some of the factors had a curvilinear (curved) relationship with spending, rather than a linear (straight line) relationship, we used a logarithmic transformation (natural log) for several factors (enrollment level, proportion of pupils

from low-income families, and average size of attendance centers). We also eliminated the district [Fort Leavenworth (207)] with the lowest wealth (\$612 per pupil) since it was so different from all other districts.

The regression equation: (1) explained about 80 percent of the variation in spending across the 303 school districts; (2) suggested that the strongest predictor of spending was the average size of attendance centers; (3) indicated that enrollment level, the proportion of pupils from low income families, and the average size of attendance centers were negatively related to spending (that is, smaller school districts, small attendance centers, and low proportions of pupils from low income families increased spending); and (4) resulted in the following equation to predict spending:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{per pupil spending for} & & = & & \$10,079 - (969.02 \times \text{natural log of size} \\ \text{instruction, plant M\&O,} & & & & \text{of attendance center) - (181.44} \times \text{natural} \\ \text{and administration.} & & & & \text{log of enrollment) - (216.44} \times \text{natural} \\ & & & & \text{log of proportion of pupils from low income} \\ & & & & \text{families) + (27,813.33} \times \text{tax effort [mills])} \\ & & & & \text{+ (.00404} \times \text{assessed value per pupil).} \end{aligned}$$

When this equation is used to predict the actual spending level of districts, there is a standard error across all districts of \$325 per pupil. Because this error exists (and differs for each district), we created a range of spending for each district within which we could be 95 percent confident that the predicted spending was correct. We then compared each district's actual spending to the high end of this range and identified districts with actual spending in excess of the high end as having unusually high spending. We found 41 districts that had unusually high spending, relative to the spending level expected given their circumstances, in 1998-99.

Selecting "Target" Districts

We developed a variety of approaches for using the results of the regression analyses of both pupil performance and per pupil spending to identify target school districts that might be reorganized. First, we wanted to find districts that have low performance relative to what might be expected and that spend at a high level compared to what might be expected. As discussed above, 36 districts had lower than expected pupil performance while 41 districts had higher than expected per pupil spending. Of these 77 districts, 10 districts had *both* higher levels of spending and lower levels of performance than would have been expected given their circumstances (using the confidence intervals associated with the regressions). These ten districts, which we refer to as Type "A" districts, are: Moscow Public Schools (209), West Solomon Valley Schools (213), Elkhart (218), Washington Schools (222), Hanston (228), Nes Tre La Go (301), Belle Plaine (357), Chase-Raymond (401), Hillcrest Rural Schools (455), and Udall (463).

In addition, there are districts that have higher than expected levels of spending *and* performance that has been lower than average for *two* years. These eight districts, which we refer to as Type "B" districts, are: Fowler (225), Triplains (275), Elk Valley (283), Cedar Vale (285), Herndon (317), Eastern Heights (324), Wathena (406), and Chetopa (505).

Finally, there are districts that had lower than expected performance in 1998, lower than average performance in 1997, *and* spending levels above the predicted level excluding the use of the confidence interval. These 10 districts, which we refer to as Type "C" districts, are: Turner-Kansas City (202), Bonner Springs (204), Mankato (278), Pleasanton (344), Oxford (358), Caldwell (360), Marysville (364), Madison-Virgil (386), Neodesha (461), and South Haven (509).

The data shown in Table III-7 compares the spending, pupil performance, and other information that has been discussed in this section for the three groups of districts separately, for the 276 districts not included in any of the three groups, and for all 304 districts.

Identifying Districts Based on Size of School

A second way to think about school districts that might benefit from reorganization is based on schools being "too small" or "too large." As has been discussed in the literature review, education researchers and practitioners have studied the optimum size of schools, the minimum size of schools, and the maximum size of schools based on the ability of schools to offer what is believed to be an appropriate curriculum, opportunities for extra-curricular activities, and a nurturing, safe environment — all at reasonable cost. While the literature provides no universally accepted guidance, it suggests that a high school should serve at least 100 pupils in order to meet academic and social expectations. It also suggests that the maximum size of high schools should be no greater than 900 pupils.¹ While there are people who might disagree with these figures, and there are plenty of examples of both successful high schools with enrollments below 100 pupils or more than 900 pupils and of unsuccessful high schools with enrollments between 100 and 900 pupils, many people find these levels to be reasonable guidelines.

¹In 1997-98, there were 89,500 public schools in the United States, the average enrollment of which was 525 pupils (the average size of elementary schools was 478 pupils while the average size of secondary schools was 699 pupils and the average size of combined elementary- secondary schools was 374 pupils). Of those schools, about 8,800 had an enrollment of less than 100 pupils and 15,100 had an enrollment greater than 800 pupils (with about 8,600 having more than 1,000 pupils) according to the National Center for Education Statistics of the U.S. Department of Education.

Selecting "Target" Districts

What we wanted to do was to examine current enrollments in Kansas and, where we saw schools that were either too small or too large based on the enrollment criteria to see whether it might be possible to reorganize districts so that schools would meet the criteria. Since our focus is on school district organization, we decided to identify districts that might be considered too small or too large. To do this, we assumed that, for any district to support a high school of at least 100 pupils, it must have an enrollment of at least 260 pupils per high school (so the enrollment of a district with two high schools should be at least 520 pupils). We also assumed that, in order for a district not to have a high school that exceeds 900 pupils, the district's enrollment should be no greater than 2,925 pupils per high school (so the enrollment of a district with two high schools should not be greater than 5,850 pupils).

In looking at enrollment figures and numbers of high schools in Kansas, we found 50 districts with enrollments less than 260 pupils (45 of which have a single high school and five of which have more than one high school). We also found 24 districts with enrollments too large to support the number of high schools they have (18 of which have one high school, two of which have two high schools, three of which have three high schools, one of which has four high schools, one of which has five high schools, and one of which has seven high schools). We also identified two districts where total enrollment is simply so high that, regardless of numbers of high schools, they might be viewed by some people as being too large to manage effectively.²

Districts that are too small relative to the number of schools they operate. The districts are listed below by category.

Too small with only one high school: Cheylin (103), White Rock (104), Moscow Public Schools (20-9), Northern Valley (212), West Solomon Valley Schools (213), Rolla (217), Ashland (220), North Central (221), Fowler (225), Hanston (228), West Smith County (238), Weskan (242), Palco (269), Triplains (275), Jewell (279), West Graham-Morland (280), Elk Valley (283), Cedar Vale (286), Grinnell Public Schools (291), Wheatland (292), Prairie Heights (295), Sylvan Grove (299), Nes Tre La Go (301), Smoky Hill (302), Bazine (304), Brewster (314), Golden Plains (316), Herndon (317), Eastern Heights (324), Logan (326), Burrton (369), Montezuma (371), Hamilton (390), Paradise (399), Chase-Raymond (401), Mullinville (424), Midway Schools (433), Hillcrest Public Schools (455), Healy Public Schools (468), Dexter (471), Haviland (474), Copeland (476), Pawnee Heights (496), Lewis (502), and Attica (511).

Too small with more than one high school: Barnes (223), Leroy-Gridley (245), Southern Cloud (334), Rural Vista (481), and Axtell (488).

²In 1997-98, there were 14,805 school districts in the United States, of which 230 districts enrolled 25,000 or more pupils (those districts represented 1.6 percent of all districts and they enrolled 31.5 percent of all pupils)

Districts that are too large.

Too large relative to the number of high schools: Turner-Kansas City (202), Blue Valley (229), Olathe (233), Emporia (253), Derby (260), Haysville (261), Goddard (265), Maize (266), Salina (305), Hutchinson (308), Seaman (345), Newton (373), Manhattan (383), Great Bend (428), Auburn Washburn (437), Dodge City (443), Leavenworth (453), Garden City (457), Geary County Schools (475), Liberal (480), Hays (489), Lawrence (497), and Kansas City (500).

Too large: Wichita (259) and Shawnee Mission (512).

TABLE III-1

**DISTRICT-WEIGHTED KANSAS STATEWIDE
STATISTICS FOR VARIABLES RELATED TO PER PUPIL
SPENDING AND PUPIL PERFORMANCE IN 1998-99**

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Statistics</u>			<u>Coeff. of Variation</u>
	<u>Average</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	
<u>Per Pupil Spending</u>				
(1) Total Spending (Instr., Admin., and Plant M&O)	\$5,367	\$3,504	\$10,928	.214
(2) Instruction	\$3,714	\$2,503	\$7,301	.191
(3) Administration	\$860	\$224	\$2,529	.377
(4) Plant M&O	\$793	\$391	\$2,184	.295
<u>Test Scores - Raw</u>				
(5) Reading	65.2	52.5	76.3	.059
(6) Math	50.5	38.5	63.3	.095
(7) Writing	3.45	2.70	4.08	.063
<u>Test Scores - Standard ("z")</u>				
(8) Total "z"	.398	- .759	6.67	1.098
(9) Reading "z"	.236	- 2.697	2.784	3.787
(10) Math "z"	- .037	- 2.168	2,228	22.550
(11) Writing "z"	.200	- 3.697	3.495	5.660

TABLE III-1 (Continued)

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Statistics</u>			<u>Coeff. of Variation</u>
	<u>Average</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	
<u>Other Variables</u>				
(12) 1998 Assessed Value Per Pupil	\$48,284	\$612	\$537,214	1.179
(13) Imputed Local Operating Tax Effort	31.4m	21.0m	55.2m	.214
(14) District Enrollment	1,477	76	44,925	2.536
(15) Attendance Center Enrollment	230	38	816	.576
(16) Percent of Pupils Eligible for Free Lunch	22.8%	1.0%	59.0%	.426

TABLE III-2

PUPIL-WEIGHTED KANSAS STATEWIDE STATISTICS
FOR VARIABLES RELATED TO PER PUPIL SPENDING
AND PUPIL PERFORMANCE IN 1998-99

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Statistics</u>			<u>Coeff. of Variation</u>
	<u>Average</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	
<u>Per Pupil Spending</u>				
(1) Total Spending (Instr., Admin., and Plant M&O)	\$4,376	\$3,504	\$10,928	.168
(2) Instruction	\$3,162	\$2,503	\$7,301	.142
(3) Administration	\$568	\$224	\$2,529	.397
(4) Plant M&O	\$646	\$391	\$2,184	.247
<u>Test Scores - Raw</u>				
(5) Reading	64.2	52.5	76.3	.068
(6) Math	50.7	38.5	63.3	.111
(7) Writing	3.41	2.70	4.08	.056
<u>Test Scores - Standard ("z")</u>				
(8) Total "z"	.000	- 7.590	6.67	n/a
(9) Reading "z"	.000	- 2.697	2.784	n/a
(10) Math "z"	.000	- 2.168	2,228	n/a
(11) Writing "z"	.000	- 3.697	3.495	n/a

TABLE III-2 (Continued)

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Statistics</u>			<u>Coeff. of Variation</u>
	<u>Average</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	
<u>Other Variables</u>				
(12) 1998 Assessed Value Per Pupil	\$41,988	\$612	\$537,214	.914
(13) Imputed Local Operating Tax Effort	34.5m	21.0m	55.2m	.185
(14) District Enrollment	1,477	76	44,925	2.536
(15) Attendance Center Enrollment	387	38	816	.366
(16) Percent of Pupils Eligible for Free Lunch	24.2%	1.0%	59.0%	.626

TABLE III-3

DISTRICT-WEIGHTED AVERAGES FOR VARIABLES RELATED
TO PER PUPIL SPENDING AND PUPIL PERFORMANCE IN
1998-99 BY QUINTILE OF PER PUPIL PERFORMANCE*
FOR SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN KANSAS

	Quintile of Performance				
	Less than - 1.40	- 1.40 to - .08	- .07 to .98	.99 to 2.22	More than 2.22
Number of Districts	61	61	61	61	60
Number of Pupils	143,826	54,550	87,229	62,162	101,159
<hr/>					
<u>Variable</u>					
<u>Per Pupil Spending</u>					
(1) Total Spending (Instr., Admin., and Plant M&O)	\$5,342	\$5,307	\$5,265	\$5,381	\$5,542
(2) Instruction	\$3,702	\$3,652	\$3,646	\$3,717	\$3,855
(3) Administration	\$852	\$855	\$833	\$863	\$897
(4) Plant M&O	\$788	\$800	\$785	\$800	\$791
<u>Test Scores - Raw</u>					
(5) Reading	60.5	63.9	65.5	67.3	69.0
(6) Math	45.3	48.7	50.5	52.4	55.8
(7) Writing	3.25	3.35	3.45	3.52	3.68

TABLE III-3 (Continued)

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Quintile of Performance</u>				
	<u>Less than -1.40</u>	<u>-1.40 to -.08</u>	<u>-.07 to .98</u>	<u>.99 to 2.22</u>	<u>More than 2.22</u>
<u>Test Scores - Standard ("z")</u>					
(8) Total "z"	- 2.659	- .733	.445	1.561	3.425
(9) Reading "z"	- .848	- .064	.291	.701	1.113
(10) Math "z"	- .969	- .355	- .037	.289	.898
(11) Writing "z"	- .842	- .315	.190	.570	1.414
<u>Other Variables</u>					
(12) 1998 Assessed Value Per Pupil	\$55,187	\$42,222	\$42,351	\$49,229	\$52,501
(13) Imputed Local Operating Tax Effort	31.5m	30.3m	30.9m	32.5m	31.6m
(14) District Enrollment	2,358	894	1,430	1,019	1,686
(15) Attendance Center Enrollment	236	222	235	243	213
(16) Percent of Pupils Eligible for Free Lunch	29.5%	23.2%	23.3%	19.9%	18.0%

* Per pupil performance is measured by the combined z-scores for the three tests.

TABLE III-4

**PUPIL-WEIGHTED AVERAGES FOR VARIABLES RELATED
TO PER PUPIL SPENDING AND PUPIL PERFORMANCE IN
1998-99 BY QUINTILE OF PER PUPIL PERFORMANCE*
FOR SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN KANSAS**

	Quintile of Performance				
	Less than - 2.50	- 2.50 to - .43	- .42 to .70	.71 to 2.58	More than 2.58
Number of Districts	27	78	64	92	43
Number of Pupils	87,113	91,947	88,133	92,528	89,133
<hr/>					
<u>Variable</u>					
<u>Per Pupil Spending</u>					
(1) Total Spending (Instr., Admin., and Plant M&O)	\$4,024	\$4,355	\$4,320	\$4,640	\$4,524
(2) Instruction	\$2,935	\$3,098	\$3,113	\$3,297	\$3,359
(3) Administration	\$475	\$615	\$566	\$663	\$515
(4) Plant M&O	\$615	\$643	\$641	\$679	\$650
 <u>Test Scores - Raw</u>					
(5) Reading	58.1	62.0	65.1	66.9	68.7
(6) Math	43.7	47.6	51.0	52.9	58.3
(7) Writing	3.20	3.30	3.41	3.50	3.63

TABLE III-4 (Continued)

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Quintile of Performance</u>				
	<u>Less than -2.50</u>	<u>- 2.50 to -.43</u>	<u>-.42 to .70</u>	<u>.71 to 2.58</u>	<u>More than 2.58</u>
<u>Test Scores - Standard ("z")</u>					
(8) Total "z"	- 3.716	- 1.605	.228	1.472	3.531
(9) Reading "z"	- 1.398	- .508	.205	.618	1.045
(10) Math "z"	- 1.250	- .548	.045	.387	1.340
(11) Writing "z"	- 1.068	- .549	- .022	.467	1.146
<u>Other Variables</u>					
(12) 1998 Assessed Value Per Pupil	\$37,305	\$38,239	\$35,278	\$42,495	\$56,527
(13) Imputed Local Operating Tax Effort	37.9m	32.3m	32.2m	33.0m	37.2m
(14) District Enrollment	3,226	1,179	1,377	1,006	2,073
(15) Attendance Center Enrollment	416	340	357	357	469
(16) Percent of Pupils Eligible for Free Lunch	43.5%	28.9%	24.4%	16.9%	8.0%

* Per pupil performance is measured by the combined z-scores for the three tests.

TABLE III-5

DISTRICT-WEIGHTED AVERAGES FOR VARIABLES RELATED TO PER PUPIL SPENDING AND PUPIL PERFORMANCE IN 1998-99 BY QUINTILE OF PER PUPIL SPENDING FOR INSTRUCTION, ADMINISTRATION, AND PLANT M&O FOR SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN KANSAS

	Quintile of Spending				
	Less than <u>\$4,390</u>	\$4,390 to <u>\$5,058</u>	\$5,059 to <u>\$5,431</u>	\$5,432 to <u>\$5,979</u>	More than <u>\$5,979</u>
Number of Districts	61	61	61	61	60
Number of Pupils	292,961	80,260	34,812	27,673	13,220
<hr/>					
<u>Variable</u>					
<u>Per Pupil Spending</u>					
(1) Total Spending (Instr., Admin., and Plant M&O)	\$4,024	\$4,754	\$5,242	\$5,698	\$7,147
(2) Instruction	\$2,919	\$3,364	\$3,631	\$3,881	\$4,793
(3) Administration	\$522	\$689	\$848	\$932	\$1,316
(4) Plant M&O	\$584	\$701	\$762	\$884	\$1,037
 <u>Test Scores - Raw</u>					
(5) Reading	64.6	64.7	65.1	66.0	65.9
(6) Math	50.6	50.8	50.3	50.9	49.9
(7) Writing	3.42	3.43	3.46	3.45	3.48

TABLE III-5 (Continued)

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Quintile of Spending</u>				
	<u>Less than \$4,390</u>	<u>\$4,390 to \$5,058</u>	<u>\$5,059 to \$5,431</u>	<u>\$5,432 to \$5,979</u>	<u>More than \$5,979</u>
<u>Test Scores - Standard ("z")</u>					
(8) Total "z"	.107	.236	.407	.655	.586
(9) Reading "z"	.079	.111	.203	.408	.380
(10) Math "z"	-.018	.016	-.071	.039	-.156
(11) Writing "z"	.046	.109	.276	.208	.362
<u>Other Variables</u>					
(12) 1998 Assessed Value Per Pupil	\$30,367	\$42,096	\$34,266	\$64,013	\$71,053
(13) Imputed Local Operating Tax Effort	32.3m	30.8m	28.7m	30.6m	34.5m
(14) District Enrollment	4,803	1,316	571	454	220
(15) Attendance Center Enrollment	409	277	206	164	92
(16) Percent of Pupils Eligible for Free Lunch	22.2%	19.5%	22.7%	22.0%	27.6%

TABLE III-6

PUPIL-WEIGHTED AVERAGES FOR VARIABLES RELATED TO PER PUPIL SPENDING AND PUPIL PERFORMANCE IN 1998-99 BY QUINTILE OF PER PUPIL SPENDING FOR INSTRUCTION, ADMINISTRATION, AND PLANT M&O FOR SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN KANSAS

	Quintile of Spending				
	Less than \$3,757	\$3,758 to \$4,033	\$4,034 to \$4,263	\$4,264 to \$4,931	More than \$4,931
Number of Districts	9	22	19	56	198
Number of Pupils	91,399	89,804	91,490	86,712	89,712
<u>Variable</u>					
<u>Per Pupil Spending</u>					
(1) Total Spending (Instr., Admin., and Plant M&O)	\$3,695	\$3,897	\$4,177	\$4,565	\$5,572
(2) Instruction	\$2,776	\$2,817	\$3,120	\$3,291	\$3,822
(3) Administration	\$407	\$456	\$459	\$608	\$918
(4) Plant M&O	\$512	\$625	\$598	\$666	\$833
<u>Test Scores - Raw</u>					
(5) Reading	61.4	62.2	66.4	65.6	65.5
(6) Math	48.0	47.7	54.5	52.7	50.7
(7) Writing	3.29	3.34	3.49	3.46	3.48

TABLE III-6 (Continued)

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Quintile of Spending</u>				
	<u>Less than \$4,390</u>	<u>\$4,390 to \$5,058</u>	<u>\$5,059 to \$5,431</u>	<u>\$5,432 to \$5,979</u>	<u>More than \$5,979</u>
<u>Test Scores - Normed ("z")</u>					
(8) Total "z"	- 1.787	- 1.362	1.604	.938	.642
(9) Reading "z"	- .659	- .453	.508	.322	.295
(10) Math "z"	- .488	- .528	.668	.356	.001
(11) Writing "z"	- .641	- .381	.428	.260	.346
<u>Other Variables</u>					
(12) 1998 Assessed Value Per Pupil	\$34,669	\$30,370	\$45,883	\$45,270	\$53,954
(13) Imputed Local Operating Tax Effort	35.0m	35.3m	35.7m	34.8m	31.5m
(14) District Enrollment	10,155	4,082	4,815	1,548	453
(15) Attendance Center Enrollment	449	425	473	390	197
(16) Percent of Pupils Eligible for Free Lunch	37.5%	29.6%	16.2%	15.4%	22.0%

TABLE III-7

**PUPIL-WEIGHTED AVERAGES FOR VARIABLES RELATED TO
PER PUPIL SPENDING AND PUPIL PERFORMANCE IN 1998-99
FOR THREE GROUPS OF KANSAS SCHOOL DISTRICTS
IDENTIFIED AS LOW PERFORMING AND HIGH SPENDING**

	<u>Group of School Districts</u>				<u>All Other Districts</u>
	<u>All Kansas Districts</u>	<u>Type A*</u>	<u>Type B**</u>	<u>Type C***</u>	
Number of Districts	304	10	8	10	276
Number of Pupils	448,926	2,919	1,654	9,545	434,808
<u>Variable</u>					
<u>Per Pupil Spending</u>					
(1) Total Spending (Instr., Admin., and Plant M&O)	\$4,376	\$6,508	\$6,723	\$4,941	\$4,340
(2) Instruction	\$3,162	\$4,513	\$4,518	\$3,429	\$3,142
(3) Administration	\$568	\$1,090	\$1,294	\$760	\$558
(4) Plant M&O	\$646	\$905	\$910	\$752	\$641
<u>Test Scores - Raw</u>					
(5) Reading	64.2	61.8	64.5	58.6	64.4
(6) Math	50.7	46.7	45.4	45.3	50.9
(7) Writing	3.41	3.18	3.34	3.17	3.42

TABLE III-7 (Continued)

Variable	Group of School Districts				All Other Districts
	All Kansas Districts	Type A*	Type B**	Type C***	
<u>Test Scores - Standard ("z")</u>					
(8) Total "z"	.000	- 2.426	- 1.237	- 3.510	.098
(9) Reading "z"	.000	- .545	.061	- 1.297	.032
(10) Math "z"	.000	- .709	- .937	- .957	.029
(11) Writing "z"	.000	- 1.173	- .361	- 1.255	.037
<u>Other Variables</u>					
(12) 1998 Assessed Value Per Pupil	\$41,988	\$75,280	\$37,946	\$27,983	\$42,087
(13) Imputed Local Operating Tax Effort	34.5m	31.5m	31.0m	39.0m	34.4m
(14) District Enrollment	1,477	292	207	955	1,575
(15) Attendance Center Enrollment	387	176	124	348	391
(16) Percent of Pupils Eligible for Free Lunch	24.2%	24.3%	40.3%	24.9%	24.1%

* Type "A" districts had *both* higher levels of spending and lower levels of performance than would have been expected given their circumstances.

** Type "B" districts had higher than expected levels of spending *and* performance that has been lower than average for *two* years.

*** Type "C" districts had lower than expected performance in 1998 *and* lower than average performance in 1997 *and* have spending levels above the predicted level excluding the use of the confidence interval.

Chapter IV

INTERVIEW PROCEDURES

The State of Kansas requested that we collect interviews and information from at least sixty (60) school districts, thereby gathering information from a broad cross-section of the state concerning reorganization and efficiency. We received survey information from 90 districts. Using a variety of procedures (including review of the survey information), we identified sixty-four (64) districts and conducted meetings, interviews, observations and analysis with these districts.

The On-Site Visit and Interview Process

Selecting Districts for Analysis

Our review of the literature prompted us to identify districts that had low levels of student performance and high levels of per pupil spending, districts that could most benefit from reorganization and efficiency. Specifically, we selected districts that had a lower pupil performance and higher per pupil spending than would have been expected, given the district's characteristics. The previous chapter provided detail for the selection of the "target" districts in Map 1. In sum, 28 districts had lower performance and higher levels of spending than we expected. These districts became our primary focus for the interview planning, inquiry and collecting data.

In addition to the twenty-eight "target" districts, we identified 44 other districts that had one or more of the following characteristics: (1) below average performance in 1997 and 1998 and higher than average spending; (2) convoluted or odd boundaries; (3) dramatic enrollment changes (a decline of 20% in 5 or 10 years); (4) all buildings 50 years old, and (5) fewer than 150 pupils in the entire district and declining enrollment.

Of these 72 districts (28+44), we isolated 15 districts that would most benefit for an on-site visit, in which interviews and observations would be made to supplement and explain the district's unique circumstances, conditions and problems. Of these 15 districts, ten (10) were type "A" districts that had lower performance and higher spending than expected; four (4) were considered type "B" and "C" districts (of the 18 districts); and one (1) district that met at least five other criteria.

In addition, we sent surveys to 90 districts to supplement the information on enrollment projects, conditions of school facilities, course offerings, distance learning, and sharing with other districts. These 90 districts include the 72 that met the criteria described above, plus 18 neighboring districts.

KASB School Board Meetings

We met with 43 districts in conjunction with the Kansas Association of School Boards (KASB) meetings:

- 14 of the remaining Type "B" or "C" districts that were not visited.
- 11 districts that met multiple criteria.
- 17 "good neighbor" districts (i.e., a neighboring district of one of the 15 being visited, with relatively high performance and low spending).
- One district neighboring of a district with a convoluted boundary.

The Research Teams

Three experienced teams (of two) of researchers met with schools at the KASB school board meetings and at district sites. The meetings took place April 2- May 11, 2000.

Team One included John Myers, partner of Augenblick & Myers (A&M), and Dr. Michael G. Lacy, A&M associate and professor at Regis University; Team Two included: Dr. John Augenblick, and Justin Silverstein, partner and associate of A&M, respectively; and Team Three included: Dr. Chris Pipho, former of Senior Fellow at the Education Commission of the States (ECS) and Terry Whitney, former senior policy specialist for National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL).

While at the meeting, a brief presentation was made describing the procedures, scope and timetable of the study. Questions were solicited at each school board meeting. Before and after the meetings, we met with superintendents, school board members, and community members. We asked the district officials a variety of questions pertaining to (a) per pupil performance and spending, (b) the role the school plays in the community, (c) the future of the district, and (d) views about developing relationships with neighboring districts.

On-Site Visits

The site visits we conducted gave district administrators, teachers, school board and community members a chance to (1) affirm or explain their (low) performance and (high) spending levels; (2) reaffirm their building capacity needs; (3) forecast future enrollments, and (4) discuss obstacles for student learning in their district.

We met with the district officials for approximately two hours. The interviews were designed to provide 30 minutes with the superintendent; 20 minutes with a

teacher; 40 minutes with a school board member and a leader or member of the community; and then, 30 minutes with a principal or superintendent again. Some school districts requested changed schedules, added interviews, or changed the interview formats. Observations were also made by each research team to confirm, deny, or supplement the interviews.

School Districts Selected

Western Kansas

The primary focus of Team One was western Kansas. They met the district superintendents, and school board members at the school board meeting in Weskan, Cimarron, and Stafford. Specifically, Team One met with Atwood (318), Chase (401), Hanston (228), Hill City (281), Hoxie (412), Hugoton (210), Jetmore (227), Oakley (274), Prairie Heights (295), and Rolla (217) all of which were “good neighbors” of districts that had lower than predicted pupil performance and higher spending. Team One conducted two site interviews with superintendents, school board members, community members, and teachers in Moscow (209) and Elkhart (218).

Central Kansas

Team Two focused on central Kansas. They attended two school board meetings in Cuba, Wellington and Goessel. After the meetings, the research team met with Burrton (369), Conway Springs (356), Lyons (405), Oxford (358), South Haven (509), Winfield (465), Wellington (353), Mankato (278), Phillipsburg (325), Clifton-Clyde (224), Pike Valley (426), Republic County (427), Southern Cloud (334), Washington (222). Team Two had site meetings at Belle Plaine (357), Caldwell (360), Eastern Heights (324), Hillcrest (455), Lenora (213), Morland (280), and Udall (463).

Eastern Kansas

Team Three went to the school board meetings in Fort Scott, Blue Rapids, Tecumseh, and Lansing. They met with Barnes (223), Bonner Springs (204), Cedar Vale (285), Lyons (406), Madison-Virgil (386), Marysville (364), Neodesha (461), North Central (221), and Pleasanton (344), and Turner-Kansas City (202).

Phone Interviews

Some school districts did not meet with us at the school board meeting, primarily because they were undergoing changes, such as a new superintendent, administrators, or other. For these districts, we conducted five telephone interviews with the superintendents. These interviews lasted about 90 minutes. The five districts were Argonia (359), Chetopa (505), Elk Valley (283), Fowler (225), and Sterling (376).

Large School Districts

In addition to per pupil performance and spending, we met with six (6) districts because of their "large" pupil population size (based on average high school enrollments above 900 pupils), to see if they could benefit from reorganization, and to hear their concerns. They were: Auburn Washburn (437), Kansas City (500), Olathe (233), Shawnee Mission (512), Topeka (501), and Wichita (259).

Conclusion

In sum, we interviewed 64 school districts, received survey information from 90 school districts in Kansas, and received school building capacity information from all school districts. This work provided the evidentiary material for descriptions, explanations and attitudes towards reorganization and consolidation, of substantial resistance and a call for state help found in the next section.

Results

A Summary Of The Interviews

The interviews with administrators, school board members, community leaders, and teachers suggest that (a) they have substantial resistance to the idea of reorganizing or consolidating school districts; (b) they support state involvement to reorganize districts in extreme cases (where there are declining enrollments and high spending); (c) they justified or defended low student performance and high expenditures; and (d) they viewed the use of technology for student learning and building projects as a way of surviving consolidation; and (e) they were ambivalent about mandates by the state.

Resistance to Consolidation

Many older and established community leaders and school board members resisted the idea of reorganizing school districts, primarily because they viewed consolidation as a threat to their community. They commonly cited the statewide consolidation in the 1960s, which created unified K-12 districts and reduced the total number of school districts in Kansas. The consolidation resulted in feelings of resentment, loss of autonomy and control, as well as disenfranchisement from the rank and file, they argued. Notably, these accounts did not reference the changing structural conditions in Kansas (e.g., economy, declining populations, desire for efficiency); instead the consolidation was blamed for the destruction of communities and difficult economic conditions. The school closures have had long-term effects they argued, because it is virtually impossible to attract new businesses and industries to

communities that do not have a school. In some counties, the school district is the major employer. In addition, community leaders and school board members consider the (high) school to be the hub of community and extracurricular activities (especially sports), thereby reinforcing a sense of community.

The resistance to consolidation also stems from longstanding and intense feelings toward neighboring districts, counties, and townships. The source of these rivalries is historic, said one superintendent, based on competition over being awarded the county seat over 100 years ago. Some argued that the differences were cultural and socioeconomic, reflecting how each of the communities developed its business activities and interests (e.g., farming, mining, oil and gas producing, and bedroom communities). These interests affected the expectations for student learning and advancement for higher degrees, explained one superintendent. Those communities that were near colleges had higher expectations for student learning. Differences were also expressed in terms of ethnic and regional differences, dramatized with lurid stories of crime and drugs in neighboring towns and cities.

Some district administrators resisted reorganization on financial grounds. They complained that combining school districts would result in less revenues and per pupil spending locally, and more money being sent to Topeka. This was a recurrent concern expressed by oil and gas-rich districts in southwestern Kansas, wanting the authority to act independently.

A Call for State Help

Some districts distinguished by low and declining enrollments (some fewer than 50 students) thought that they could benefit from state reorganization and support. Many of these districts had large geographic areas. For the most part, these school administrators were concerned about economic efficiency and lowering cost, however they resisted the idea that their declining enrollments affected the quality of education, curricula and student learning. However, one story told by a superintendent unearthed a serious problem. The superintendent reported that one of their most experienced and popular high school math teachers, who taught four grade levels, moved away. Her replacement was not a good teacher. The district enticed the established teacher to return (because of her status in the community); however during her absence, the students suffered. This stark and succinct example shows that in small districts, one good or bad teacher can affect many students, over many grade levels for one or many years.

Rather than closing or consolidating schools, struggling districts proposed that they become "special needs" or "education centers" (e.g., teaching special education, bilingual education, adult education). School board members and community leaders said that they would consider consolidation if the state would "bring neighboring districts here." In other words, the compromises and sacrifices should be made elsewhere.

Explanations for Low Student Performance

As suggested earlier, one of the criteria that we used to select the schools for the interviews was student performance. The district officials attempted to justify their low performance scores, or defended them by using other criteria.

Justifications for Low Performance

Some school district administrators justified their lower than predicted performance by complaining about the tests:

- the scope of the tests and indexes were unrepresentative (“scores in the past would have been much higher”).
- the tests were unreliable and unrepresentative (particularly the writing tests).
- the scores were attributed to a statistical aberration, caused by one or two students.
- each class is different and the test did not include the “good” classes.

School administrators accounted for their low student performance by blaming certain groups:

- a bad cohort of students who score poorly on the tests.
- the changing ethnic and socioeconomic demographics (the school serves a high number of ESL students, Hispanics, and “outsiders”).

Neighboring superintendents and school board members argued that low performing schools were a product of:

- poor leadership by superintendents and administrators.
- inexperienced teachers (particularly in remote and rural areas of the state).
- low expectations of student performance, and too much emphasis on extracurricular activities.

Defending Low Student Performance

Although most did not provide hard evidence, school administrators argued that

the state assessments were not valid or credible because one student could easily bring down the score and status of the entire school. They argued for national comparative standards and new criteria (rather than state assessment), defending their student performance on the grounds that their scores on national test scores (e.g., the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills or CTBS, or the Iowa Test of Basic Skills, or ITBS) were above the national average. In addition, they argued that scholastic achievement should be measured by graduation rates, which would be better and more reliable measures of success.

In addition, many school officials defended their performance scores by using anecdotal evidence, of three or four exemplars in the community that earned higher degrees from Ivy League Universities, who actively contribute to the community and, have talented children. Without hesitation, administrators could recite the names of students in their districts who received national merit awards or scholarships to major universities.

In addition, some school board members highlighted the benefits of small schools and small school districts, such as: (a) smaller class sizes; (b) higher participation in extracurricular activities; (c) lower dropout rates; (d) less problems; and (e) the production of more productive citizens – particularly when compared to neighboring districts known for crime, drug problems and low scholastic achievement. (“Parents would not send their children there!”)

Explanations for High Spending

Some districts accepted the fact that they were spending too much, but justified it because of teacher development, training and retention. In spite of the fact that the state is making it easier to cross county and district lines, transportation costs were still cited as the largest expenditure, particularly in large geographic areas with declining enrollments. Thus, because of teacher retention issues (in a climate of teacher shortages) and transportation issues, school administrators argued that the state would not be saving much by consolidating these districts. In addition, high spending was a result of special needs programs, such as ESL, adult education courses, and salaries for bilingual teachers.

In any event, some superintendents and school board members argued that the high level of spending was “not out of line” because the state allows that level of spending in their authorized budget and “local option budget” (LOB), which provided for additional expenditures. After all, they argued, the LOB was supported by the local school board elected by the community. Therefore, they argue that district spending levels are not necessarily a state issue. Moreover, the state financing formulas were inadequate and unrealistic to apply to the special demands of the districts.

Responses to Consolidation

There was a broad range of responses to reorganizing school districts in Kansas, including denial, capital improvements, innovations, and acceptance.

Denial

Many school district officials and school board members were in denial about consolidation and reorganization ("Nothing will be done anyway!"), the extent that the districts were low performing and high spending, as well as declining enrollment problems. The most recalcitrant school board members said that they would not even discuss possible plans for sharing with neighboring districts because those "discussions" would eventually lead to consolidation.

Even given the intensity of the rivalries, school board members acknowledged that sharing and cooperation with neighboring districts was occurring in the area of sports and extracurricular activities, but not in the academic arena.

The Building Boom

Perhaps the most striking response to reorganization was the "building boom." Some districts were undergoing new construction of new buildings (especially gymnasiums) to increase the probability of the survival of their district. The belief was that by building new, large and modern structures, these districts were less likely candidates for school closures and consolidation. Students from neighboring communities would have to go there.

Technology as Savior

In response to low student learning and limited curricula, superintendents promised that technology (Two-Way Interactive Television Networks, or ITV courses) was presently addressing their students' needs. The ITV and distance learning courses offered college-bound students the curricula and course offerings that were not available in the traditional school setting. Through ITV courses, high school students could receive college credit before attending college. However, very few student performance measures on distance learning were available; instead, school officials lionized the ITV. In addition, there has been an effort to build a technology backbone throughout the state, using the community colleges and universities. While most rural areas considered the Internet courses a panacea, a few urban school districts felt burdened by the costs of the Internet.

Changing and Maintaining Convolved Boundaries

On the onset of this study, the state expressed interest in changing or straightening the convoluted district boundaries. After all, the district boundaries were set in the 1960s and the rationale for maintaining them is perhaps no longer useful. Still, nearly all of the interviewees said that changing the boundaries is "more trouble than it's worth," primarily because of the present open enrollment policies permit students to enroll in districts other than they reside. In addition, the 1992 changes in the School Finance Act decreased the influence of local property value on school funding. Moreover, technology has created "virtual school districts," one superintendent argued, thereby undermining the need for uniform district boundaries.

Superintendents as Managers

In spite of the prevalence of Special Education Cooperatives, Service Centers, Interlocals and Networks, most administrators do not routinely and regularly share with neighboring districts. The more innovative superintendents have districts that shared technology, resources, nurses and teachers. Most sharing occurred because of prior relationships among superintendents. One superintendent argued that if reorganization was left up to the superintendents, organizational problems would be easily solved, because (unlike the school boards) superintendents are willing to work together. These superintendents saw the entrenched power of school board members and the lack of clear administrative roles and responsibilities as a major hindrance to taking thoughtful action. Some, however, suggested that sharing teachers for example, caused scheduling and governance problems (i.e., how would teachers be paid and by which district?). Some districts were sharing senior administrators, but savings were unrealized because the superintendents in small districts had other roles and responsibilities, including principal and transportation director.

Some administrators of large school districts have resisted sharing with smaller districts, particularly in rural areas, because of the budgetary, logistical and scheduling demands. The high transportation costs alone do not warrant the effort, they argued. Superintendents of larger districts expressed concern that the smaller districts viewed them as monoliths posed to usurp their schools and communities.

The Reorganization Process

The more established superintendents suggested that the state should mandate change, while providing timetables and incentives, and not require districts hold down spending and raise taxes until they no longer can afford it ("bleeding the district"). Mandating change would minimize the period of resentment, they argued, while taking the pressure off local school boards and administrators to make difficult financial decisions.

Some administrators wanted the state to provide incentives for reorganization efforts and the sharing of resources. Funding for the programs could occur without state mandates, and could be reevaluated periodically (every 2 or 3 years). Moreover, funding should be given for programs that encourage community dialogue, though "pen pal programs," head start programs, and others.

Conclusion

Although there is substantial resistance to reorganizing school districts in Kansas, some district officials acknowledge that something needs to be done. They suggest that a more comprehensive approach for organizing school districts will enhance efficiency and student performance.

Chapter V

ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO REORGANIZING SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN KANSAS

Introduction

In Section III, we described two ways to identify districts that might need to be reorganized. First, we focused on school districts where pupil performance was low and where per pupil spending was high. Second, we focused on school districts where schools, or the district itself, may be too small or too large to provide a broad array of services effectively. Having identified "target" districts, we then examined the characteristics of all districts that are neighbors of those target districts to determine if reorganization with one or more of them might address the conditions in each target district. In the case of those districts selected on the basis of relatively low pupil performance and relatively high per pupil spending, we identified suitable neighbors as ones with relatively high performance and relatively low per pupil spending. In the case of those districts selected on the basis of size, we identified suitable neighbors based on proximity, size, and the availability of space to serve pupils. In pursuing these approaches, we discovered several situations in which we were either unable to find a suitable neighboring district for a target district, or the suitable neighbor we found differed depending on which approach (size or performance) was used to identify the neighbor. Therefore, we developed a third approach, which focused on the same target districts we identified using the first and second approaches, but selected neighboring districts using some criteria associated with the first two approaches, as well as information gleaned from the interviews we conducted with school districts, making the outcome both rational and reasonable.

The result of pursuing these three approaches was the development of three maps that display the districts we believe should be reorganized. There are several important things to take into consideration in reviewing the maps. First, we have attempted to use data to drive the process. That is, we established criteria to guide our work and then collected and evaluated relevant information to determine whether any district met the criteria and whether other districts should be involved in reorganization. We strongly believe that this approach is the only legitimate way to do this kind of work and that other approaches would not withstand scrutiny by those who are affected by policy decisions. Second, we used data in making our decisions that some might complain were never intended to be used for that purpose. In our view, the state has gone to the trouble of developing pupil performance data using statewide tests as well as school district spending data using statewide accounting procedures, and such information is the best and only basis for making the kinds of decisions we needed to make in doing this work. Third, while we took our work to completion; that is, we used the data and information we had to recommend that specific districts be reorganized. We did this primarily to illustrate that it is possible to reach such conclusions. However,

as is discussed in Section IV, we believe that the actual reorganization of school districts should follow a process that places the burden on the state to identify districts targeted for reorganization. This should be based on appropriate criteria and data, which might be similar to those we used, then gives target districts some time to overcome the problems that brought them to the state's attention, and then creates a process for identifying which districts would be reorganized if the target district were unable to rectify the situation by itself. Finally, a number of the issues we encountered in doing this work are intra-school or intra-district issues that focus on whether schools should be reorganized or closed. The discussion below is focused exclusively on school districts and assumes that the state has no authority to make school closure decisions or decisions of a similar nature even when they might be what is required to address an issue that brought a school district to our attention.

The First Approach to School District Reorganization (Map 1)

The purpose of Map 1 is to show how school districts in Kansas might look if districts with lower than expected pupil performance and higher than expected per pupil spending were required to merge with other districts in response to those conditions. As has been discussed in the literature review, the rationale for making changes in school district organization has focused on three broad areas of interest: (1) spending levels; (2) programmatic elements; and (3) levels of pupil performance. Map 1 is designed to reflect the results of statistical analysis of pupil performance data and per pupil spending data, which was used to identify target districts as well as to select neighboring districts that might make the best candidates for merger with target districts.

The Target Districts

As discussed in Section III, we identified 28 districts that have a combination of relatively low pupil performance and relatively high per pupil spending. Those 28 districts are as follows:

Type "A" (much lower than expected pupil performance and much higher than expected per pupil spending): Moscow Public Schools (209), West Solomon Valley Schools (213), Elkhart (218), Washington Schools (222), Hanston (228), Nes Tre La Go (301), Belle Plaine (357), Chase-Raymond (401), Hillcrest Rural Schools (455), and Udall (463).

Type "B" (much higher than expected levels of spending *and* performance that has been lower than average for *two* years): Fowler (225), Triplains (275), Elk Valley (283), Cedar Vale (285), Herndon (317), Eastern Heights (324), Wathena (406), and Chetopa (505).

Type "C" (somewhat lower than expected performance in 1998, lower than average performance in 1997, *and* spending levels somewhat above the

predicted level): Turner-Kansas City (202), Bonner Springs (204), Mankato (278), Pleasanton (344), Oxford (358), Caldwell (360), Marysville (364), Madison-Virgil (386), Neodesha (461), and South Haven (509).

Identifying Appropriate Neighboring Districts

Having identified 28 target districts, we examined all their neighboring districts to find appropriate candidates for merger based on four factors: (1) pupil performance; (2) per pupil spending; (3) distance between schools; and (4) being in the same county. Our assumption is that the best candidates for merger are those districts with relatively high levels of pupil performance and relatively low levels of per pupil spending that are reasonably close to target districts (that is, having schools within a distance of 20 miles of each other) and within the same county (representing a similar community of interest). The figures in Table V-1 indicate those characteristics of neighbor districts for each of the 28 target districts.

Table V-2 indicates the recommended mergers of districts, which result in: (1) the creation of 20 merged districts, combining 20 target districts with 22 neighbor districts; (2) of the 20 new districts, 18 reflect merging a target district with one other district and two reflect merging a target district with two other districts; (3) no mergers between target districts; and (4) eight target districts that cannot be reorganized.

The Second Approach to School District Reorganization (Map 2)

As discussed in Section III, we also identified school districts that might benefit from reorganization on the basis of school size. In looking at enrollment figures and numbers of high schools in Kansas, we found 50 districts with enrollments less than 260 pupils. We also found 24 districts with enrollments that are too large in relationship to the number of high schools they have. We also identified two districts where total enrollment is simply so high that, regardless of numbers of high schools, they might be viewed by some people as being too large to manage effectively.

The Target Districts

Districts that are too small relative to the number of schools they operate.

Too small with only one high school: Cheylin (103), White Rock (104), Moscow Public Schools (20-9), Northern Valley (212), West Solomon Valley Schools (213), Rolla (217), Ashland (220), North Central (221), Fowler (225), Hanston (228), West Smith County (238), Weskan (242), Palco (269), Triplains (275), Jewell (279), West Graham-Morland (280), Elk Valley (283), Cedar Vale (286), Grinnell Public Schools (291), Wheatland (292), Prairie Heights (295), Sylvan Grove (299), Nes Tre La Go (301), Smoky Hill (302), Bazine (304), Brewster

(314), Golden Plains (316), Herndon (317), Eastern Heights (324), Logan (326), Burrton (369), Montezuma (371), Hamilton (390), Paradise (399), Chase-Raymond (401), Mullinville (424), Midway Schools (433), Hillcrest (455), Healy (468), Dexter (471), Haviiland (474), Copeland (476), Pawnee Heights (496), Lewis (502), and Attica (511).

Too small with more than one high school: Barnes (223), Leroy-Gridley (245), Southern Cloud (334), Rural Vista (481), and Axtell (488).

Districts that are too large.

Too large relative to the number of high schools: Turner-Kansas City (202), Blue Valley (229), Olathe (233), Emporia (253), Derby (260), Haysville (261), Goddard (265), Maize (266), Salina (305), Hutchinson (308), Seaman (345), Newton (373), Manhattan (383), Great Bend (428), Auburn Washburn (437), Dodge City (443), Leavenworth (453), Garden City (457), Geary County Schools (475), Liberal (480), Hays (489), Lawrence (497), and Kansas City (500).

Too large: Wichita (259) and Shawnee Mission (512).

Identifying Appropriate Neighboring Districts

Once the target districts using this approach were identified, we examined neighboring districts to determine whether consolidation could address the issue that brought the district under scrutiny. In order for a merger to be feasible, we decided that existing high schools in two districts should be no more than 20 miles apart and that there would need to be sufficient capacity in one or more schools to serve all of the pupils in the newly formed district. The figures in Table V-3 indicate the characteristics of neighboring districts for all 76 target districts.

We found that 45 of the 50 districts considered to be too small could be merged with one or more neighboring districts and would meet all criteria while. For five districts, consolidation with a neighboring district would not solve the problem. Twenty-nine neighboring districts were merged with these 45, resulting in 34 new districts. This meant that where there had originally been 74 districts there were now 34 (of those 34 new districts, 29 are the result of the merger of two districts, four are the result of the merger of three districts, and one is the result of the merger of four districts).

We also found that district reorganization would only address the needs of six districts that are too large relative to the number of high schools they operate. These six districts could be merged with seven neighboring districts to create five new districts (of these five districts, two are the result of merging two districts and three are the result of merging three districts). In 18 districts, some other approach, such as creating "schools within schools," would need to be used to address the issue of large high schools. That approach plus others, such as dividing a district into several districts,

would need to be used to address the issues associated with the two districts that are very large.

Mergers that we consider to be appropriate are shown in Table V-4(A) and Table V-4(B). Map 2 indicates a variety of approaches that might be used to address optimum size issues. The map shows a total of 39 new districts created by merging 51 target districts (ones considered to be too small or too large given the number of high schools they operate) with 36 neighboring districts that, together, are close enough and have sufficient capacity to address the concern in a reasonable way. The map shows that the 39 new districts are the result of 31 mergers of two districts, seven mergers of three districts, and one merger of four districts. In the end, the state would have 256 school districts rather than the 304 districts that exist currently. The map also shows: (1) the five districts that have enrollments that are too low to support a high school of 100 pupils for which we could not find a suitable neighbor for merger; (2) the 18 districts that have high schools considered to be too large but for which we could not find a suitable neighbor for merger (and within which some other approach would need to be taken to address the problem); and (3) the two districts that are very large.

The Third Approach to School District Reorganization (Map 3)

The purpose of Map 3 is to combine the information shown in Map 1 and Map 2 with other information we obtained, including that gained during the interviews with school district personnel, to create a set of districts that should be, and could be, reorganized. Map 3 reflects the research on school and school district size, the actual performance and spending levels of districts, and the practical matters that ought to be taken into consideration before making recommendations about changing school district boundaries.

In order to create Map 3, we developed nine rationales (A-I) for selecting target districts and neighbor districts. The rationales are shown below.

Rationale "A"

Select any reorganized sets of districts that are the same on both Map 1 and Map 2. In this case, any target district would be selected on the basis of the criteria used in both Map 1 and Map 2 and any districts selected for merger with a target district would meet the criteria used in both Map 1 and Map 2. We identify five target districts and five merger districts using this rational.

Rationale "B"

Select any target district that meets the criteria for identifying target districts on both Map 1 and Map 2 but that is reorganized differently in Map 1 than it is in Map 2; resolve the differences in Map 3. In some cases, this means that we selected a merger district for a target district for which no merger district is

selected in Map 1. In other cases, we selected a merger district from among alternative districts that we identify in Map 1 or Map 2. Using this rationale, we identify seven target districts and nine merger districts, four of which are targets in Map 2, using this rationale.

Rational "C"

Select sets of districts in which one district is a target district in Map 1 and merger districts are target districts in Map 2. Using this rationale, we identify six sets of merger districts.

Rationale "D"

Select all districts using Map 1 criteria that have not been selected already and reconfigure them using merger districts from Map 1 or Map 2 if they are reasonable based on distance and information obtained in interviews. We identify nine target districts and nine merger districts using this rationale.

Rationale "E"

Select all districts that have schools considered to be too small using Map 2 criteria that have only one high school, which have not been selected already, and reconfigure them only if they meet the following additional criteria:

- (A) If they have between 150 and 260 pupils, they must also meet two out of the following three criteria:
 - (1) Have little or no projected enrollment growth;
 - (2) Have actual per pupil spending that is more than 30 percent above predicted spending per pupil;
 - (3) Have actual average pupil performance below predicted pupil performance.

- (B) If they have less than 150 pupils, they must meet one of the following criteria:
 - (1) Have little or no projected enrollment growth;
 - (2) Have actual per pupil spending that is more than 20 percent above predicted spending per pupil.

Using this rationale, we identify nine target districts and nine merger districts, one of which meets Map 2 selection criteria.

Rationale "F"

Select all districts that have schools considered to be too small using Map 2 criteria that have more than one high school, which have not been selected already, and reconfigure them only if they meet two out of three of the following additional criteria:

- (1) Have little or no projected enrollment growth;
- (2) Have actual per pupil spending that is more than 30 percent above predicted spending per pupil;
- (3) Have actual average pupil performance below predicted pupil performance.

We identify four target districts and four merger districts using this rationale.

Rationale "G"

Select all districts that have schools that are too large using Map 2 criteria where merger with other districts can alleviate the concern and merger is possible due to available capacity in existing facilities. Using this rationale, we identify three target districts and four merger districts.

Rationale "H"

Select all districts that have schools that are too large using Map 2 criteria where merger with other districts does not appear capable of resolving the concern and where intra-district or intra-school action needs to be taken. We identify 19 districts using this rationale.

Rationale "I"

Select districts considered to be too large using Map 2 criteria. These districts may need to be disaggregated into smaller districts. We identify two districts using these criteria.

TABLE V-1

DATA RELATED TO THE SELECTION OF NEIGHBORING DISTRICTS TO MERGE WITH THE TARGET DISTRICTS ASSOCIATED WITH MAP 1

<u>Target District</u>	<u>Neighbor Districts</u>	Is the N'ghbor a Target District?	Pupil Performance z-score		Per Pupil Spending		Distance (Miles)	In Target District County?
			Pred.	Actual	Pred.	Actual		
Type "A".								
209	Moscow			1.09	-1.46	\$7,564	\$8,647	
	210 Hugoton Public Schools	No	-0.50	-1.22	\$5,695	\$4,866	13	Yes
	214 Ulysses	No	-0.46	-1.61	\$4,851	\$4,659	23	No
	480 Liberal	No	-2.16	-1.52	\$3,707	\$3,569	26	No
	483 Kismet-Plains	No	-0.35	-0.77	\$4,785	\$5,256	35	No
	507 Satanta	No	-1.68	-3.97	\$5,886	\$5,861	15	No
213	West Solomon Valley P.S.			1.23	-3.18	\$7,055	\$8,714	
	211 Norton Community Schools	No	1.25	-0.77	\$4,865	\$5,002	17	Yes
	280 West Graham-Morland	No	2.78	1.43	\$7,640	\$10,928	19	No
	281 Hill City	No	0.72	-0.38	\$5,596	\$5,717	19	No
	295 Prairie Heights	No	0.95	-1.07	\$6,835	\$7,307	16	No
	326 Logan	No	0.32	0.77	\$6,033	\$6,932	23	No
218	Elkhart			1.22	-3.33	\$5,610	\$6,534	
	217 Rolla	No	-0.19	1.55	\$7,402	\$8,434	17	Yes
	452 Stanton County	No	-0.54	-0.78	\$6,153	\$5,825	44	No

10/1/13

TABLE V-1 (Continued)

<u>Target District</u>	<u>Neighbor Districts</u>	Is the N'ghbor a Target District?	Pupil Performance z-score		Per Pupil Spending		Distance (Miles)	In Target District County?
			<u>Pred.</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Pred.</u>	<u>Actual</u>		
Type "A"								
222 Washington Schools			1.66	-0.69	\$5,364	\$6,053		
	221 North Central	No	-0.97	-1.18	\$6,430	\$6,921	14	Yes
	223 Barnes	No	0.72	-1.86	\$6,258	\$5,823	11	Yes
228 Hanston			3.05	-0.08	\$6,705	\$7,693		
	227 Jetmore	No	1.59	0.76	\$5,326	\$5,588	12	Yes
	304 Bazine	No	1.00	0.76	\$6,725	\$7,604	27	No
	347 Kinsley-Offerle	No	0.09	-1.35	\$6,292	\$6,242	19	No
	381 Spearville	No	1.33	-2.62	\$5,252	\$5,165	17	No
	496 Pawnee Heights	No	2.75	2.30	\$6,328	\$7,655	11	No
301 Nes Tre La Go			2.84	-3.91	\$7,797	\$10,441		
	208 Wakeeney	No	1.25	3.33	\$4,891	\$5,458	31	No
	293 Quinter Public Schools	No	2.22	5.53	\$5,660	\$6,235	29	No
	302 Smoky Hill	No	1.91	0.05	\$6,385	\$7,521	13	Yes
	303 Ness City	No	1.04	0.68	\$5,878	\$5,900	20	Yes
	482 Dighton	No	0.46	1.98	\$6,024	\$5,943	20	No

TABLE V-1 (Continued)

<u>Target District</u>	<u>Neighbor Districts</u>	Is the N'ghbor a Target District?	Pupil Performance z-score		Per Pupil Spending		Distance (Miles)	In Target District County?
			Pred.	Actual	Pred.	Actual		
<u>Type "A"</u>								
357 Belle Plaine			1.53	-2.51	\$4,604	\$5,337		
	263 Mulvane	No	0.95	-0.95	\$4,251	\$3,760	7	No
	264 Clearwater	No	2.06	2.65	\$4,848	\$4,411	14	No
	353 Wellington	No	-0.79	-2.35	\$4,535	\$3,813	11	Yes
	358 Oxford	Yes	1.77	-2.81	\$4,989	\$5,622	11	Yes
	463 Udall	Yes	0.88	-1.54	\$5,175	\$5,857	10	No
401 Chase-Raymond			-1.22	-4.50	\$6,636	\$7,393		
	310 Fairfield	No	-1.01	-0.83	\$5,906	\$5,684	34	No
	328 Lorraine	No	0.23	4.16	\$5,744	\$5,457	37	No
	349 Stafford	No	-1.86	-0.50	\$5,765	\$6,125	31	No
	355 Ellinwood public Schools	No	0.45	0.85	\$5,146	\$5,189	12	No
	376 Sterling	No	0.07	1.25	\$5,371	\$5,717	13	Yes
	405 Lyons	No	-0.43	2.57	\$5,312	\$4,865	13	Yes
455 Hillcrest Rural Schools			-0.05	-4.51	\$6,126	\$7,157		
	221 North Central	No	-0.97	-1.18	\$6,430	\$6,921	15	No
	224 Clifton-Clyde	No	0.61	2.68	\$5,951	\$5,920	18	No
	333 Concordia	No	-0.23	2.09	\$4,505	\$4,511	19	No
	427 Republic County	No	0.61	\$1.49	\$5,337	\$5,615	10	Yes

TABLE V-1 (Continued)

<u>Target District</u>	<u>Neighbor Districts</u>	Is the N'ghbor a Target District?	Pupil Performance z-score		Per Pupil Spending		Distance (Miles)	In Target District County?
			<u>Pred.</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Pred.</u>	<u>Actual</u>		
<u>Type "A"</u>								
463 Udall			0.88	-1.54	\$5,175	\$5,857		
	263 Mulvane	No	0.95	-0.95	\$4,251	\$3,760	11	No
	357 Belle Plaine	Yes	1.53	-2.51	\$4,604	\$5,337	10	No
	358 Oxford	Yes	1.77	-2.81	\$4,989	\$5,622	9	No
	396 Douglass Public Schools	No	1.96	0.75	\$4,638	\$4,930	11	No
	462 Central	No	0.52	-0.65	\$5,577	\$5,846	21	Yes
	465 Winfield	No	0.49	-0.31	\$4,828	\$4,162	14	Yes
<u>Type "B"</u>								
225 Fowler			0.39	-0.51	\$6,656	\$8,027		
	102 Cimarron-Ensign	No	0.56	-1.39	\$4,623	\$4,541	30	No
	219 Minneola	No	-0.03	-1.99	\$5,683	\$5,687	10	No
	220 Ashland	No	0.23	2.15	\$6,327	\$6,338	27	No
	226 Meade	No	0.87	1.30	\$5,494	\$5,505	11	Yes
	371 Montezuma	No	-0.73	-2.48	\$6,390	\$6,637	20	No

TABLE V-1 (Continued)

<u>Target District</u>	<u>Neighbor Districts</u>	Is the N'ghbor a Target District?	Pupil Performance z-score		Per Pupil Spending		Distance (Miles)	In Target District County?
			Pred.	Actual	Pred.	Actual		
Type "B"								
275	Triplains		1.60	-0.05	\$7,221	\$8,485		
	241 Wallace County Schools	No	-0.65	3.20	\$5,330	\$5,545	30	No
	274 Oakley	No	-0.74	0.42	\$5,652	\$5,979	22	Yes
	314 Brewster	No	1.37	2.96	\$6,410	\$6,988	22	No
	315 Colby Public Schools	No	0.72	0.45	\$4,361	\$4,302	25	No
	466 Scott County	No	0.82	2.48	\$4,753	\$4,736	45	No
	467 Leoti	No	-0.14	2.11	\$5,386	\$5,524	40	No
283	Elk Valley		-3.17	-1.56	\$5,359	\$6,631		
	282 West Elk	No	-0.84	1.32	\$5,046	\$5,643	19	Yes
	286 Chauatauqua County Community	No	-0.24	-0.01	\$4,658	\$5,249	18	No
	446 Independence	No	-0.65	-1.57	\$3,969	\$4,060	23	No
	461 Neodesha	Yes	-0.16	-4.01	\$4,633	\$5,220	22	No
	484 Fredonia	No	-0.86	-1.78	\$4,667	\$5,066	18	No
285	Cedar Vale		-2.11	-0.65	\$5,890	\$6,930		
	282 West Elk	No	-0.84	1.32	\$5,046	\$5,643	38	No
	286 Chauatauqua County Community	No	-0.24	-0.01	\$4,658	\$5,249	18	Yes
	462 Central	No	0.52	-0.65	\$5,577	\$5,846	20	No
	471 Dexter	No	0.47	3.17	\$5,775	\$6,481	13	No

TABLE V-1 (Continued)

Target District	Neighbor Districts	Is the N'ghbor a Target District?	Pupil Performance z-score		Per Pupil Spending		Distance (Miles)	In Target District County?
			Pred.	Actual	Pred.	Actual		
Type "B"								
317 Herndon			0.25	-0.25	\$6,572	\$7,765		
	294 Oberlin	No	0.85	4.40	\$4,918	\$5,256	15	No
	316 Golden Plains	No	-0.41	3.95	\$6,460	\$6,764	30	No
	318 Atwood	No	0.16	4.51	\$4,934	\$5,325	15	Yes
324 Eastern Heights			-1.22	-0.32	\$5,642	\$6,583		
	238 West Smith County	No	3.08	1.47	\$5,847	\$6,935	9	No
	271 Stockton	No	0.98	2.28	\$4,880	\$5,292	30	No
	325 Phillipsburg	No	1.43	2.38	\$5,008	\$5,305	13	Yes
	392 Osborne County	No	-0.07	1.00	\$5,161	\$5,385	38	No
406 Wathena			0.59	-1.40	\$5,080	\$5,835		
	429 Troy Public Schools	No	1.06	1.19	\$5,440	\$5,875	7	Yes
	486 Elwood	No	-1.44	-4.48	\$5,159	\$5,146	4	Yes
505 Chetopa			-4.00	-3.05	\$5,537	\$6,253		
	493 Columbus	No	-1.37	0.61	\$4,747	\$4,447	26	No
	504 Oswego	No	-1.03	3.31	\$5,520	\$5,095	10	No
	506 Labette County	No	0.74	0.80	\$4,598	\$4,018	22	Yes

TABLE V-1 (Continued)

<u>Target District</u>	<u>Neighbor Districts</u>	Is the N'ghbor a Target District?	Pupil Performance z-score		Per Pupil Spending		Distance (Miles)	In Target District County?
			Pred.	Actual	Pred.	Actual		
Type "C"								
202 Turner-Kansas City			-2.22	-4.85	\$4,506	\$4,634		
	204 Bonner Springs	Yes	-0.04	-2.89	\$4,363	\$4,665	12	Yes
	232 De Soto	No	1.98	3.46	\$4,816	\$4,959	18	No
	500 Kansas City	No	-5.41	-6.63	\$3,798	\$3,825	8	Yes
	512 Shawnee Mission P.S.	No	2.60	3.09	\$4,036	\$4,262	12	No
204 Bonner Springs			-0.04	-2.89	\$4,363	\$4,665		
	203 Piper-Kansas City	No	1.51	1.35	\$5,079	\$4,504	8	Yes
	232 De Soto	No	1.98	3.46	\$4,816	\$4,959	8	No
	458 Basehor-Linwood	No	1.21	1.39	\$4,497	\$4,137	9	No
	500 Kansas City	No	-5.41	-6.63	\$3,798	\$3,825	16	Yes
278 Mankato			-0.11	-2.36	\$6,029	\$6,072		
	104 White Rock	No	-0.45	-1.49	\$6,610	\$6,864	14	Yes
	279 Jewell	No	0.97	-1.22	\$6,592	\$7,171	9	Yes
	426 Pike Valley	No	0.65	-1.98	\$5,720	\$5,662	23	No
344 Pleasanton			-0.11	-3.03	\$4,885	\$5,418		
	346 Jayhawk	No	-0.31	-0.28	\$5,163	\$5,209	20	Yes
	362 Prairie View	No	1.03	2.79	\$5,620	\$6,010	18	Yes

TABLE V-1 (Continued)

<u>Target District</u>	<u>Neighbor Districts</u>	Is the N'ghbor a Target District?	Pupil Performance z-score		Per Pupil Spending		Distance (Miles)	In Target District County?
			Pred.	Actual	Pred.	Actual		
Type "C"								
358 Oxford			1.77	-2.81	\$4,989	\$5,622		
	353 Wellington	No	-0.79	-2.35	\$4,535	\$3,813	14	Yes
	357 Belle Plaine	Yes	1.53	-2.51	\$4,604	\$5,337	10	Yes
	463 Udall	Yes	0.88	-1.54	\$5,175	\$5,857	9	No
	465 Winfield	No	0.49	-0.31	\$4,828	\$4,162	13	No
	470 Arkansas City	No	-1.95	-2.11	\$4,333	\$3,922	16	No
	509 South Haven	Yes	0.07	-3.66	\$5,412	\$5,485	20	Yes
360 Caldwell			0.42	-2.51	\$5,401	\$5,765		
	353 Wellington	No	-0.79	-2.35	\$4,535	\$3,813	21	Yes
	359 Argonia Public Schools	No	-0.45	-0.75	\$5,447	\$5,629	19	Yes
	361 Anthony-Harper	No	-0.10	-1.86	\$4,247	\$4,594	29	No
	509 South Haven	Yes	0.07	-3.66	\$5,412	\$5,485	11	Yes
364 Marysville			2.27	-0.86	\$4,595	\$5,023		
	223 Barnes	No	0.72	-1.86	\$6,258	\$5,823	37	No
	380 Vermillion	No	0.53	2.56	\$5,200	\$5,239	15	No
	488 Axtell	No	2.41	0.39	\$6,264	\$5,617	37	Yes
	498 Valley Heights	No	-0.49	3.91	\$5,350	\$5,376	22	Yes

TABLE V-1 (Continued)

<u>Target District</u>	<u>Neighbor Districts</u>	Is the N'ghbor a Target District?	Pupil Performance z-score		Per Pupil Spending		Distance (Miles)	In Target District County?
			Pred.	Actual	Pred.	Actual		
Type "C"								
386 Madison-Virgil			-0.43	-2.70	\$5,483	\$5,525		
	245 Leroy-Gridley	No	0.04	-0.85	\$5,806	\$5,067	28	No
	252 Southern Lyon County	No	0.72	-1.07	\$5,195	\$4,981	18	No
	390 Hamilton	No	-0.26	2.47	\$6,270	\$7,397	11	Yes
461 Neodesha			-0.16	-4.01	\$4,633	\$5,220		
	101 Erie-St. Paul	No	0.11	1.66	\$5,353	\$4,849	29	No
	283 Elk Valley	Yes	-3.17	-1.56	\$5,359	\$6,631	22	No
	387 Altoona-Midway	No	-0.06	0.15	\$5,831	\$5,368	20	Yes
	446 Independence	No	-0.65	-1.57	\$3,969	\$4,060	14	No
	447 Cherryvale	No	-1.63	-3.40	\$4,438	\$4,944	14	No
	484 Fredonia	No	-0.86	-1.78	\$4,667	\$5,066	11	Yes
509 South Haven			0.07	-3.66	\$5,412	\$5,485		
	353 Wellington	No	-0.79	-2.35	\$4,535	\$3,813	16	Yes
	358 Oxford	Yes	1.77	-2.81	\$4,989	\$5,622	20	Yes
	360 Caldwell	Yes	0.42	-2.51	\$5,401	\$5,765	12	Yes
	470 Arkansas City	No	-1.95	-2.11	\$4,333	\$3,922	21	No

TABLE V-2

DISTRICTS INVOLVED IN RECONFIGURATION WHERE TARGET DISTRICTS ARE THOSE WITH RELATIVELY LOW PERFORMANCE AND RELATIVELY HIGH SPENDING (MAP 1)

<u>List of 28 Map 1 Target Districts by Type</u>		<u>Districts Involved in Reconfiguration</u>	
		<u>Other Districts that are Map 1 Targets</u>	<u>Other Districts that are not Map 1 Targets</u>
<u>Type "A"</u>			
209	Moscow Public Schools		210 Hugoton P.S.
213	West Solomon Valley P.S.	--	--
218	Elkhart		217 Rolla
222	Washington Schools	--	--
228	Hanston		227 Jetmore
301	Nes Tre La Go		482 Dighton
357	Belle Plaine		264 Clearwater
401	Chase-Raymond		405 Lyons
455	Hillcrest Rural Schools		427 Republic County
463	Udall	--	--
 <u>Type "B"</u>			
225	Fowler		226 Meade
275	Triplains		274 Oakley
283	Elk Valley		282 West Elk
285	Cedar Vale		471 Dexter

TABLE V-2 (Continued)

<u>List of 28 Map 1 Target Districts by Type</u>		<u>Districts Involved in Reconfiguration</u>	
		<u>Other Districts that are Map 1 Targets</u>	<u>Other Districts that are not Map 1 Targets</u>
<u>Type "B" (Continued)</u>			
317	Herndon		318 Atwood
324	Eastern Heights		325 Phillipsburg
406	Wathena	--	--
505	Chetopa		504 Oswego
 <u>Type "C"</u>			
202	Turner-Kansas City		512 Shawnee Mission
204	Bonner Springs		203 Piper-Kansas City
278	Mankato	--	--
344	Pleasanton		346 Jayhawk
358	Oxford	--	--
360	Caldwell	--	--
364	Marysville		498 Valley Heights
386	Madison-Virgil		390 Hamilton
461	Neodesha		387 Altoona-Midway
509	South Haven	--	--

TABLE V-2 (Continued)

Summary of Reconfiguration

1. There are 28 target districts based on relatively low performance and relatively high spending.
2. We looked at all neighbor districts of those 28 target districts and were able to reconfigure 20 of them taking into consideration performance levels, spending levels, and distance from a target district.
3. It takes 20 unduplicated reconfigurations to address the needs of the remaining 20 districts.
4. Of these reconfigurations, all 20 involve two-district mergers.

Note: Type "A" districts are those that had both pupil performance levels lower than expected in 1998 (using a 90% confidence interval) and per pupil spending higher than expected in 1998 (using a 95% confidence interval) on the basis of statewide analysis of district characteristics that predict pupil performance and per pupil spending.

Type "B" districts are those in which pupil performance was lower than the statewide average in both 1998 and 1997 while per pupil spending was higher than expected (using a 95% confidence interval on the basis of statewide analysis of district characteristics that predict per pupil spending).

Type "C" districts are those that had lower than expected performance in 1998 on the basis of statewide analysis of district characteristics that predict pupil performance, lower than statewide average pupil performance in 1997, and per pupil spending somewhat above the level expected (without using a confidence interval) on the basis of statewide analysis of district characteristics that predict per pupil spending.

TABLE V-3

DATA RELATED TO THE SELECTION OF NEIGHBORING DISTRICTS TO MERGE WITH THE TARGET DISTRICTS ASSOCIATED WITH MAP 2

<u>Target District</u>	<u>Neighbor Districts</u>	<u>Is the Neighbor a Target District?</u>	<u>District Enroll. per High School</u>	<u>Excess Capacity of Close High Schools</u>	<u>Distance (Miles)</u>
<u>Too Small (One High School)</u>					
103	Cheylin		192		
	297 St. Francis Com. School	No	441	277	14
	314 Brewster	Yes	161		28
	318 Atwood	No	435		27
	352 Goodland	Yes	1,156		30
104	White Rock		200		
	237 Smith Center	No	585		23
	272 Waconda	No	279		40
	278 Mankato	No	275	241	14
	279 Jewell	Yes	186		21
	427 Republic County	No	606		44
209	Moscow Pub. Schools		192		
	210 Hugoton Public Schools	No	957	142	14
	214 Ulysses	No	1,770		23
	480 Liberal	Yes	4,050		26
	483 Kismet-Plains	No	693		35
	507 Satanta	Yes	438	106	14

TABLE V-3 (Continued)

<u>Target District</u>	<u>Neighbor Districts</u>	<u>Is the Neighbor a Target District?</u>	<u>District Enroll. per High School</u>	<u>Excess Capacity of Close High Schools</u>	<u>Distance (Miles)</u>
Too Small (One High School)					
212 Northern Valley			198		
	211 Norton Community Schools	No	746		21
	325 Phillipsburg	No	697		23
	326 Logan	Yes	208	139	20
213 West Solomon Valley S.			95		
	211 Norton Community Schools	No	746	286	17
	280 West Graham-Morland	Yes	91	284	19
	281 Hill City	No	426	244	19
	295 Prairie Heights	Yes	92	132	16
	326 Logan	Yes	208		23
217 Rolla			206		
	210 Hugoton Public Schools	No	957	142	16
	218 Elkhart	No	551	218	17
	452 Stanton County	No	540		34

TABLE V-3 (Continued)

<u>Target District</u>	<u>Neighbor Districts</u>	<u>Is the Neighbor a Target District?</u>	<u>District Enroll. per High School</u>	<u>Excess Capacity of Close High Schools</u>	<u>Distance (Miles)</u>
<u>Too Small (One High School)</u>					
220 Ashland			247		
	219 Minneola	No	278		22
	225 Fowler	Yes	170		27
	226 Meade	No	441		28
	300 Comanche County	No	359		26
	459 Bucklin	No	354		26
221 North Central			161		
	222 Washington Schools	No	375	120	14
	223 Barnes	Yes	197		23
	224 Clifton-Clyde	No	389		22
	455 Hillcrest Rural Schools	Yes	154	125	16
225 Fowler			170		
	102 Cimarron-Ensign	No	634		30
	219 Minneola	No	278	170	10
	220 Ashland	Yes	247		27
	226 Meade	No	441	33	11
	371 Montezuma	Yes	215		20

TABLE V-3 (Continued)

<u>Target District</u>	<u>Neighbor Districts</u>	<u>Is the N'ghbor a Target District?</u>	<u>District Enroll. per High School</u>	<u>Excess Capacity of Close High Schools</u>	<u>Distance (Miles)</u>
<u>Too Small (One High School)</u>					
228 Hanston			139		
	227 Jetmore	No	332	251	12
	304 Bazine	Yes	112		27
	347 Kinsley-Offerle	No	356	504	19
	381 Spearville	No	362	330	17
	496 Pawnee Heights	Yes	159	104	11
238 West Smith County			196		
	237 Smith Center	No	585	215	14
	324 Eastern Heights	Yes	195	65	9
	392 Osborne County	No	496		29
242 Weskan			125		
	200 Greeley County Schools	No	320		29
	241 Wallace County Schools	No	306	75	12

TABLE V-3 (Continued)

<u>Target District</u>	<u>Neighbor Districts</u>	<u>Is the Neighbor a Target District?</u>	<u>District Enroll. per High School</u>	<u>Excess Capacity of Close High Schools</u>	<u>Distance (Miles)</u>
<u>Too Small (One High School)</u>					
269 Palco			179		
	208 Wakeeney	No	572		29
	270 Plainville	No	453	329	17
	271 Stockton	No	440		21
	280 West Graham-Morland	Yes	91		28
	281 Hill City	No	426	244	17
	388 Ellis	No	368		30
	399 Paradise	Yes	154		32
	489 Hays	Yes	3,423		41
275 Triplains			93		
	241 Wallace County Schools	No	306		30
	274 Oakley	No	510		22
	314 Brewster	Yes	161		22
	315 Colby Public Schools	No	1,122		25
	466 Scott County	No	1,121		45
	467 Leoti	No	478		40

TABLE V-3 (Continued)

<u>Target District</u>	<u>Neighbor Districts</u>	<u>Is the N'ghbor a Target District?</u>	<u>District Enroll. per High School</u>	<u>Excess Capacity of Close High Schools</u>	<u>Distance (Miles)</u>
<u>Too Small (One High School)</u>					
279 Jewell			186		
	104 White Rock	Yes	200		21
	272 Waconda	No	279		29
	273 Beloit	No	807	152	14
	278 Mankato	No	275	104	9
	333 Concordia	No	1,308		28
	426 Pike Valley	No	300		22
280 West Graham-Morland			91		
	208 Wakeeney	No	572		25
	213 West Solomon Valley Schools	Yes	95	238	19
	281 Hill City	No	426	244	12
	293 Quinter Public Schools	No	390		21
	412 Hoxie Community Schools	No	447	253	19
283 Elk Valley			219		
	282 West Elk	No	524	371	19
	286 Chautauqua County Comm.	No	509	664	18
	446 Independence	No	2,221		23
	461 Neodesha	No	758		22
	484 Fredonia	No	882	187	18

TABLE V-3 (Continued)

<u>Target District</u>	<u>Neighbor Districts</u>	<u>Is the N'ghbor a Target District?</u>	<u>District Enroll. per High School</u>	<u>Excess Capacity of Close High Schools</u>	<u>Distance (Miles)</u>
<u>Too Small (One High School)</u>					
285 Cedar Vale			206		
	282 West Elk	No	524		38
	286 Chauatuqua County Comm.	No	509	664	18
	462 Central	No	405		20
	471 Dexter	Yes	201	69	13
291 Grinnell Public Schools.			160		
	274 Oakley	No	510	182	19
	292 Wheatland	Yes	184	191	18
	316 Golden Plains	Yes	176		43
	412 Hoxie Community Schools	No	447		33
292 Wheatland			184		
	291 Grinnell Public Schools	Yes	160	220	18
	293 Quinter Public Schools	No	390	181	13
	412 Hoxie Community Schools	No	447		21
	468 Healy Public Schools	Yes	104		36

TABLE V-3 (Continued)

<u>Target District</u>	<u>Neighbor Districts</u>	<u>Is the N'ghbor a Target District?</u>	<u>District Enroll. per High School</u>	<u>Excess Capacity of Close High Schools</u>	<u>Distance (Miles)</u>
<u>Too Small (One High School)</u>					
295	Prairie Heights		92		
	211 Norton Community Schools	No	746		23
	213 West Solomon Valley Schools	Yes	95	238	16
	294 Oberlin	No	558	202	16
	412 Hoxie Community Schools	No	447		23
299	Sylvan Grove		205		
	272 Waconda	No	279		35
	273 Beloit	No	807		35
	298 Lincoln	No	412	326	13
	327 Ellsworth	No	754		25
	328 Lorraine	No	279		35
	407 Russell County	No	583		26
301	Nes Tre La Go		76		
	208 Wakeeney	No	572		31
	293 Quinter Public Schools	No	390		29
	302 Smoky Hill	Yes	161	239	13
	303 Ness City	No	289	281	20
	482 Dighton	No	345	355	20

TABLE V-3 (Continued)

<u>Target District</u>	<u>Neighbor Districts</u>	<u>Is the N'ghbor a Target District?</u>	<u>District Enroll. per High School</u>	<u>Excess Capacity of Close High Schools</u>	<u>Distance (Miles)</u>
<u>Too Small (One High School)</u>					
302 Smoky Hill			161		
	208 Wakeeney	No	572		27
	301 Nes Tre La Go	Yes	76	64	13
	303 Ness City	No	289	281	12
	304 Bazine	Yes	112	128	19
	388 Ellis	No	368		28
	395 Lacrosse	No	357		35
304 Bazine			112		
	228 Hanston	Yes	139		27
	302 Smoky Hill	Yes	161	239	19
	303 Ness City	No	289	281	11
	395 Lacrosse	No	257		22
	496 Pawnee Heights	Yes	159		22
314 Brewster			161		
	103 Cheylin	Yes	192		28
	275 Triplains	Yes	93		22
	315 Colby Public Schools	No	1,122	441	18
	318 Atwood	No	435		35
	352 Goodland	No	1,156	811	18

TABLE V-3 (Continued)

<u>Target District</u>	<u>Neighbor Districts</u>	<u>Is the N'ghbor a Target District?</u>	<u>District Enroll. per High School</u>	<u>Excess Capacity of Close High Schools</u>	<u>Distance (Miles)</u>
<u>Too Small (One High School)</u>					
316 Golden Plains			176		
	274 Oakley	No	510		32
	291 Grinnell Public Schools	Yes	160		43
	294 Oberlin	No	558		27
	315 Colby Public Schools	No	1,122		27
	317 Herndon	Yes	100		30
	412 Hoxie Community Schools	No	447	249	18
317 Herndon			100		
	294 Oberlin	No	558	202	14
	316 Golden Plains	Yes	176		30
	318 Atwood	No	435	315	15
324 Eastern Heights			195		
	238 West Smith County	Yes	196	191	9
	271 Stockton	No	440		31
	325 Phillipsburg	No	697	199	13
	392 Osborne County	No	496		38

TABLE V-3 (Continued)

<u>Target District</u>	<u>Neighbor Districts</u>	<u>Is the N'ghbor a Target District?</u>	<u>District Enroll. per High School</u>	<u>Excess Capacity of Close High Schools</u>	<u>Distance (Miles)</u>
<u>Too Small (One High School)</u>					
326 Logan			208		
	211 Norton Community Schools	No	746		21
	212 Northern Valley	Yes	198	202	19
	213 West Solomon Valley Sch.	Yes	95		23
	271 Stockton	No	440		22
	281 Hill City	No	426		25
	325 Phillipsburg	No	697	283	15
369 Burrton			246		
	312 Haven Public Schools	No	1,123		23
	313 Buhler	No	2,212	263	15
	423 Moundridge	No	452	125	15
	440 Halstead	No	751	258	12
371 Montezuma			215		
	102 Cimarron-Ensign	No	634	170	16
	225 Fowler	Yes	170		20
	226 Meade	No	441		26
	476 Copeland	Yes	122	178	11
	477 Ingalls	No	294		26
	483 Kismet-Plains	No	693		42

TABLE V-3 (Continued)

<u>Target District</u>	<u>Neighbor Districts</u>	<u>Is the N'ghbor a Target District?</u>	<u>District Enroll. per High School</u>	<u>Excess Capacity of Close High Schools</u>	<u>Distance (Miles)</u>
<u>Too Small (One High School)</u>					
390 Hamilton			122		
	284 Chase County	No	493		28
	386 Madison-Virgil	No	282	330	10
	389 Eureka	No	796	122	12
	492 Flinthills	No	339		26
399 Paradise			154		
	270 Plainville	No	453	329	15
	271 Stockton	No	440		22
	392 Osborne County	No	496		24
	407 Russell County	No	583		28
	432 Victoria	No	302		24
	489 Hays	No	3,423		29
401 Chase-Raymond			182		
	310 Fairfield	No	448		34
	328 Lorraine	No	279		37
	349 Stafford	No	338		31
	355 Ellinwood Public Schools	No	601	107	12
	376 Sterling	No	532	180	13
	405 Lyons	No	934	403	13

TABLE V-3 (Continued)

<u>Target District</u>	<u>Neighbor Districts</u>	<u>Is the N'ghbor a Target District?</u>	<u>District Enroll. per High School</u>	<u>Excess Capacity of Close High Schools</u>	<u>Distance (Miles)</u>
<u>Too Small (One High School)</u>					
424 Mullinville			109		
	300 Comanche County	No	359		26
	347 Kinsley-Offerle	No	356		24
	422 Greensburg	No	294	238	10
	459 Bucklin	No	354	64	9
433 Midway Schools			232		
	377 Atchison County Comm. Schools	No	806	364	15
	415 Hiawatha	No	1,096	285	17
	425 Highland	No	279	156	11
	429 Troy Public Schools	No	399	56	12
	430 South Brown County	No	725	633	13
455 Hillcrest Rural Schools			154		
	221 North Central	Yes	161	189	15
	222 Washington Schools	No	375		21
	223 Barnes	Yes	197		32
	224 Clifton-Clyde	No	389	511	18
	333 Concordia	No	1,308	242	19
	427 Republic County	No	606	144	10

TABLE V-3 (Continued)

<u>Target District</u>	<u>Neighbor Districts</u>	<u>Is the N'ghbor a Target District?</u>	<u>District Enroll. per High School</u>	<u>Excess Capacity of Close High Schools</u>	<u>Distance (Miles)</u>
<u>Too Small (One High School)</u>					
468 Healy Public Schools			104		
	274 Oaley	No	510		40
	292 Wheatland	Yes	184		36
	293 Quinter Public Schools	No	390		36
	466 Scott County	No	1,121		21
	482 Dighton	No	345	355	9
471 Dexter			201		
	285 Cedar Vale	Yes	206	127	13
	462 Central	No	405	346	10
	465 Winfield	No	2,642	955	16
	470 Arkansas City	No	2,858	917	19
474 Haviland			179		
	254 Barber County North	No	759		37
	300 Comanche County	No	359		30
	351 Macksville	No	295		30
	422 Greensburg	No	294	206	8
	438 Skyline Schools	No	346		22
	502 Lewis	Yes	191		27

TABLE V-3 (Continued)

<u>Target District</u>	<u>Neighbor Districts</u>	<u>Is the N'ghbor a Target District?</u>	<u>District Enroll. per High School</u>	<u>Excess Capacity of Close High Schools</u>	<u>Distance (Miles)</u>
Too Small (One High School)					
476 Copeland			122		
	371 Montezuma	Yes	215	29	11
	374 Sublette	No	494	123	12
	457 Garden City	No	7,100		36
	477 Ingalls	No	294		30
	483 Kismet-Plains	No	693		34
496 Pawnee Heights			159		
	228 Hanston	Yes	139	126	11
	304 Bazine	Yes	112		22
	347 Kinsley-Offerle	No	356		21
	395 Lacrosse	No	357		27
	403 Otis-Bison	No	336		35
	495 Ft. Larned	No	1,073		30
502 Lewis			191		
	347 Kinsley-Offerle	No	356	504	16
	351 Macksville	No	295	292	16
	422 Greensburg	No	294		23
	424 Mullinville	Yes	109		26
	474 Haviland	Yes	179		26
	495 Ft. Larned	No	1,073		27

TABLE V-3 (Continued)

<u>Target District</u>	<u>Neighbor Districts</u>	<u>Is the N'ghbor a Target District?</u>	<u>District Enroll. per High School</u>	<u>Excess Capacity of Close High Schools</u>	<u>Distance (Miles)</u>
<u>Too Small (One High School)</u>					
511 Attica			163		
	254 Barber County North	No	759		20
	255 South Barber	No	325		28
	332 Cunningham	No	334		30
	361 Anthony-Harper	No	1,079	428	13
<u>Too Small (More than One High School)</u>					
223 Barnes			197		
	221 North Central	Yes	161		23
	222 Washington Schools	No	375	120	11
	224 Clifton-Clyde	No	389		35
	364 Marysville	No	971		37
	379 Clay Center	No	795		55
	384 Blue Valley (Riley Co.)	No	303		37
	498 Valley Heights	No	514		25

TABLE V-3 (Continued)

<u>Target District</u>	<u>Neighbor Districts</u>	<u>Is the N'ghbor a Target District?</u>	<u>District Enroll. per High School</u>	<u>Excess Capacity of Close High Schools</u>	<u>Distance (Miles)</u>
<u>Too Small (More than One High School)</u>					
245 Leroy-Gridley			183		
	244 Burlington	No	918	186	11
	252 Southern Lyon County	No	659		31
	257 Iola	No	1,673		34
	365 Garnett	No	1,122		45
	366 Woodson	No	620	228	17
	386 Madison-Virgil	No	282		27
	390 Hamilton	Yes	122		31
	479 Crest	No	311		40
334 Southern Cloud			137		
	224 Clifton-Clyde	No	389		33
	239 North Ottawa County	No	687		21
	273 Beloit	No	807		36
	333 Concordia	No	1,308	276	18
	379 Clay Center	No	795		45

1-97

TABLE V-3 (Continued)

<u>Target District</u>	<u>Neighbor Districts</u>	<u>Is the N'ghbor a Target District?</u>	<u>District Enroll. per High School</u>	<u>Excess Capacity of Close High Schools</u>	<u>Distance (Miles)</u>
<u>Too Small (More than One High School)</u>					
481 Rural Vista			226		
	397 Centre	No	307		21
	410 Durham-Hillsborough-Lehigh	No	736		40
	417 Morris County	No	1,036		32
	473 Chapman	No	1,227		33
	475 Geary County Schools	No	6,077		34
	487 Herington	No	571	221	15
488 Axtell			187		
	364 Marysville	No	971		36
	380 Vermillion	No	315		30
	451 B & B	No	270	95	13
<u>Too Large</u>					
202 Turner-Kansas City			3,641		
	204 Bonner Springs	Yes	2,130	295	13
	232 De Soto	No	2,515	588	18
	500 Kansas City	Yes	4,969	7,827	8
	512 Shawnee Mission	Yes	6,059	8,930	12

TABLE V-3 (Continued)

<u>Target District</u>	<u>Neighbor Districts</u>	<u>Is the N'ghbor a Target District?</u>	<u>District Enroll. per High School</u>	<u>Excess Capacity of Close High Schools</u>	<u>Distance (Miles)</u>
<u>Too Large</u>					
229 Blue Valley (Johnson Co.)			5,140		
	230 Spring Hill	No	1,354	289	16
	233 Olathe	Yes	6,209	11,817	16
	416 Louisburg	No	1,303		22
	512 Shawnee Mission P.S.	Yes	6,059	8,930	19
233 Olathe			6,209		
	229 Blue Valley	Yes	5,140	4,163	16
	230 Spring Hill	No	1,354	289	13
	231 Gardner-Edgerton-Antioch	No	2,384	265	18
	232 De Soto	No	2,515	588	15
	512 Shawnee Mission P.S.	Yes	6,059	8,930	17
253 Emporia			4,570		
	251 North Lyon County	No	716	134	18
	252 Southern Lyon County	No	329	471	17
	284 Chase County	No	493	332	20

TABLE V-3 (Continued)

<u>Target District</u>	<u>Neighbor Districts</u>	<u>Is the N'ghbor a Target District?</u>	<u>District Enroll. per High School</u>	<u>Excess Capacity of Close High Schools</u>	<u>Distance (Miles)</u>
<u>Too Large</u>					
260 Derby			6,673		
	259 Wichita	Yes	6,418	10,352	18
	261 Haysville	Yes	4,198	442	10
	263 Mulvane	No	1,938	462	11
	394 Rose hill Public Schools	No	1,755	170	9
261 Haysville	(Not evaluated due to large alternative school)				
265 Goddard			3,260		
	259 Wichita	Yes	6,418		21
	261 Haysville	Yes	4,198	442	15
	264 Clearwater	No	1,145	177	11
	266 Maize	Yes	4,895	995	11
	267 Renwick	No	904	1,696	10
266 Maize			4,895		
	259 Wichita	Yes	6,418	10,352	17
	262 Valley Center P.S.	No	2,303	763	7
	265 Goddard	Yes	3,260	1,115	10
	267 Renwick	No	904	1,696	15
	440 Halstead	No	751	256	17

TABLE V-3 (Continued)

<u>Target District</u>	<u>Neighbor Districts</u>	<u>Is the N'ghbor a Target District?</u>	<u>District Enroll. per High School</u>	<u>Excess Capacity of Close High Schools</u>	<u>Distance (Miles)</u>
<u>Too Large</u>					
305 Salina			3,629		
	240 Twin Valley	No	314		21
	306 Southeast of Salina	No	679	21	16
	307 Ell-Salina	No	460	200	17
	393 Solomon	No	427	16	17
308 Hutchinson P.S.			4,892		
	309 Nickerson	No	1,358	156	11
	312 Haven Public Schools	No	1,123		22
	313 Buhler	No	2,212	123	11
345 Seaman			3,180		
	337 Royal Valley	No	854	595	18
	340 Jefferson West	No	944	N/A	16
	343 Perry Public Schools	No	1,045		21
	372 Silver Lake	No	695	185	13
	437 Auburn Washburn	Yes	4,957	1,056	19
	450 Shawnee Heights	No	1,692	341	16
	501 Topeka	Yes	4,493	3,725	12

TABLE V-3 (Continued)

<u>Target District</u>	<u>Neighbor Districts</u>	<u>Is the N'ghbor a Target District?</u>	<u>District Enroll. per High School</u>	<u>Excess Capacity of Close High Schools</u>	<u>Distance (Miles)</u>
<u>Too Large</u>					
373 Newton			3,465		
	206 Remington-Whitewater	No	549		21
	262 Valley Center P.S.	No	2,303	957	16
	398 Peabody-Burns	No	467	183	16
	411 Goessel	No	316	259	15
	439 Sedgwick Public Schools	No	463	137	11
	440 Halstead	No	751	256	15
	460 Hesston	No	841	359	9
383 Manhattan			5,819		
	320 Wamego	No	1,412	188	17
	323 Rock Creek	No	775	140	18
	329 Mill Creek Valley	No	558		33
	378 Riley County	No	625	363	16
	417 Morris County	No	1,036		40
	475 Geary County Schools	Yes	6,077		21

TABLE V-3 (Continued)

<u>Target District</u>	<u>Neighbor Districts</u>	<u>Is the N'ghbor a Target District?</u>	<u>District Enroll. per High School</u>	<u>Excess Capacity of Close High Schools</u>	<u>Distance (Miles)</u>
<u>Too Large</u>					
428 Great Bend	350 St. John-Hudson	No	444		26
	351 Macksville	No	295		31
	354 Claflin	No	325	175	19
	355 Ellinwood Public Schools	No	601	99	13
	403 Otis-Bison	No	336		21
	431 Hoisington	No	744	146	11
	495 Ft. Larned	No	1,073		23
437 Auburn Washburn			4,957		
	321 Kaw Valley	No	534		32
	330 Wabaunsee East	No	636		23
	372 Silver Lake	No	695	185	14
	434 Santa Fe Trail	No	1,318		22
	450 Shawnee Heights	No	1,692	341	16
	454 Burlingame Public Schools	No	365		21
	501 Topeka Public Schools	Yes	4,493	3,725	15

TABLE V-3 (Continued)

<u>Target District</u>	<u>Neighbor Districts</u>	<u>Is the N'ghbor a Target District?</u>	<u>District Enroll. per High School</u>	<u>Excess Capacity of Close High Schools</u>	<u>Distance (Miles)</u>
<u>Too Large</u>					
443 Dodge City			4,917		
	102 Cimarron-Ensign	No	634		24
	219 Minneola	No	278		24
	227 Jetmore	No	332		25
	381 Spearville	No	362	338	18
	459 Bucklin	No	354		26
453 Leavenworth			4,041		
	207 Ft. Leavenworth	No	--	--	5
	449 Easton	No	704	0	12
	469 Lansing	No	1,913	16	6
457 Garden City			7,100		
	102 Cimarron-Ensign	No	634		32
	216 Deerfield	No	375	285	19
	363 Holcomb	No	870	680	14
	374 Sublette	No	494		38
	466 Scott County	No	1,121		46
	476 Copeland	Yes	122		36
	477 Ingalls	No	294		23
	482 Dighton	No	345		51
	507 Satanta	No	438		42

1-104

TABLE V-3 (Continued)

<u>Target District</u>	<u>Neighbor Districts</u>	<u>Is the N'ghbor a Target District?</u>	<u>District Enroll. per High School</u>	<u>Excess Capacity of Close High Schools</u>	<u>Distance (Miles)</u>
<u>Too Large</u>					
475 Geary County Schools			6,077		
	378 Riley County	No	625	363	20
	379 Clay Center	No	795		37
	383 Manhattan	Yes	5,819		21
	417 Morris County	No	1,036		42
	473 Chapman	No	1,227		27
	481 Rural Vista	Yes	226		35
480 Liberal			4,050		
	209 Moscow Public Schools	Yes	192		26
	210 Hugoton Public Schools	No	956		26
	483 Kismet-Plains	No	693		24
489 Hays			3,423		
	269 Palco	Yes	179		40
	270 Plainville	No	453		28
	388 Ellis	No	368	182	17
	395 Lacrosse	No	357		26
	399 Paradise	Yes	154		29
	403 Otis-Bison	No	336		28
	432 Victoria	No	302	463	11

74

TABLE V-3 (Continued)

<u>Target District</u>	<u>Neighbor Districts</u>	<u>Is the N'ghbor a Target District?</u>	<u>District Enroll. per High School</u>	<u>Excess Capacity of Close High Schools</u>	<u>Distance (Miles)</u>
<u>Too Large</u>					
497 Lawrence			5,008		
	342 McLouth	No	577		21
	343 Perry Public Schools	No	1,045	235	14
	348 Baldwin City	No	1,241	229	17
	434 Santa Fe Trail	No	1,318		33
	450 Shawnee Heights	No	1,692		23
	464 Tonganoxie	No	1,467	33	19
	491 Eudora	No	1,100	170	12
500 Kansas City			4,969		
	202 Turner-Kansas City	Yes	3,641	259	8
	203 Piper-Kansas City	No	1,282	643	15
	204 Bonner Springs	Yes	2,130	295	16
501 Topeka P.S.			4,493		
	345 Seaman	Yes	3,180	2,040	12
	372 Silver Lake	No	695	185	13
	437 Auburn Washburn	Yes	4,957	1,056	15
	450 Shawnee Heights	No	1,692	341	10

TABLE V-4(A)

DISTRICTS INVOLVED IN RECONFIGURATION WHERE TARGET DISTRICTS ARE THOSE WITH SCHOOLS CONSIDERED TO BE TOO SMALL BASED ON ENROLLMENT RELATIVE TO NUMBER OF HIGH SCHOOLS (MAP 2)

<u>List of 50 Map 2 (Too Small) Target Districts</u>		<u>Other Districts Involved in Reconfiguration</u>	
		<u>Other Districts that are Map 2 Targets</u>	<u>Other Districts that are not Map 2 Targets</u>
103	Cheylin		297 St. Franc. Com. Sch.
104	White Rock	279 Jewell	278 Mankato
209	Moscow Public Schools		507 Satanta
212	Northern Valley	326 Logan	
213	West Solomon Valley Sch.		211 Norton Comm. Sch.
217	Rolla		218 Elkhart
220	Ashland	--	--
221	North Central	223 Barnes	222 Washington Sch.
223	Barnes	221	222
225	Fowler	North Central	Washington Sch.
228	Hanston		219 Minneola
238	West Smith County	496 Pawnee Heights	
242	Weskan	324 Eastern Heights	
245	Leroy-Gridley	--	241 Wallace Cty. Sch.
269	Palco	280 West Graham-Morland	--
275	Triplains		281 Hill City
279	Jewell	104	274 Oakley
280	West Graham-Morland	White Rock	278
283	Elk Valley	Palco	Mankato
285	Cedar Vale		281
291	Grinnell Public Schools	471 Dexter	HillCity
292	Wheatland	292 Wheatland	282 West Elk
295	Prairie Heights	291	
299	Sylvan Grove	Grinnell Public Schools	294 Oberlin
			298 Lincoln

Note: District numbers that are **bolded and italicized** reflect duplicate reconfigurations.

TABLE V-4(A) (Continued)

List of 50 Map 2 (Too Small) Target Districts		Other Districts Involved in Reconfiguration			
		Other Districts that are Map 2 Targets	Other Districts that are not Map 2 Targets		
301	Nes Tre La Go	302	Smoky Hill	303	Ness City
302	<i>Smoky Hill</i>	304	Bazine	303	<i>Ness City</i>
304	<i>Bazine</i>	301	<i>Nes Tre La Go</i>	303	<i>Ness City</i>
		304	<i>Bazine</i>	303	<i>Ness City</i>
		301	<i>Nes Tre La Go</i>		
		302	<i>Smoky Hill</i>		
314	Brewster			315	Colby Public Schools
316	Golden Plains			412	Hoxie Com. Sch.
317	Herndon			318	Atwood
324	<i>Eastern Heights</i>	238	<i>West Smith County</i>		
326	<i>Logan</i>	212	<i>Northern Valley</i>		
334	Southern Cloud	--	--	--	--
369	Burrton			440	Halstead
371	Montezuma			102	Cimarron-Ensign
390	Hamilton			386	Madison-Virgil
399	Paradise			270	Plainville
401	Chase-Raymond			405	Lyons
424	Mullinville	474	Haviland	422	Greensburg
433	Midway Schools			430	South Brown Cty.
455	Hillcrest Rural Schools			427	Republic County
468	Healy Public Schools			482	Dighton
471	<i>Dexter</i>	285	<i>Cedar Vale</i>		
474	<i>Haviland</i>	424	<i>Mullinville</i>	422	<i>Greensburg</i>
476	Copeland			374	Sublette
481	Rural Vista	--	--	--	--
488	Axtell	--	--	--	--
496	<i>Pawnee Heights</i>	228	<i>Hanston</i>		
502	Lewis			347	Kinsley-Offerle
511	Attica			361	Anthony-Harper

Note: District numbers that are ***bolded and italicized*** reflect duplicate reconfigurations.

TABLE V-4(A) (Continued)

Summary of Reconfiguration

1. There are 50 target districts that have schools considered to be too small.
2. We looked at all neighbor districts of those 50 districts and were able to reconfigure 45 of them taking into consideration the capacity of schools, projected enrollment, and distance from a target district.
3. It takes 34 unduplicated reconfigurations to address the needs of those 45 districts.
4. Of these reconfigurations, 29 involve two-district mergers, four involve three-district mergers, and one involves a four-district merger.

TABLE V-4(B)

DISTRICTS INVOLVED IN RECONFIGURATION WHERE TARGET DISTRICTS ARE THOSE WITH SCHOOLS CONSIDERED TO BE TOO LARGE BASED ON ENROLLMENT RELATIVE TO NUMBER OF HIGH SCHOOLS OR WHERE THE DISTRICT ITSELF IS CONSIDERED TO BE TOO LARGE (MAP 3)

List of 24 Map 2 Target Districts with Schools that are Too Large		<u>Other Districts Involved in Reconfiguration</u>	
		<u>Other Districts that are Map 2 Targets</u>	<u>Other Districts that are not Map 2 Targets</u>
202	Turner-Kansas City	--	--
229	Blue Valley	--	--
233	Olathe	--	--
253	Emporia	--	--
260	Derby	--	--
261	Haysville	--	--
265	Goddard	266	267
266	<i>Maize</i>	265	<i>Renwick</i>
305	Salina	--	--
308	Hutchinson Public Schools		309
			313
345	Seaman	--	--
373	Newton	--	--
383	Manhattan	--	--
428	Great Bend	--	--
437	Auburn Washburn	--	--
443	Dodge City		381
453	Leavenworth	--	--
457	Garden City		216
			363
475	Geary County Schools		378
480	Liberal	--	--
489	Hays	--	--
497	Lawrence	--	--
500	Kansas City	--	--
501	Topeka Public Schools	--	--

Note: District numbers that are ***bolded and italicized*** reflect duplicate reconfigurations

TABLE V-4(B)

<u>List of Two Map 2 Target Districts that are Too Large</u>		<u>Other Districts Involved in Reconfiguration</u>	
		<u>Other Districts that are Map 2 Targets</u>	<u>Other Districts that are not Map 2 Targets</u>
512	Shawnee Mission Public Schools	--	--
259	Wichita	--	--

Summary of Reconfiguration

1. There are 24 districts that have schools considered to be too large and two districts with enrollments that are considered to be too large.
2. We looked at all neighbor districts of those 26 districts and were able to reconfigure six of them taking into consideration school size, the capacity of schools, projected enrollment, and distance from a target district.
3. It takes five unduplicated reconfigurations to address the needs of the six districts.
4. Of these reconfigurations, three involve two district mergers, and two involve three district mergers.

TABLE V-5

DISTRICTS INVOLVED IN RECONFIGURATION WHERE TARGET DISTRICTS ARE THOSE IDENTIFIED IN MAP 1 AND MAP 2 AND SOME ISSUES THAT AROSE IN MAKING THOSE MAPS ARE RESOLVED (MAP 3)

<u>List of Map 3 Target Districts by Rationale for Selection</u>	<u>Districts Involved in Reconfiguration</u>	
	<u>Other Districts that are Map 1 or Map 2 Targets</u>	<u>Other Districts that are not Map 1 or Map 2 Targets</u>
<u>Rationale "A"</u>		
275 Triplains (1B, 2A)		274 Oakley
283 Elk Valley (1B, 2A)		282 West Elk
285 Cedar Vale (1B, 2A)	471 Dexter (2A)	
317 Herndon (1B, 2A)		318 Atwood
401 Chase-Raymond (1A, 2A)		405 Lyons
455 Hillcrest Rural Schools (1A, 2A)		427 Republic County
<u>Rationale "B"</u>		
202 Turner-Kansas City (1C, 2B)	500 Kansas City (2B)	
209 Moscow Public Schools (1A, 2A)		210 Hugoton P.S.
213 West Solomon Valley P.S. (1A, 2A)		211 Norton Comm. Schools
225 Fowler (1B, 2A)		226 Meade
228 Hanston (1A, 2A)		227 Jetmore
301 Nes Tre La Go (1A, 2A)	302 Smoky Hill (2A) 304 Bazine (2A)	303 Ness City
324 Eastern Heights (1B, 2A)	238 West Smith County (2A)	

TABLE V-5 (Continued)

<u>List of Map 3 Target Districts by Rationale for Selection</u>	<u>Districts Involved in Reconfiguration</u>	
	<u>Other Districts that are Map 1 or Map 2 Targets</u>	<u>Other Districts that are not Map 1 or Map 2 Targets</u>
<u>Rationale "C"</u>		
218 Elkhart (1A)	217 Rolla (2A)	
222 Washington Schools (1A)	221 North Central (2A) 223 Barnes (2A)	
278 Mankato (1C)	104 White Rock (2A) 279 Jewell (2A)	
358 Oxford (1C)	509 South Haven (1C)	353 Wellington
386 Madison-Virgil (1C)	390 Hamilton (2A)	
<u>Rationale "D"</u>		
204 Bonner Springs (1C)		203 Piper-Kansas City
344 Pleasanton (1C)		346 Jayhawk
357 Belle Plaine (1A)		263 Mulvane
360 Caldwell (1C)		359 Argonia P.S.
364 Marysville (1C)		498 Valley Heights
406 Wathena (1B)		486 Elwood
461 Neodesha (1C)		387 Altoona-Midway
463 Udall (1A)		465 Winfield
505 Chetopa (1B)		504 Oswego

TABLE V-5 (Continued)

<u>List of Map 3 Target Districts by Rationale for Selection</u>	<u>Districts Involved in Reconfiguration</u>	
	<u>Other Districts that <i>are</i> Map 1 or Map 2 Targets</u>	<u>Other Districts that <i>are not</i> Map 1 or Map 2 Targets</u>
<u>Rationale "E"</u>		
103 Cheylin (2A)		297 St. Francis Comm. Schools
242 Weskan (2A)		241 Wallace Co. Schools
280 West Graham-Morland (2A)		281 Hill City
295 Prairie Heights (2A)		294 Oberlin
369 Burrton (2A)		440 Halstead
424 Mullinville (2A)		422 Greensburg
468 Healy Public Schools (2A)		482 Dighton
476 Copeland (2A)	371 Montezuma (2A)	
511 Attica (2A)		361 Anthony-Harper
<u>Rationale "F"</u>		
245 Leroy-Gridley (2A)		244 Burlington
334 Southern Cloud (2A)		333 Concordia
481 Rural Vista (2A)		487 Herington
488 Axtell (2A)		451 B & B
<u>Rationale "G"</u>		
308 Hutchinson Public Schools (2B)		309 Nickerson 313 Buhler
443 Dodge City (2B)		381 Spearville
475 Geary County Schools (2B)		378 Riley County

TABLE V-5 (Continued)

<u>List of Map 3 Target Districts by Rationale for Selection</u>	<u>Districts Involved in Reconfiguration</u>	
	<u>Other Districts that are Map 1 or Map 2 Targets</u>	<u>Other Districts that are <i>not</i> Map 1 or Map 2 Targets</u>
<u>Rationale "H"</u>		
229 Blue Valley (2B)	--	--
233 Olathe (2B)	--	--
253 Emporia (2B)	--	--
260 Derby (2B)	--	--
261 Haysville (2B)	--	--
265 Goddard (2B)	--	--
266 Maize (2B)	--	--
305 Salina (2B)	--	--
345 Seaman (2B)	--	--
373 Newton (2B)	--	--
383 Manhattan (2B)	--	--
428 Great Bend (2B)	--	--
437 Auburn Washburn (2B)	--	--
453 Leavenworth (2B)	--	--
457 Garden City (2B)	--	--
480 Liberal (2B)	--	--
489 Hays (2B)	--	--
497 Lawrence (2B)	--	--
501 Topeka Public Schools (2B)	--	--

TABLE V-5 (Continued)

<u>List of Map 3 Target Districts by Rationale for Selection</u>	<u>Districts Involved in Reconfiguration</u>	
	<u>Other Districts that are Map 1 or Map 2 Targets</u>	<u>Other Districts that are not Map 1 or Map 2 Targets</u>
<u>Rationale "I"</u>		
259 Wichita (2B)	--	--
512 Shawnee Mission (2B)	--	--

Note: Numbers in parentheses (X) indicate the specific reason for which a district is a target district in Map 3. All target districts in Map 3 are target districts in Map 1 or Map 2. In the case of Map 1, three different criteria are used to identify target districts (1A, 1B, or 1C) — see Table V-2 for a list of the districts that meet those criteria. In the case of Map 2, districts meet criteria related to being too small (2A) or too large (2B) — see Table V-4(A) and Table V-4(B) for lists of districts that meet those criteria.

Summary of Reconfiguration

1. All 28 of the Map 1 target districts are included in Map 3.
2. 36 of the 50 Map 2 target districts (too small) are included in Map 3.
3. 26 of the 26 Map 2 target districts (too large) are included in Map 3.
4. Of the 64 districts that meet Map 1 or Map 2 (too small) criteria, there are 12 districts that are duplicates; the 52 unduplicated districts (64 - 12) are all involved in multi-district reconfigurations in Map 3.
5. Of the 26 districts that meet Map 2 (too large) criteria, only five are involved in multi-district reconfigurations and one of those is a duplicate from Map 1; therefore only four districts (5 - 1) are involved in unduplicated reconfigurations in Map 3.
6. Therefore, there are 56 unduplicated districts (52 + 4) that are target districts in Map 1 or Map 2 that are involved in multi-district reconfigurations in Map 3.
7. In addition, 36 other districts that are not target districts in Map 1 or Map 2 are involved in multi-district reconfigurations in Map 3.
8. The 92 districts (56 + 36) reconfigured in Map 3 result in 43 new districts, of which 38 are two-district mergers, four are three-district mergers, and one is a four-district merger.

1-115
+14

1-116
544-1

TABLE V-6

**NUMBERS OF DISTRICTS THAT ARE RECONFIGURED
IN ASSOCIATION WITH MAP 1, MAP 2, AND MAP 3**

MAP	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)				(7)
	Number of Districts that Meet Criteria	Number of Districts that A&M Does Not Recon- figure	Number of Districts that Meet Criteria and Are Re- configured	Number of Other Districts that Are In- volved in Re- configuration	Number of New Districts Created	Number of Unduplicated Reconfigurations Based on the Number of Districts Merged				Total Number of Districts in the State After Recon- figuration
						2	3	4	5	
MAP 1	28	8	20	22	20	18	2	0	0	282
MAP 2										
<i>Too Small</i>	50	5	45	29	34	29	4	1	0	—
<i>Too Large</i>	26	20	6	7	5	2	3	0	0	—
Map 2 Total	76	25	51	36	39	31	7	1	0	256
MAP 3										
<i>Mergers</i>	56	0	56	36	43	38	4	1	0	—
<i>Within District Changes</i>	21	0	21	0	21	21	0	0	0	—
Map 3 Total	77	0	77	36	64	59	4	1	0	255


Note: Figures in column (3) = column (1) - column (2); figures in columns under column (6) sum to the figures in column (5); and figures in column (7) = 304 - column (3) - column (4) + column (5).

MAP 1

MAP 1 Legend

- TYPE "A" MERGED (7)
- TYPE "A" NOT MERGED (4)
- TYPE "B" MERGED (7)
- TYPE "B" NOT MERGED (1)
- TYPE "C" MERGED (7)
- TYPE "C" NOT MERGED (2)
- all others (256)

1-117




Should be Lt. Green

MAP 2 Legend

- TOO LARGE DISTRICT (2)
- LARGE H.S. NOT MERGED (18)
- LARGE H.S. MERGED (5)
- SMALL H.S. NOT MERGED (5)
- SMALL H.S. MERGED (34)
- all others (192)

011-1

MAP 2




MAP 3 Legend

- RATIONALE "A" (6)
- RATIONALE "B" (7)
- RATIONALE "C" (5)
- RATIONALE "D" (9)
- RATIONALE "E" (9)
- RATIONALE "F" (4)
- RATIONALE "G" (3)
- RATIONALE "H" (19)
- RATIONALE "I" (2)
- all others (191)

6/11-1

MAP 3



Chapter VI

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STATUTORY CHANGES

Current Statutes

An essential component in analyzing the process of school district boundary changes is the Kansas State Statutes. Kansas Statutes found in Chapter 72, Article 71, Sections 72-7101 through 72-7110, discuss the transfer of school district territory and Article 73, Section 72-7301 through 72-7307, address the disorganization of school districts. Most of the statutes in these two articles are over 20 years old, with almost half of the statutes being more than 30 years old. In fact, only three statutes were amended in the 1980s and one statute was amended in 1999.

The statutes address three general areas: election concerns, taxation issues, indebtedness and actual processes for transferring or disorganizing a district. For this summary, the focus is solely on the statutes that deal with transferring territory or disorganizing a district. The following points are important to the discussion of boundary changes:

- On the effective date of any transfer, the school district receiving the transfer assumes the right to all school buildings and furnishings. (7104)
- On the effective date of any transfer, the school district receiving the transfer assumes payment of the unpaid bonded indebtedness that incurred prior to the transfer, except the giving district will be solely liable for the principal and interest payments on bonds which are due or may become due on or before December 1 following the effective date of the transfer. (7104)
- The giving district will have to make payments to the receiving district in order to defray the costs of the transfer. (7105a)
- Transfer of territory can only occur under the following circumstances (7108):
 - Upon written agreement of any two boards and that is approved by the state board of education.
 - Upon order of the state board of education after the petition by one board and a public hearing conducted by the state board of education.
 - The effective date of any such transfer shall be the date of approval or the following July 1.

- If a public hearing is necessary, notice will be given for two consecutive weeks in a local newspaper in the district from which the territory is to be transferred. The notice must circulate at least 10 days prior and not less than three days prior to the hearing. The time and place must be clearly stated in the notice along with a summary of the transfer proposal.
- Within 90 days of receiving the petition or after the hearing, the state board of education will issue an order approving or not approving the transfer.
- If the petition is denied, there is a two-year waiting period before another petition can be made to the state board of education.
- A school district can be disorganized under the following circumstances (7301):
 - Upon petition of the board of education of a school district for disorganization and attachment of that district to another territory to the state board of education.
 - The state board of education will consider disorganization if it finds that there is only one high school in the district and it can't meet the 30 unit minimum accreditation requirement, or if it finds that the district fails to meet the minimum requirements for the establishment of a district. The disorganization must also improve the educational system of the state and the area in which it is taking place.
 - The effective date of any disorganization will be by order of the state board of education, usually July 1.
- Voters can petition for a disorganization of a district. The petition must be filed with the county election officer and no election can occur between January 1 and July 1 of any year. (7302)
 - There is a two-year waiting period between petitions.
 - All disorganizations are effective on July 1.
- The following procedures are required for the disorganization of one district and its attachment to one or more other districts (7304 and 7305):
 - An election will be held in the school district proposed to be disorganized.
 - The election proposal will include the specific concerns regarding the disorganization and attachment, including information on indebtedness.

- If the vote passes, the county clerk certifies this to the board(s) of education of the district(s) to which the territory to be attached and the board of the district to be disorganized, and to the state board of education.
- The board of education of the district which will have territory attached has 30 days to approve or reject the proposal. They then give the acceptance or rejection to the state board of education.
- The state board of education then has 30 days to issue an order in accordance with the resolution for disorganization and attachment.
- All disorganizations under this section will be effective on July 1 following the election approving the disorganization.
- For taxation purposes, the territory is transferred on Dec. 31 preceding the July 1.
- On July 1 the property, records, and all funds, on hand or to be collected, of the disorganized district will be given to the receiving district.

The above points illustrate the detailed procedures required by the state regarding the transfer and consolidation of school district territory. It is important to remember that there are numerous other statutes included in Chapter 72, Articles 71 and 73 that are concerned with taxation and indebtedness issues. Within these other statutes there are more complicated and detailed requirements for transferring territory or changing school district boundaries.

Recommendations

In order to meet the recommendations of this study, statutory changes will be needed. The review of some of the important relevant statutes above suggests places that will need to be amended. The laws that were used in the 1960's to unify school districts were repealed. Article 67 of Chapter 72 created a process for the entire state that involved planning boards and county superintendents of education in the drawing of school district boundaries. A&M would recommend a similar process for targeted school districts based on the identification of certain school districts that are not effective or efficient.

In the 1960's the County Superintendent helped facilitate the unification and consolidation process. The County Superintendent position no longer exists in Kansas. We recommend that the legislature delegate to the State Board of Education powers to change school district boundaries in a more direct way than currently exists in the statutes cited above. The planning for school district change would primarily be a function of the State Board of Education working with local school districts as described below.

This study has shown the need for three levels of state involvement in the school district boundary issue. We recommend that new statutes be adopted to create three different levels of state involvement: (1) Emergency school district dissolution, (2) Required boundary change planning, and, (3) Review of boundary options.

Emergency dissolution

The first recommendation for state involvement would be for the small number of districts that are very small and declining in size. For these districts we would recommend that the legislature set two enrollment levels such as: (1) less than 80 students on September 20, 2000 and (2) less than 100 on September 20, 2001.

All school boards that are declining in enrollment and less than 80 students on September 20, 2000, would be required to hold a public hearing concerning the dissolution of the district by July 1, 2001. The school board shall report the recommendations for dissolution that came from the public hearing to the State Board of Education. We recommend that the legislature require the State Board of Education to take action by August 15, 2001, in prescribing the reorganization of the identified school districts in the manner proposed by the local school board or in any manner the State Board shall amend the recommendation for dissolution. (This action is needed because of a compelling need in certain districts. It will require swift action by the legislature, school boards, and the State Board of Education).

We recommend a similar process for districts with declining enrollments and less than 100 students on September 20, 2001. Those school districts would be required to hold a public hearing on possible options for dissolution of the district by December 15, 2001. The school board report on recommendations from the public hearing would be due so the State Board of Education could take action by February 28, 2002, with the effect of the action implemented by July 1, 2002. The legislature may wish to follow this schedule for annually for any districts that meet these criteria in the future.

Required Boundary Change Planning

We recommend that the legislature delegate to the State Board of Education the responsibility for oversight of a boundary change planning process for all school districts identified as target districts on map one that were not in the emergency dissolution group. The process could extend over a three-year period of time. During that period the school district could work to change from a high spending, low performing district to a district that no longer met the target levels. During this effort, the district would be required to work with neighboring districts to find a possible voluntary boundary change that could assist with the possible change. Maps 1, 2, and 3 provide some options for consideration. If the school district has improved student performance and reduced per pupil spending, a plan to continue to address those issues would not require a plan for dissolution. At the end of the three years, if the districts is still a target and no voluntary

boundary change has been made, we recommend that the State Board require that a hearing for dissolution be held, a report be made to the State Board, and the State Board shall accept or modify the dissolution plan.

Review of Boundary Options

We recommend that all districts identified as target districts on Map 2 be asked to follow the same procedure as the required boundary change planning districts, without the final requirement of emergency dissolution. The State Board of Education would encourage school districts and their neighbors to identify possible changes in school district and school size that would remove the districts from the group of target districts. The legislature should make it clear that the State Board of Education has the authority to take action in changing school district boundaries if a district or a group of districts submits a request for change.

Other Statutory Issues

The 1999 Legislature provided that any school district formed by consolidation will be entitled to state financial aid equal to the amount of former districts for two years. We recommend that elimination of fiscal disincentive be granted for a longer period of time: 3-5 years. In light of the number of new districts that are likely to be created with this new approach, a further review of this issue may lead to additional changes.

The current school building closing laws are not consistent for the entire state and could be in conflict with the school board plans we are recommending. We recognize that efficiencies are gained by closing school facilities; still these decisions have been local. We recommend that the decisions for closing buildings be left to local school boards and that existing statutes be changed to make this a statewide policy.

New school facilities are being built and major renovation of existing building are currently being completed in places where there may not be enough students in the future to warrant the public investment. We recommend a that the legislature direct the State Board of Education to establish procedures for a review of school district building plans that considers the possibility of future school district boundary changes.

521-1
1214

APPENDIX I

ENROLLMENT DATA FOR ALL DISTRICTS

District #	District	County	9-20-89 FTE	9-20-93 FTE	9-20-98 FTE	% Change over 10- years	% Change over 5- years	# of High Schools	Enrollment per HS	Projected Enrollment 2004-05
D0101	ERIE-ST PAUL	NEOSHO	1,091.50	1,168.50	1,182.40	8%	1%	3	394	1,060.0
D0102	CIMARRON-ENSIGN	GRAY	567.5	618.8	634.4	12%	2%	1	634	610.0
D0103	CHEYLIN	CHEYENNE	209.5	222.5	192	-8%	-12%	1	192	174.0
D0104	WHITE ROCK	JEWELL	177	194	199.5	13%	7%	1	200	125.0
D0200	GREELEY COUNTY	GREELEY	351.5	352.5	320	-9%	-9%	1	320	290.0
D0202	TURNER-KANSAS CITY	WYANDOTTE	3,812.30	3,786.40	3,640.90	-4%	-6%	1	3,641	3,300.0
D0203	PIPER-KANSAS CITY	WYANDOTTE	1,014.50	1,212.60	1,282.00	26%	3%	1	1,282	1,417.0
D0204	BONNER SPRINGS	WYANDOTTE	2,047.50	2,013.00	2,129.50	4%	7%	1	2,130	2,325.0
D0205	LEON	BUTLER	718.5	823.6	775.7	8%	-4%	1	776	800.0
D0206	REMINGTON-WHITEWATER	BUTLER	487.5	550	548.5	13%	-1%	1	549	570.0
D0207	FT LEAVENWORTH	LEAVENWORTH	1,774.00	1,845.50	1,686.00	-5%	-9%			1,790.0
D0208	WAKEENEY	TREGO	630.5	677.1	571.5	-9%	-11%	1	572	409.0
D0209	MOSCOW PUBLIC SCHOOLS	STEVENS	159	180.5	192.2	21%	-4%	1	192	194.0
D0210	HUGOTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS	STEVENS	890	976.5	956.5	7%	-5%	1	957	1,000.0
D0211	NORTON COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	NORTON	712.9	752	746.2	5%	-5%	1	746	690.0
D0212	NORTHERN VALLEY	NORTON	180.5	205	197.5	9%	-4%	1	198	159.0
D0213	WEST SOLOMON VALLEY SCHOOLS	NORTON	113	96.5	94.5	-16%	-5%	1	95	93.0
D0214	ULYSSES	GRANT	1,575.70	1,699.10	1,769.60	12%	5%	1	1,770	1,707.5
D0215	LAKIN	KEARNY	649.3	734.3	730.5	13%	0%	1	731	760.0
D0216	DEERFIELD	KEARNY	250.5	337.7	374.7	50%	2%	1	375	348.0
D0217	ROLLA	MORTON	215	196.5	206.3	-4%	4%	1	206	220.0
D0218	ELKHART	MORTON	563.5	529.5	550.5	-2%	2%	1	551	500.0
D0219	MINNEOLA	CLARK	200	258.5	277.5	39%	4%	1	278	259.0
D0220	ASHLAND	CLARK	246.1	256.5	246.5	0%	-8%	1	247	245.0
D0221	NORTH CENTRAL	WASHINGTON	180.5	164.5	160.5	-11%	0%	1	161	112.0
D0222	WASHINGTON SCHOOLS	WASHINGTON	418.5	396.2	375	-10%	-10%	1	375	324.0
D0223	BARNES	WASHINGTON	396	371.3	393.9	-1%	11%	2	197	290.4
D0224	REPUBLICAN VALLEY	WASHINGTON	388	392	388.6	0%	3%	1	389	304.0
D0225	FOWLER	MEADE	143.9	153.5	169.6	18%	4%	1	170	142.0
D0226	MEADE	MEADE	403.5	427.5	441	9%	7%	1	441	465.0
D0227	JETMORE	HODGEMAN	235.5	294.5	331.5	41%	10%	1	332	332.0
D0228	HANSTON	HODGEMAN	150.5	151	138.5	-8%	-1%	1	139	99.0
D0229	SOUTHEAST JOHNSON CO	JOHNSON	8,193.90	11,569.60	15,418.50	88%	26%	3	5,140	19,160.0
D0230	SPRING HILL	JOHNSON	1,234.40	1,245.80	1,353.50	10%	7%	1	1,354	1,725.0
D0231	GARDNER-EDGERTON-ANTIOCH	JOHNSON	1,625.30	1,803.60	2,384.30	47%	25%	1	2,384	3,590.0

9-21-1
521-1

District #	District	County	9-20-89 FTE	9-20-93 FTE	9-20-98 FTE	% Change over 10- years	% Change over 5- years	# of High Schools	Enrollment per HS	Projected Enrollment 2004-05
D0232	DESOTO	JOHNSON	1,697.50	1,829.50	2,515.00	48%	29%	1	2,515	4,587.0
D0233	OLATHE	JOHNSON	13,300.20	15,831.70	18,626.80	40%	14%	3	6,209	22,139.6
D0234	FT SCOTT	BOURBON	2,053.60	2,105.00	2,114.60	3%	0%	1	2,115	2,115.0
D0235	UNIONTOWN	BOURBON	500.5	458.5	498.8	0%	9%	1	499	500.0
D0237	SMITH CENTER	SMITH	637.9	631.5	585.3	-8%	-8%	1	585	447.0
D0238	WEST SMITH COUNTY	SMITH	213	191.5	195.5	-8%	-3%	1	196	190.0
D0239	NORTH OTTAWA COUNTY	OTTAWA	652	728	687.1	5%	-6%	1	687	610.0
D0240	TWIN VALLEY	OTTAWA	470.5	468.5	627.1	33%	12%	2	314	1,100.0
D0241	WALLACE COUNTY SCHOOLS	WALLACE	286.1	298.5	306	7%	5%	1	306	225.0
D0242	WESKAN	WALLACE	101	119.5	125	24%	-1%	1	125	128.0
D0243	LEBO-WAVERLY	COFFEY	491	578.5	581.5	18%	-2%	2	291	597.0
D0244	BURLINGTON	COFFEY	847.2	975	918	8%	-5%	1	918	715.5
D0245	LEROY-GRIDLEY	COFFEY	322.5	351	365	13%	-1%	2	183	303.0
D0246	NORTHEAST	CRAWFORD	587	605.7	577	-2%	-9%	1	577	532.0
D0247	CHEROKEE	CRAWFORD	774.4	835.5	842.8	9%	2%	1	843	820.0
D0248	GIRARD	CRAWFORD	1,075.00	1,125.50	1,130.50	5%	1%	1	1,131	1,115.0
D0249	FRONTENAC PUBLIC SCHOOLS	CRAWFORD	471	522	657.3	40%	13%	1	657	690.0
D0250	PITTSBURG	CRAWFORD	2,732.80	2,959.00	2,579.80	-6%	-9%	1	2,580	2,310.0
D0251	NORTH LYON COUNTY	LYON	695.1	733	715.5	3%	-2%	1	716	563.0
D0252	SOUTHERN LYON COUNTY	LYON	525	599	658.5	25%	1%	2	329	625.0
D0253	EMPORIA	LYON	4,550.00	4,622.00	4,570.20	0%	1%	1	4,570	4,684.0
D0254	BARBER COUNTY NORTH	BARBER	787	758.8	758.9	-4%	2%	1	759	625.0
D0255	SOUTH BARBER	BARBER	311.5	357	325	4%	-12%	1	325	269.0
D0256	MARMATON VALLEY	ALLEN	319	375	415	30%	11%	1	415	326.0
D0257	IOLA	ALLEN	1,775.10	1,833.50	1,672.70	-6%	-8%	1	1,673	1,451.0
D0258	HUMBOLDT	ALLEN	646.5	619	535.9	-17%	-14%	1	536	510.0
D0259	WICHITA	SEDGWICK	43,941.80	44,792.00	44,924.60	2%	3%	7	6,418	45,305.4
D0260	DERBY	SEDGWICK	5,693.70	6,198.10	6,673.00	17%	5%	1	6,673	7,400.0
D0261	HAYSVILLE	SEDGWICK	3,281.90	3,582.90	4,197.50	28%	16%	1	4,198	4,562.0
D0262	VALLEY CENTER PUBLIC SCHOOLS	SEDGWICK	2,004.60	2,146.90	2,303.00	15%	5%	1	2,303	2,390.0
D0263	MULVANE	SEDGWICK	1,802.90	1,918.20	1,937.50	7%	3%	1	1,938	2,061.8
D0264	CLEARWATER	SEDGWICK	974	1,038.00	1,144.70	18%	9%	1	1,145	1,280.0
D0265	GODDARD	SEDGWICK	1,921.90	2,349.00	3,259.80	70%	32%	1	3,260	4,631.0
D0266	MAIZE	SEDGWICK	2,197.30	3,542.40	4,895.30	123%	29%	1	4,895	5,636.0
D0267	RENWICK	SEDGWICK	1,374.00	1,469.00	1,808.00	32%	19%	2	904	2,100.0
D0268	CHENEY	SEDGWICK	527.2	666.2	709.6	35%	3%	1	710	785.0
D0269	PALCO	ROOKS	178	178.6	178.5	0%	6%	1	179	133.0
D0270	PLAINVILLE	ROOKS	488	485.7	453.3	-7%	-12%	1	453	400.0
D0271	STOCKTON	ROOKS	400.5	439	439.6	10%	1%	1	440	387.0

District #	District	County	9-20-89 FTE	9-20-93 FTE	9-20-98 FTE	% Change over 10- years	% Change over 5- years	# of High Schools	Enrollment per HS	Projected Enrollment 2004-05
D0272	WACONDA	MITCHELL	568.5	581	558.8	-2%	-4%	2	279	409.0
D0273	BELOIT	MITCHELL	773.3	817	807.2	4%	-2%	1	807	776.0
D0274	OAKLEY	LOGAN	472.7	503.9	509.5	8%	-4%	1	510	430.0
D0275	TRIPLAINS	LOGAN	110	110.5	92.5	-16%	-23%	1	93	79.5
D0278	MANKATO	JEWELL	292.5	303	274.5	-6%	-10%	1	275	245.0
D0279	JEWELL	JEWELL	198.5	203	186	-6%	-11%	1	186	175.0
D0280	WEST GRAHAM-MORLAND	GRAHAM	121	118.6	91	-25%	-15%	1	91	56.0
D0281	HILL CITY	GRAHAM	518	536.3	426	-18%	-18%	1	426	329.0
D0282	WEST ELK	ELK	454.5	508.5	524	15%	-3%	1	524	470.0
D0283	ELK VALLEY	ELK	176.5	206.1	219	24%	-8%	1	219	205.0
D0284	CHASE COUNTY	CHASE	548.5	556.7	492.6	-10%	-13%	1	493	442.5
D0285	CEDAR VALE	CHAUTAUQUA	199	174	205.5	3%	6%	1	206	214.0
D0286	CHAUTAUQUA COUNTY COMMUNITY	CHAUTAUQUA	483.5	470.4	509.3	5%	4%	1	509	515.0
D0287	WEST FRANKLIN	FRANKLIN	768	821.5	918.4	20%	11%	2	459	1,000.0
D0288	CENTRAL HEIGHTS	FRANKLIN	512.5	621.3	702	37%	10%	1	702	575.0
D0289	WELLSVILLE	FRANKLIN	709.9	763.5	768.5	8%	3%	1	769	889.0
D0290	OTTAWA	FRANKLIN	2,211.30	2,329.10	2,287.90	3%	-3%	1	2,288	2,370.0
D0291	GRINNELL PUBLIC SCHOOLS	GOVE	145.5	165	160	10%	-2%	1	160	110.5
D0292	GRAINFIELD	GOVE	194.4	167	184	-5%	6%	1	184	170.0
D0293	QUINTER PUBLIC SCHOOLS	GOVE	355	370	390	10%	8%	1	390	371.0
D0294	OBERLIN	DECATUR	578.5	613	557.5	-4%	-10%	1	558	460.0
D0295	PRAIRIE HEIGHTS	DECATUR	122.5	96.5	91.5	-25%	2%	1	92	54.5
D0297	ST FRANCIS COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	CHEYENNE	418	435	441	6%	1%	1	441	356.0
D0298	LINCOLN	LINCOLN	424.5	405	411.5	-3%	0%	1	412	390.0
D0299	SYLVAN GROVE	LINCOLN	217	195	205	-6%	9%	1	205	140.0
D0300	COMMANCHE COUNTY	COMANCHE	413.5	410.5	358.6	-13%	-14%	1	359	294.5
D0301	NES TRES LA GO	NESS	85	79.5	76	-11%	1%	1	76	50.0
D0302	SMOKY HILL	NESS	197.5	193.5	160.5	-19%	-12%	1	161	114.5
D0303	NESS CITY	NESS	333.5	357.5	289	-13%	-15%	1	289	212.5
D0304	BAZINE	NESS	116.5	135.5	112	-4%	-13%	1	112	80.0
D0305	SALINA	SALINE	6,787.40	7,334.70	7,257.00	7%	0%	2	3,629	7,345.0
D0306	SOUTHEAST OF SALINE	SALINE	581.5	609.5	678.6	17%	10%	1	679	685.0
D0307	ELL-SALINE	SALINE	359	403.1	460.4	28%	9%	1	460	540.0
D0308	HUTCHINSON PUBLIC SCHOOLS	RENO	4,932.60	5,156.00	4,892.10	-1%	-3%	1	4,892	4,700.0
D0309	NICKERSON	RENO	1,418.50	1,421.80	1,358.00	-4%	-6%	1	1,358	1,215.5
D0310	FAIRFIELD	RENO	482.5	477.5	448.3	-7%	-5%	1	448	425.0
D0311	PRETTY PRAIRIE	RENO	257.5	306.5	326.8	27%	2%	1	327	295.0
D0312	HAVEN PUBLIC SCHOOLS	RENO	1,164.70	1,165.50	1,122.90	-4%	-5%	1	1,123	925.0
D0313	BUHLER	RENO	2,117.50	2,199.00	2,212.20	4%	1%	1	2,212	2,407.0

1-127
1-126

District #	District	County	9-20-89 FTE	9-20-93 FTE	9-20-98 FTE	% Change over 10- years	% Change over 5- years	# of High Schools	Enrollment per HS	Projected Enrollment 2004-05
D0314	BREWSTER	THOMAS	141.5	146.5	160.5	13%	8%	1	161	145.0
D0315	COLBY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	THOMAS	1,241.50	1,300.50	1,122.20	-10%	-15%	1	1,122	970.0
D0316	GOLDEN PLAINS	THOMAS	143	151.5	176	23%	7%	1	176	155.0
D0317	HERNDON	RAWLINS	72	86.5	100	39%	-12%	1	100	62.0
D0318	ATWOOD	RAWLINS	482.5	478	434.5	-10%	-7%	1	435	303.0
D0320	WAMEGO	POTTAWATOMIE	1,262.00	1,386.90	1,412.40	12%	0%	1	1,412	1,410.0
D0321	KAW VALLEY	POTTAWATOMIE	979	1,029.00	1,068.50	9%	1%	2	534	1,021.0
D0322	ONAGA-HAVENSVILLE-WHEATON	POTTAWATOMIE	428.5	461.5	422.3	-1%	-6%	1	422	318.5
D0323	WESTMORELAND	POTTAWATOMIE	591.5	698.8	775.4	31%	3%	1	775	890.0
D0324	EASTERN HEIGHTS	PHILLIPS	159	172	194.5	22%	12%	1	195	175.0
D0325	PHILLIPSBURG	PHILLIPS	700.6	729.2	696.8	-1%	-5%	1	697	602.0
D0326	LOGAN	PHILLIPS	226.5	221	208.1	-8%	-6%	1	208	200.0
D0327	ELLSWORTH	ELLSWORTH	740.7	869	753.5	2%	-14%	1	754	604.5
D0328	LORRAINE	ELLSWORTH	496.6	559.1	557.5	12%	1%	2	279	560.0
D0329	ALMA	WABAUNSEE	531.9	585.3	557.6	5%	-4%	1	558	530.0
D0330	WABAUNSEE EAST	WABAUNSEE	580.9	616	635.5	9%	-2%	1	636	550.0
D0331	KINGMAN	KINGMAN	1,056.20	1,227.40	1,217.80	15%	0%	2	609	1,245.0
D0332	CUNNINGHAM	KINGMAN	315	316.5	333.5	6%	4%	1	334	293.0
D0333	CONCORDIA	CLOUD	1,341.50	1,330.50	1,308.10	-2%	-3%	1	1,308	1,200.0
D0334	SOUTHERN CLOUD	CLOUD	258	263	272.5	6%	2%	2	136	196.0
D0335	NORTH JACKSON	JACKSON	415	411.5	431.8	4%	4%	1	432	420.0
D0336	HOLTON	JACKSON	934.5	1,001.00	1,086.10	16%	8%	1	1,086	1,062.0
D0337	MAYETTA	JACKSON	766.5	822.5	854.1	11%	3%	1	854	874.0
D0338	VALLEY FALLS	JEFFERSON	483	483	462	-4%	-7%	1	462	448.0
D0339	JEFFERSON COUNTY NORTH	JEFFERSON	446	453.7	481.1	8%	0%	1	481	460.0
D0340	JEFFERSON WEST	JEFFERSON	695.5	846.1	944.3	36%	6%	1	944	
D0341	OSKALOOSA PUBLIC SCHOOLS	JEFFERSON	546.5	706.5	724	32%	-1%	1	724	740.0
D0342	MCLOUTH	JEFFERSON	518.5	564.5	577.1	11%	5%	1	577	527.0
D0343	PERRY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	JEFFERSON	872	995.6	1,045.10	20%	-1%	1	1,045	975.0
D0344	PLEASANTON	LINN	424.7	420.5	425	0%	1%	1	425	400.0
D0345	SEAMAN	SHAWNEE	3,247.70	3,379.50	3,179.70	-2%	-6%	1	3,180	3,200.0
D0346	JAYHAWK	LINN	548.5	563.5	600	9%	7%	1	600	550.5
D0347	KINSLEY-OFFERLE	EDWARDS	401.7	421.5	355.5	-12%	-21%	1	356	280.0
D0348	BALDWIN CITY	DOUGLAS	962.4	1,126.70	1,241.40	29%	5%	1	1,241	1,295.0
D0349	STAFFORD	STAFFORD	272.5	316.5	337.8	24%	3%	1	338	304.0
D0350	ST JOHN-HUDSON	STAFFORD	426	472.5	443.5	4%	-6%	1	444	340.0
D0351	MACKSVILLE	STAFFORD	284.5	278.5	295	4%	3%	1	295	272.0
D0352	GOODLAND	SHERMAN	1,206.00	1,195.10	1,155.50	-4%	-4%	1	1,156	1,098.0
D0353	WELLINGTON	SUMNER	1,910.50	2,028.40	1,970.60	3%	-2%	1	1,971	1,713.0

8-12-1
12-1

District #	District	County	9-20-89 FTE	9-20-93 FTE	9-20-98 FTE	% Change over 10- years	% Change over 5- years	# of High Schools	Enrollment per HS	Projected Enrollment 2004-05
D0354	CLAFLIN	BARTON	240	329	324.7	35%	-5%	1	325	285.0
D0355	ELLINWOOD PUBLIC SCHOOLS	BARTON	559.1	576.8	601.2	8%	4%	1	601	541.0
D0356	CONWAY SPRINGS	SUMNER	448.1	485.2	551.8	23%	15%	1	552	570.0
D0357	BELLE PLAINE	SUMNER	709	773.5	836.5	18%	4%	1	837	830.0
D0358	OXFORD	SUMNER	424	465.5	456.5	8%	6%	1	457	450.0
D0359	ARGONIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS	SUMNER	224	243	270	21%	5%	1	270	268.0
D0360	CALDWELL	SUMNER	329	337.5	344	5%	-1%	1	344	274.5
D0361	ANTHONY-HARPER	HARPER	1,049.00	1,052.80	1,078.90	3%	4%	1	1,079	1,000.0
D0362	PRAIRIE VIEW	LINN	821.3	887.4	911.4	11%	3%	1	911	990.0
D0363	HOLCOMB	FINNEY	659.5	727.5	870	32%	16%	1	870	1,052.0
D0364	MARYSVILLE	MARSHALL	976	1,025.50	970.8	-1%	-6%	1	971	860.0
D0365	GARNETT	ANDERSON	959.1	1,082.50	1,121.70	17%	4%	1	1,122	1,122.0
D0366	WOODSON	WOODSON	574	631.5	619.5	8%	-3%	1	620	475.0
D0367	OSAWATOMIE	MIAMI	1,112.90	1,137.50	1,253.00	13%	7%	1	1,253	1,228.0
D0368	PAOLA	MIAMI	1,576.50	1,776.60	2,055.00	30%	10%	1	2,055	2,050.0
D0369	BURRTON	HARVEY	294.9	291.5	245.5	-17%	-20%	1	246	245.0
D0371	MONTEZUMA	GRAY	212	181.5	215	1%	18%	1	215	224.0
D0372	SILVER LAKE	SHAWNEE	605.5	660.1	695.2	15%	6%	1	695	755.0
D0373	NEWTON	HARVEY	3,200.40	3,467.30	3,465.30	8%	1%	1	3,465	3,284.5
D0374	SUBLETTE	HASKELL	504.5	517	494	-2%	0%	1	494	487.9
D0375	CIRCLE	BUTLER	1,259.00	1,384.50	1,406.00	12%	2%	1	1,406	1,620.0
D0376	STERLING	RICE	533	549	531.5	0%	-5%	1	532	500.0
D0377	ATCHISON CO COMM SCHOOLS	ATCHISON	783	819.5	805.5	3%	-4%	1	806	750.0
D0378	RILEY COUNTY	RILEY	550.4	645.5	625.1	14%	-6%	1	625	474.0
D0379	CLAY CENTER	CLAY	1,530.60	1,699.80	1,589.10	4%	-7%	2	795	1,510.0
D0380	VERMILLION	MARSHALL	592.9	645.5	629.1	6%	-4%	2	315	506.0
D0381	SPEARVILLE-WINDTHORST	FORD	246	305.9	362	47%	14%	1	362	323.0
D0382	PRATT	PRATT	1,344.20	1,350.00	1,374.00	2%	-2%	1	1,374	1,081.0
D0383	MANHATTAN	RILEY	6,010.10	6,456.60	5,819.40	-3%	-9%	1	5,819	5,499.0
D0384	BLUE VALLEY	RILEY	273	293.5	302.5	11%	-2%	1	303	274.0
D0385	ANDOVER	BUTLER	1,620.00	1,989.50	2,791.40	72%	31%	1	2,791	3,485.0
D0386	MADISON-VIRGIL	GREENWOOD	288.1	296.4	282	-2%	-9%	1	282	264.0
D0387	ALTOONA-MIDWAY	WILSON	387.9	375	359.5	-7%	-5%	1	360	293.5
D0388	ELLIS	ELLIS	365.5	375.2	368	1%	-5%	1	368	340.0
D0389	EUREKA	GREENWOOD	751.2	849.3	795.5	6%	-6%	1	796	785.0
D0390	HAMILTON	GREENWOOD	126.5	125.5	122	-4%	-6%	1	122	122.0
D0392	OSBORNE COUNTY	OSBORNE	455	483.5	496	9%	-4%	1	496	475.0
D0393	SOLOMON	DICKINSON	325	374.5	427.2	31%	5%	1	427	453.0
D0394	ROSE HILL PUBLIC SCHOOLS	BUTLER	1,333.00	1,589.20	1,755.00	32%	7%	1	1,755	1,980.0

6-12-11
824-4

1-130
1-129

District #	District	County	9-20-89 FTE	9-20-93 FTE	9-20-98 FTE	% Change over 10- years	% Change over 5- years	# of High Schools	Enrollment per HS	Projected Enrollment 2004-05
D0395	LACROSSE	RUSH	342.4	357	357.4	4%	-2%	1	357	320.0
D0396	DOUGLASS PUBLIC SCHOOLS	BUTLER	725.6	782.1	904.4	25%	7%	1	904	
D0397	CENTRE	MARION	306.1	288	306.9	0%	2%	1	307	257.0
D0398	PEABODY-BURNS	MARION	403.5	442.8	466.5	16%	5%	1	467	426.5
D0399	PARADISE	RUSSELL	172.4	109.8	154	-11%	28%	1	154	121.0
D0400	LINDSBORG	MCPHERSON	845	933	990.3	17%	0%	1	990	955.0
D0401	CHASE	RICE	180.5	194.5	182	1%	-10%	1	182	187.0
D0402	AUGUSTA	BUTLER	1,904.40	2,193.10	2,226.70	17%	6%	1	2,227	2,425.5
D0403	OTIS-BISON	RUSH	344	357	335.5	-2%	-6%	1	336	200.0
D0404	RIVERTON	CHEROKEE	701.8	743.5	828.3	18%	9%	1	828	805.0
D0405	LYONS	RICE	785.5	880.8	934.1	19%	8%	1	934	880.0
D0406	WATHENA	DONIPHAN	489	485	402	-18%	-12%	1	402	380.0
D0407	RUSSELL COUNTY	RUSSELL	1,211.50	1,204.60	1,165.50	-4%	-5%	2	583	1,049.0
D0408	MARION	MARION	572	645	725.7	27%	6%	1	726	730.0
D0409	ATCHISON PUBLIC SCHOOLS	ATCHISON	1,709.40	1,682.90	1,616.00	-5%	-1%	1	1,616	1,640.0
D0410	DURHAM-HILLSBORO-LEHIGH	MARION	589	641.6	735.8	25%	8%	1	736	640.0
D0411	GOESSEL	MARION	245.5	283.5	316.4	29%	-2%	1	316	288.5
D0412	HOXIE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	SHERIDAN	527	492.5	447	-15%	-7%	1	447	350.0
D0413	CHANUTE PUBLIC SCHOOLS	NEOSHO	1,856.80	1,995.30	1,954.90	5%	-1%	1	1,955	1,751.0
D0415	HIAWATHA	BROWN	1,215.50	1,228.20	1,095.80	-10%	-9%	1	1,096	925.4
D0416	LOUISBURG	MIAMI	1,071.00	1,140.00	1,303.00	22%	10%	1	1,303	1,540.0
D0417	MORRIS COUNTY	MORRIS	1,023.00	1,078.00	1,036.10	1%	-6%	1	1,036	910.0
D0418	MCPHERSON	MCPHERSON	2,370.20	2,652.30	2,710.50	14%	2%	1	2,711	2,425.0
D0419	CANTON-GALVA	MCPHERSON	402.7	476.5	425.9	6%	-10%	1	426	410.0
D0420	OSAGE CITY	OSAGE	600.6	626.5	745	24%	16%	1	745	780.0
D0421	LYNDON	OSAGE	400.5	463.5	507	27%	1%	1	507	411.0
D0422	GREENSBURG	KIOWA	404.5	352	294	-27%	-21%	1	294	269.0
D0423	MOUNDRIDGE	MCPHERSON	427.5	469	452.1	6%	0%	1	452	500.0
D0424	MULLINVILLE	KIOWA	112	100.5	109	-3%	8%	1	109	100.0
D0425	HIGHLAND	DONIPHAN	275	292.5	278.5	1%	-4%	1	279	260.0
D0426	PIKE VALLEY	REPUBLIC	260.5	281	300	15%	2%	1	300	270.0
D0427	BELLEVILLE	REPUBLIC	619.5	671	605.5	-2%	-9%	1	606	470.0
D0428	GREAT BEND	BARTON	3,321.40	3,393.50	3,158.50	-5%	-6%	1	3,159	2,678.3
D0429	TROY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	DONIPHAN	374.2	438.5	398.5	6%	-8%	1	399	375.0
D0430	BROWN COUNTY	BROWN	633.9	697.7	725.3	14%	3%	1	725	700.0
D0431	HOISINGTON	BARTON	716.6	821.9	744.4	4%	-11%	1	744	690.0
D0432	VICTORIA	ELLIS	397	369	302	-24%	-13%	1	302	249.0
D0433	MIDWAY SCHOOLS	DONIPHAN	205	221	232	13%	6%	1	232	199.0
D0434	SANTA FE TRAIL	OSAGE	1,219.70	1,291.60	1,317.50	8%	-3%	1	1,318	1,335.0

District #	District	County	9-20-89 FTE	9-20-93 FTE	9-20-98 FTE	% Change over 10- years	% Change over 5- years	# of High Schools	Enrollment per HS	Projected Enrollment 2004-05
D0435	ABILENE	DICKINSON	1,354.80	1,479.50	1,505.50	11%	1%	1	1,506	1,322.0
D0436	CANEY VALLEY	MONTGOMERY	765.7	804	959.5	25%	18%	1	960	930.0
D0437	AUBURN WASHBURN	SHAWNEE	3,749.30	4,690.70	4,956.50	32%	2%	1	4,957	5,100.0
D0438	SKYLINE SCHOOLS	PRATT	358	371	346	-3%	-4%	1	346	360.0
D0439	SEDGWICK PUBLIC SCHOOLS	HARVEY	398	389.5	463	16%	13%	1	463	513.0
D0440	HALSTEAD	HARVEY	745	739	750.7	1%	-2%	1	751	770.0
D0441	SABETHA	NEMAHA	1,006.10	1,064.00	1,039.00	3%	-3%	2	520	1,002.0
D0442	NEMAHA VALLEY SCHOOLS	NEMAHA	376.1	497.2	516.7	37%	0%	1	517	490.0
D0443	DODGE CITY	FORD	4,138.20	4,470.30	4,916.90	19%	7%	1	4,917	5,485.0
D0444	LITTLE RIVER	RICE	378.5	279.5	275.7	-27%	-3%	1	276	260.0
D0445	COFFEYVILLE	MONTGOMERY	2,712.10	2,540.60	2,235.50	-18%	-10%	1	2,236	2,100.0
D0446	INDEPENDENCE	MONTGOMERY	2,357.50	2,326.90	2,220.70	-6%	-4%	1	2,221	2,220.0
D0447	CHERRYVALE	MONTGOMERY	626.5	644	676.2	8%	5%	1	676	315.0
D0448	INMAN	MCPHERSON	410.5	463.5	486	18%	1%	1	486	442.0
D0449	EASTON	LEAVENWORTH	652.5	609.9	703.6	8%	7%	1	704	710.0
D0450	SHAWNEE HEIGHTS	SHAWNEE	3,303.10	3,380.50	3,384.40	2%	0%	2	1,692	3,221.0
D0451	B & B	NEMAHA	218.5	245.5	270	24%	8%	1	270	224.5
D0452	STANTON COUNTY	STANTON	521.5	537.8	539.5	3%	-2%	1	540	490.0
D0453	LEAVENWORTH	LEAVENWORTH	4,265.10	4,324.30	4,040.60	-5%	-7%	1	4,041	4,000.0
D0454	BURLINGAME PUBLIC SCHOOLS	OSAGE	346.4	368.5	364.9	5%	0%	1	365	375.0
D0455	HILLCREST RURAL SCHOOLS	REPUBLIC	128.5	152	153.6	20%	-9%	1	154	127.0
D0456	MARAIS DES CYGNES VALLEY	OSAGE	295.5	272	289.5	-2%	-1%	1	290	288.0
D0457	GARDEN CITY	FINNEY	6,077.20	6,745.10	7,099.50	17%	4%	1	7,100	7,718.7
D0458	BASEHOR-LINWOOD	LEAVENWORTH	1,210.50	1,506.40	1,691.50	40%	9%	1	1,692	2,275.0
D0459	BUCKLIN	FORD	296	384	354	20%	-10%	1	354	250.0
D0460	HESSTON	HARVEY	720	790.5	840.5	17%	3%	1	841	780.0
D0461	NEODESHA	WILSON	726	759.8	758	4%	-6%	1	758	869.0
D0462	CENTRAL	COWLEY	388	366.2	405.2	4%	11%	1	405	417.0
D0463	UDALL	COWLEY	357.2	430.4	320	-10%	-22%	1	320	335.0
D0464	TONGANOXIE	LEAVENWORTH	1,312.80	1,517.50	1,466.70	12%	-4%	1	1,467	1,460.0
D0465	WINFIELD	COWLEY	2,360.10	2,566.20	2,642.20	12%	1%	1	2,642	2,197.8
D0466	SCOTT COUNTY	SCOTT	1,059.20	1,072.60	1,121.20	6%	1%	1	1,121	967.5
D0467	LEOTI	WICHITA	581	607.5	477.5	-18%	-19%	1	478	446.0
D0468	HEALY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	LANE	110.5	117	103.5	-6%	2%	1	104	100.0
D0469	LANSING	LEAVENWORTH	1,594.50	1,916.10	1,913.00	20%	-1%	1	1,913	1,859.0
D0470	ARKANSAS CITY	COWLEY	3,095.10	3,043.10	2,857.50	-8%	-8%	1	2,858	2,940.4
D0471	DEXTER	COWLEY	155.5	181.8	200.5	29%	7%	1	201	215.0
D0473	CHAPMAN	DICKINSON	1,211.00	1,312.50	1,227.00	1%	-8%	1	1,227	1,070.0
D0474	HAVILAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS	KIOWA	159	187.9	179.3	13%	-4%	1	179	175.0

1-131
+130

1-132
4-151

District #	District	County	9-20-89 FTE	9-20-93 FTE	9-20-98 FTE	% Change over 10- years	% Change over 5- years	# of High Schools	Enrollment per HS	Projected Enrollment 2004-05
D0475	JUNCTION CITY	GEARY	6,731.80	6,759.50	6,076.80	-10%	-10%	1	6,077	6,450.0
D0476	COPELAND	GRAY	124	112	121.5	-2%	8%	1	122	120.0
D0477	INGALLS	GRAY	225.5	276	293.5	30%	10%	1	294	266.0
D0479	CREST	ANDERSON	279.5	314	311	11%	1%	1	311	276.0
D0480	LIBERAL	SEWARD	3,400.60	3,803.80	4,050.20	19%	2%	1	4,050	4,260.0
D0481	RURAL VISTA	DICKINSON	362.5	395	452.5	25%	12%	2	226	410.0
D0482	DIGHTON	LANE	387.7	405.3	345.4	-11%	-14%	1	345	NA
D0483	KISMET-PLAINS	SEWARD	567.5	613.5	693.1	22%	10%	1	693	735.0
D0484	FREDONIA	WILSON	881	927	882.1	0%	-4%	1	882	792.0
D0486	ELWOOD	DONIPHAN	254	193.5	312.5	23%	50%	1	313	365.0
D0487	HERINGTON	DICKINSON	577.5	561	571.3	-1%	-3%	1	571	555.0
D0488	AXTELL	MARSHALL	328.5	365.5	374	14%	1%	2	187	283.0
D0489	HAYS	ELLIS	3,375.90	3,454.60	3,422.70	1%	0%	1	3,423	3,008.0
D0490	EL DORADO	BUTLER	2,040.70	2,305.90	2,178.50	7%	-4%	1	2,179	2,120.0
D0491	EUDORA	DOUGLAS	810.4	883.5	1,100.10	36%	18%	1	1,100	1,358.0
D0492	FLINTHILLS	BUTLER	230	255.5	339	47%	23%	1	339	347.0
D0493	COLUMBUS	CHEROKEE	1,265.50	1,370.50	1,375.70	9%	0%	1	1,376	1,300.0
D0494	SYRACUSE	HAMILTON	400.5	398.5	509	27%	21%	1	509	526.0
D0495	FT LARNED	PAWNEE	1,106.60	1,175.70	1,073.30	-3%	-11%	1	1,073	937.0
D0496	PAWNEE HEIGHTS	PAWNEE	152.5	168.5	159	4%	-9%	1	159	160.0
D0497	LAWRENCE	DOUGLAS	8,034.30	8,919.10	10,016.00	25%	9%	2	5,008	10,750.0
D0498	VALLEY HEIGHTS	MARSHALL	425	464.8	513.5	21%	9%	1	514	420.0
D0499	GALENA	CHEROKEE	730.1	752.6	794.7	9%	6%	1	795	782.0
D0500	KANSAS CITY	WYANDOTTE	21,520.60	21,001.50	19,876.50	-8%	-4%	4	4,969	20,200.0
D0501	TOPEKA PUBLIC SCHOOLS	SHAWNEE	14,095.20	13,955.10	13,478.40	-4%	-1%	3	4,493	13,129.6
D0502	LEWIS	EDWARDS	176.5	191	191	8%	7%	1	191	183.0
D0503	PARSONS	LABELLE	1,915.60	1,936.00	1,708.90	-11%	-9%	1	1,709	1,485.0
D0504	OSWEGO	LABELLE	459	467.5	497.5	8%	0%	1	498	500.0
D0505	CHETOPA	LABELLE	313.2	285	270.5	-14%	1%	1	271	261.0
D0506	LABELLE COUNTY	LABELLE	1,625.10	1,663.60	1,780.80	10%	2%	1	1,781	1,700.0
D0507	SATANTA	HASKELL	356.1	371.5	438	23%	21%	1	438	440.0
D0508	BAXTER SPRINGS	CHEROKEE	884.8	908.3	884.1	0%	-4%	1	884	860.0
D0509	SOUTH HAVEN	SUMNER	233	237.5	264.5	14%	10%	1	265	280.0
D0511	ATTICA	HARPER	217.5	182	163	-25%	-23%	1	163	145.0
D0512	SHAWNEE MISSION PUBLIC SCHO	JOHNSON	28,885.30	30,537.10	30,293.70	5%	-1%	5	6,059	27,984.0

APPENDIX II

PERFORMANCE DATA FOR ALL DISTRICTS

1-133
1132

District #	District	County	Reading Index 98-99	Math Power 98-99	Writing Composite 98-99	Actual Z-Score 98-99	Predicted Z-Score 98-99	Reading Index 97-98	Math Power 97-98	Writing Composite 97-98	Actual Z-Score 97-98
D0101	ERIE-ST PAUL	NEOSHO	66.4	55.2	3.48	1.66	0.11	67.5	54.2	3.25	0.77
D0102	CIMARRON-ENSIGN	GRAY	66.3	48.7	3.12	-1.39	0.56	62.2	45.5	3.13	-2.79
D0103	CHEYLIN	CHEYENNE	64.0	53.8	3.76	2.32	0.70	67.2	53.8	3.78	3.79
D0104	WHITE ROCK	JEWELL	62.6	44.1	3.42	-1.49	-0.45	64.4	50.0	3.37	-0.02
D0200	GREELEY COUNTY	GREELEY	64.3	56.6	3.56	1.85	1.08	63.5	57.2	3.68	2.92
D0202	TURNER-KANSAS CITY	WYANDOTTE	57.1	46.1	2.95	-4.85	-2.22	56.1	40.8	3.11	-5.22
D0203	PIPER-KANSAS CITY	WYANDOTTE	65.4	55.0	3.47	1.35	1.51	64.7	53.0	3.46	1.13
D0204	BONNER SPRINGS	WYANDOTTE	57.9	44.1	3.36	-2.89	-0.04	59.3	45.5	3.39	-1.93
D0205	LEON	BUTLER	64.9	52.8	3.92	3.19	1.36	65.9	51.6	3.89	3.74
D0206	REMINGTON-WHITEWATER	BUTLER	70.7	52.1	3.53	2.37	2.46	65.8	47.6	3.29	-0.60
D0207	FT LEAVENWORTH	LEAVENWORTH	69.6	62.8	4.04	6.67		66.6	54.9	3.71	3.43
D0208	WAKEENEY	TREGO	70.0	51.4	3.77	3.33	1.25	64.3	49.3	3.46	0.37
D0209	MOSCOW PUBLIC SCHOOLS	STEVENS	60.7	44.7	3.49	-1.46	1.09	62.4	46.7	3.34	-1.27
D0210	HUGOTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS	STEVENS	62.8	43.9	3.47	-1.22	-0.50	60.8	45.0	3.27	-2.38
D0211	NORTON COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	NORTON	67.6	49.6	3.15	-0.77	1.25	67.8	49.7	3.56	1.87
D0212	NORTHERN VALLEY	NORTON	69.3	62.5	3.75	5.03	0.03	69.8	55.0	3.44	2.60
D0213	WEST SOLOMON VALLEY SCHOOLS	NORTON	53.6	45.7	3.44	-3.18	1.23	64.1	45.7	3.65	0.80
D0214	ULYSSES	GRANT	60.9	42.7	3.52	-1.61	-0.46	62.4	41.7	3.31	-2.36
D0215	LAKIN	KEARNY	59.6	43.4	3.37	-2.57	-0.67	62.9	42.5	3.53	-0.78
D0216	DEERFIELD	KEARNY	55.7	39.8	2.70	-7.59	-2.62	56.6	37.9	3.77	-1.69
D0217	ROLLA	MORTON	65.5	46.9	3.78	1.55	-0.19	71.0	51.7	4.32	7.54
D0218	ELKHART	MORTON	58.1	43.7	3.28	-3.33	1.22	61.4	44.5	3.36	-1.79
D0219	MINNEOLA	CLARK	64.0	57.1	2.82	-1.99	-0.03	63.8	51.6	3.24	-0.65
D0220	ASHLAND	CLARK	66.0	52.6	3.68	2.15	0.23	68.8	57.4	3.53	3.33
D0221	NORTH CENTRAL	WASHINGTON	67.6	53.2	2.95	-1.18	-0.97	67.7	47.3	2.95	-2.23
D0222	WASHINGTON SCHOOLS	WASHINGTON	65.2	56.4	3.04	-0.69	1.66	66.7	58.6	3.21	1.13
D0223	BARNES	WASHINGTON	60.8	46.7	3.34	-1.86	0.72	64.8	43.3	2.90	-3.95
D0224	REPUBLICAN VALLEY	WASHINGTON	74.4	53.2	3.39	2.68	0.61	71.5	54.1	3.11	0.87
D0225	FOWLER	MEADE	63.1	51.9	3.32	-0.51	0.39	63.7	53.1	3.18	-0.76
D0226	MEADE	MEADE	68.1	53.6	3.39	1.30	0.87	65.7	52.5	3.32	0.45
D0227	JETMORE	HODGEMAN	66.0	47.7	3.58	0.76	1.59	65.8	46.0	3.49	0.31
D0228	HANSTON	HODGEMAN	63.9	49.2	3.46	-0.08	3.05	64.5	48.2	3.69	1.59
D0229	SOUTHEAST JOHNSON CO	JOHNSON	68.5	58.2	3.67	3.67	3.93	69.0	56.5	3.56	3.39
D0230	SPRING HILL	JOHNSON	68.9	49.4	3.67	2.20	1.38	66.7	50.8	3.61	2.11
D0231	GARDNER-EDGERTON-ANTIOCH	JOHNSON	64.8	51.5	3.65	1.53	0.69	64.2	49.9	3.41	0.15
D0	DESOTO	JOHNSON	66.3	57.8	3.74	3.46	1.98	69.7	55.3	3.87	5.20
D0	OLATHE	JOHNSON	69.2	59.9	3.61	3.82	3.45	70.0	61.4	3.46	3.92

1-134
T-133

District #	District	County	Reading Index 98-99	Math Power 98-99	Writing Composite 98-99	Actual Z-Score 98-99	Predicted Z-Score 98-99	Reading Index 97-98	Math Power 97-98	Writing Composite 97-98	Actual Z-Score 97-98
D0234	FT SCOTT	BOURBON	65.6	49.8	3.42	0.21	-1.16	62.9	47.8	3.31	-1.13
D0235	UNIONTOWN	BOURBON	67.9	49.2	3.40	0.53	-0.45	69.6	49.8	3.41	1.43
D0237	SMITH CENTER	SMITH	68.9	55.6	4.03	5.18	0.87	69.4	55.3	3.53	3.09
D0238	WEST SMITH COUNTY	SMITH	67.7	53.6	3.44	1.47	3.08	60.7	48.5	3.45	-0.70
D0239	NORTH OTTAWA COUNTY	OTTAWA	67.6	47.2	3.59	1.10	0.07	68.0	48.7	3.38	0.66
D0240	TWIN VALLEY	OTTAWA	67.6	46.7	3.29	-0.56	1.28	63.4	50.3	3.16	-1.46
D0241	WALLACE COUNTY SCHOOLS	WALLACE	69.2	52.3	3.75	3.20	-0.65	70.5	52.3	3.79	4.36
D0242	WESKAN	WALLACE	62.5	41.8	3.91	0.63	1.33	71.6	48.3	3.48	2.05
D0243	LEBO-WAVERLY	COFFEY	63.2	48.5	3.19	-1.77	0.11	66.7	49.5	3.27	-0.16
D0244	BURLINGTON	COFFEY	68.5	51.9	3.65	2.45	1.07	69.6	51.4	3.25	0.76
D0245	LEROY-GRIDLEY	COFFEY	64.3	47.0	3.37	-0.85	0.04	63.6	44.3	3.46	-0.71
D0246	NORTHEAST	CRAWFORD	60.8	52.1	3.37	-0.75	-1.02	59.6	49.2	2.90	-4.12
D0247	CHEROKEE	CRAWFORD	61.3	45.7	3.30	-2.13	-1.15	60.1	43.6	3.38	-2.15
D0248	GIRARD	CRAWFORD	66.4	54.5	3.56	1.96	1.68	60.5	49.4	3.49	-0.34
D0249	FRONTENAC PUBLIC SCHOOLS	CRAWFORD	61.8	53.0	3.25	-0.98	-0.33	64.1	50.5	3.43	0.36
D0250	PITTSBURG	CRAWFORD	65.2	52.4	3.54	1.20	-1.53	62.6	45.4	3.22	-2.18
D0251	NORTH LYON COUNTY	LYON	62.3	49.2	3.61	0.33	1.11	63.7	48.9	3.49	0.33
D0252	SOUTHERN LYON COUNTY	LYON	62.5	45.7	3.45	-1.07	0.72	61.5	42.7	3.71	0.00
D0253	EMPORIA	LYON	63.7	47.3	3.58	0.16	-1.54	64.3	50.3	3.66	1.74
D0254	BARBER COUNTY NORTH	BARBER	67.4	49.0	3.65	1.68	-0.48	66.9	47.5	3.66	1.86
D0255	SOUTH BARBER	BARBER	66.9	55.4	3.06	-0.37	0.28	63.2	53.6	2.89	-2.52
D0256	MARMATON VALLEY	ALLEN	64.2	49.4	3.83	1.95	-0.03	64.8	47.9	3.55	0.77
D0257	IOLA	ALLEN	65.1	50.8	3.69	1.68	-0.81	65.5	48.0	3.58	1.14
D0258	HUMBOLDT	ALLEN	62.0	52.8	3.64	1.06	1.43	60.8	52.3	3.50	0.32
D0259	WICHITA	SEDGWICK	59.9	46.0	3.27	-2.56	-2.78	60.5	46.3	3.34	-1.80
D0260	DERBY	SEDGWICK	65.3	53.7	3.31	0.26	0.70	65.4	50.8	3.34	0.19
D0261	HAYSVILLE	SEDGWICK	62.8	45.8	3.34	-1.56	-0.64	65.0	46.3	3.41	-0.31
D0262	VALLEY CENTER PUBLIC SCHOOLS	SEDGWICK	66.5	48.8	3.46	0.45	1.73	66.8	48.3	3.38	0.31
D0263	MULVANE	SEDGWICK	64.6	51.6	3.18	-0.95	0.95	63.9	47.3	3.60	0.75
D0264	CLEARWATER	SEDGWICK	66.5	62.1	3.43	2.65	2.06	64.9	50.5	3.51	1.03
D0265	GODDARD	SEDGWICK	67.4	51.5	3.47	1.19	0.97	65.8	51.3	3.17	-0.64
D0266	MAIZE	SEDGWICK	67.9	52.9	3.45	1.45	0.72	67.6	52.6	3.34	1.04
D0267	RENWICK	SEDGWICK	70.6	56.4	3.52	3.05	1.95	68.5	57.6	3.48	3.00
D0268	CHENEY	SEDGWICK	60.5	49.2	3.38	-1.28	1.50	64.3	48.5	3.71	1.72
D0269	PALCO	ROOKS	69.3	54.7	3.94	4.64	-0.15	67.1	53.3	3.79	3.73
D0270	PLAINVILLE	ROOKS	60.2	42.8	3.54	-1.65	-0.98	63.4	42.9	3.68	0.31
D0271	STOCKTON	ROOKS	66.6	54.3	3.62	2.28	0.98	62.0	45.1	3.59	-0.17
D0272	WACONDA	MITCHELL	69.5	56.6	3.31	1.74	1.17	66.8	53.5	3.23	0.35
D0273	BELOIT	MITCHELL	62.2	46.8	3.58	-0.27	0.80	63.1	45.3	3.53	-0.23
D0274	OAKLEY	LOGAN	66.9	49.6	3.41	0.42	-0.74	61.0	52.8	3.23	-1.16
DC	TRIPLAINS	LOGAN	69.1	42.6	3.46	-0.05	1.60	61.2	46.0	3.50	-0.73
DC	MANKATO	JEWELL	60.7	43.7	3.35	-2.36	-0.11	64.3	42.6	2.84	-4.55

District #	District	County	Reading Index 98-99	Math Power 98-99	Writing Composite 98-99	Actual Z-Score 98-99	Predicted Z-Score 98-99	Reading Index 97-98	Math Power 97-98	Writing Composite 97-98	Actual Z-Score 97-98
D0279	JEWELL	JEWELL	59.2	47.7	3.50	-1.22	0.97	62.0	49.2	3.64	0.88
D0280	WEST GRAHAM-MORLAND	GRAHAM	75.1	46.1	3.36	1.43	2.78	66.2	45.4	3.57	0.77
D0281	HILL CITY	GRAHAM	63.4	45.8	3.54	-0.38	0.72	65.8	47.0	3.36	-0.29
D0282	WEST ELK	ELK	66.7	52.3	3.50	1.32	-0.84	64.0	53.2	3.20	-0.55
D0283	ELK VALLEY	ELK	64.8	43.2	3.34	-1.56	-3.17	60.9	41.8	2.75	-6.05
D0284	CHASE COUNTY	CHASE	66.0	49.3	3.44	0.32	1.19	66.0	50.0	3.76	2.69
D0285	CEDAR VALE	CHAUTAUQUA	67.8	45.6	3.30	-0.65	-2.11	62.1	37.1	3.14	-4.28
D0286	CHAUTAUQUA COUNTY COMMUNITY	CHAUTAUQUA	62.7	49.4	3.52	-0.01	-0.24	59.7	43.8	3.52	-1.37
D0287	WEST FRANKLIN	FRANKLIN	68.5	54.7	3.39	1.59	0.16	68.6	52.5	3.33	1.20
D0288	CENTRAL HEIGHTS	FRANKLIN	64.9	49.1	3.54	0.55	0.27	67.2	45.2	3.41	0.02
D0289	WELLSVILLE	FRANKLIN	64.5	52.8	3.39	0.33	1.54	64.6	51.4	3.46	0.82
D0290	OTTAWA	FRANKLIN	63.1	48.0	3.43	-0.63	-0.36	62.9	44.7	3.45	-0.86
D0291	GRINNELL PUBLIC SCHOOLS	GOVE	72.9	49.9	3.85	4.15	2.65	70.0	51.4	3.49	2.29
D0292	GRAINFIELD	GOVE	67.7	49.0	3.65	1.75	0.09	72.8	61.3	3.65	5.71
D0293	QUINTER PUBLIC SCHOOLS	GOVE	70.4	54.2	4.08	5.54	2.22	69.2	50.5	3.62	2.71
D0294	OBERLIN	DECATUR	70.2	52.2	3.94	4.40	0.85	71.9	50.3	3.92	5.11
D0295	PRAIRIE HEIGHTS	DECATUR	63.7	48.3	3.31	-1.07	0.95	66.0	42.0	3.76	1.24
D0297	ST FRANCIS COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	CHEYENNE	69.7	53.9	3.72	3.44	-0.07	68.4	47.6	3.73	2.65
D0298	LINCOLN	LINCOLN	70.0	53.3	3.66	3.09	0.85	67.9	49.1	3.60	2.03
D0299	SYLVAN GROVE	LINCOLN	72.7	61.1	3.85	6.09	1.72	67.2	45.4	3.57	1.01
D0300	COMMANCHE COUNTY	COMANCHE	67.6	50.0	3.58	1.54	1.56	65.2	50.6	3.33	0.04
D0301	NES TRES LA GO	NESS	61.8	41.5	3.08	-3.91	2.84	59.9	45.0	3.59	-0.69
D0302	SMOKY HILL	NESS	65.2	45.9	3.54	0.05	1.91	65.2	49.8	3.27	-0.46
D0303	NESS CITY	NESS	66.1	53.0	3.38	0.68	1.04	67.0	46.5	3.51	0.80
D0304	BAZINE	NESS	68.8	45.2	3.54	0.76	1.00	62.9	41.3	3.31	-2.31
D0305	SALINA	SALINE	66.0	50.3	3.27	-0.39	0.98	65.1	48.1	3.33	-0.44
D0306	SOUTHEAST OF SALINE	SALINE	67.9	59.9	3.44	2.63	2.11	68.3	60.4	3.53	3.75
D0307	ELL-SALINE	SALINE	60.7	50.9	3.36	-1.04	0.43	63.6	53.2	3.24	-0.41
D0308	HUTCHINSON PUBLIC SCHOOLS	RENO	63.1	51.5	3.46	0.14	-1.15	64.1	49.7	3.36	-0.20
D0309	NICKERSON	RENO	66.5	51.1	3.26	-0.19	-0.18	64.5	53.3	3.45	1.08
D0310	FAIRFIELD	RENO	64.1	49.4	3.30	-0.83	-1.01	66.8	50.7	3.23	-0.16
D0311	PRETTY PRAIRIE	RENO	69.7	54.3	3.42	1.95	1.06	64.3	50.0	3.17	-1.24
D0312	HAVEN PUBLIC SCHOOLS	RENO	69.9	56.1	3.54	2.94	0.93	68.4	55.4	3.52	2.81
D0313	BUHLER	RENO	70.3	55.0	3.43	2.27	1.15	67.5	54.8	3.60	2.97
D0314	BREWSTER	THOMAS	72.7	56.7	3.40	2.96	1.37	71.2	53.6	3.65	3.93
D0315	COLBY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	THOMAS	67.2	51.4	3.34	0.45	0.72	66.8	49.3	3.53	1.38
D0316	GOLDEN PLAINS	THOMAS	74.7	57.3	3.48	3.95	-0.41	78.2	66.2	3.92	9.50
D0317	HERNDON	RAWLINS	66.8	45.2	3.43	-0.28	0.25	63.2	50.6	3.29	-0.67
D0318	ATWOOD	RAWLINS	71.7	58.2	3.69	4.51	0.16	73.9	57.5	3.92	6.90
D0319	WAMEGO	POTTAWATOMIE	62.6	49.7	3.83	1.64	1.50	64.7	46.6	3.80	2.00
D0320	KAW VALLEY	POTTAWATOMIE	63.4	53.6	3.76	2.15	2.95	67.4	47.8	3.77	2.69
D0321	ONAGA-HAVENSVILLE-WHEATON	POTTAWATOMIE	67.1	54.2	3.42	1.34	1.58	65.5	52.4	3.45	1.16

1-135
1-134

1-136
+135

District #	District	County	Reading Index 98-99	Math Power 98-99	Writing Composite 98-99	Actual Z-Score 98-99	Predicted Z-Score 98-99	Reading Index 97-98	Math Power 97-98	Writing Composite 97-98	Actual Z-Score 97-98
D0323	WESTMORELAND	POTTAWATOMIE	66.8	58.4	3.10	0.34	1.27	65.2	53.8	3.38	0.92
D0324	EASTERN HEIGHTS	PHILLIPS	64.2	48.6	3.42	-0.32	-1.22	57.4	49.2	3.08	-3.57
D0325	PHILLIPSBURG	PHILLIPS	71.9	57.7	3.29	2.38	1.43	70.2	57.7	3.72	4.85
D0326	LOGAN	PHILLIPS	66.9	45.1	3.63	0.77	0.32	68.2	54.7	3.55	2.82
D0327	ELLSWORTH	ELLSWORTH	71.4	52.3	3.69	3.40	0.95	67.7	50.8	3.66	2.65
D0328	LORRAINE	ELLSWORTH	68.2	53.7	3.93	4.16	0.23	70.4	57.4	3.80	5.32
D0329	ALMA	WABAUNSEE	68.2	55.9	3.47	2.15	0.90	67.1	53.4	3.83	3.99
D0330	WABAUNSEE EAST	WABAUNSEE	66.7	53.9	3.53	1.76	0.28	63.6	47.9	3.35	-0.71
D0331	KINGMAN	KINGMAN	64.3	53.9	3.43	0.69	0.97	66.4	50.1	3.35	0.36
D0332	CUNNINGHAM	KINGMAN	70.0	56.3	3.39	2.22	-0.56	68.5	53.3	3.57	2.75
D0333	CONCORDIA	CLOUD	68.5	57.8	3.38	2.09	-0.23	67.2	53.9	3.46	1.89
D0334	SOUTHERN CLOUD	CLOUD	60.1	40.1	3.01	-4.91	0.07	61.4	42.3	3.21	-3.09
D0335	NORTH JACKSON	JACKSON	61.0	47.1	3.40	-1.43	2.09	61.1	46.8	3.90	1.78
D0336	HOLTON	JACKSON	63.3	52.2	3.60	1.04	2.03	65.7	47.9	3.53	0.87
D0337	MAYETTA	JACKSON	64.3	53.4	3.13	-0.96	-0.51	63.3	47.0	2.96	-3.28
D0338	VALLEY FALLS	JEFFERSON	62.8	44.7	3.48	-1.03	0.69	69.8	50.3	3.51	2.16
D0339	JEFFERSON COUNTY NORTH	JEFFERSON	65.6	54.6	3.85	3.30	1.11	66.4	57.3	3.39	1.90
D0340	JEFFERSON WEST	JEFFERSON	61.2	48.1	3.31	-1.68	1.56	63.5	51.7	3.52	0.97
D0341	OSKALOOSA PUBLIC SCHOOLS	JEFFERSON	63.4	51.4	3.26	-0.85	0.55	68.5	49.6	3.28	0.35
D0342	MCLOUTH	JEFFERSON	60.9	50.0	3.49	-0.47	1.57	60.9	45.3	3.47	-1.11
D0343	PERRY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	JEFFERSON	66.4	50.8	3.39	0.42	0.96	70.0	52.9	3.38	1.90
D0344	PLEASANTON	LINN	56.1	52.4	3.13	-3.03	-0.11	59.7	45.9	3.00	-4.10
D0345	SEAMAN	SHAWNEE	64.1	49.1	3.26	-1.09	1.28	63.9	49.5	3.21	-1.19
D0346	JAYHAWK	LINN	65.5	46.0	3.46	-0.28	-0.31	68.7	47.4	3.50	1.31
D0347	KINSLEY-OFFERLE	EDWARDS	59.8	46.5	3.49	-1.35	0.09	63.5	50.3	3.67	1.61
D0348	BALDWIN CITY	DOUGLAS	65.2	45.9	3.28	-1.30	1.45	60.5	45.4	3.14	-3.16
D0349	STAFFORD	STAFFORD	61.5	50.8	3.43	-0.50	-1.86	62.6	52.2	3.05	-1.96
D0350	ST JOHN-HUDSON	STAFFORD	69.7	47.0	3.31	0.08	-0.61	67.9	50.0	3.42	1.12
D0351	MACKSVILLE	STAFFORD	62.5	50.3	3.39	-0.57	-1.46	64.8	46.4	3.38	-0.52
D0352	GOODLAND	SHERMAN	62.2	47.2	3.27	-1.82	-0.63	62.8	45.5	3.14	-2.59
D0353	WELLINGTON	SUMNER	59.5	48.6	3.24	-2.35	-0.79	60.2	41.8	3.26	-3.17
D0354	CLAFLIN	BARTON	68.6	53.2	3.29	0.83	1.89	67.1	55.3	3.05	-0.32
D0355	ELLINWOOD PUBLIC SCHOOLS	BARTON	64.5	51.3	3.54	0.85	0.45	70.5	53.4	3.30	1.64
D0356	CONWAY SPRINGS	SUMNER	67.2	47.0	3.44	0.19	1.17	62.7	43.5	3.32	-1.90
D0357	BELLE PLAINE	SUMNER	65.4	45.6	3.05	-2.51	1.53	60.0	44.8	3.35	-2.13
D0358	OXFORD	SUMNER	63.0	42.3	3.21	-2.81	1.77	61.2	47.4	3.24	-2.03
D0359	ARGONIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS	SUMNER	66.5	44.1	3.39	-0.75	-0.45	67.6	50.8	3.43	1.25
D0360	CALDWELL	SUMNER	62.6	45.7	3.17	-2.51	0.42	61.6	43.1	2.88	-4.87
D0361	ANTHONY-HARPER	HARPER	64.2	46.4	3.20	-1.86	-0.10	64.3	48.2	3.13	-1.80
D0362	PRAIRIE VIEW	LINN	65.4	55.8	3.72	2.79	1.03	61.4	47.2	3.43	-0.88
D0	HOLCOMB	FINNEY	61.0	52.6	3.60	0.59	0.30	62.8	45.5	3.39	-1.10
D0	MARYSVILLE	MARSHALL	63.1	47.3	3.41	-0.86	2.27	65.6	46.5	3.33	-0.61

District #	District	County	Reading Index 98-99	Math Power 98-99	Writing Composite 98-99	Actual Z-Score 98-99	Predicted Z-Score 98-99	Reading Index 97-98	Math Power 97-98	Writing Composite 97-98	Actual Z-Score 97-98
D0365	GARNETT	ANDERSON	65.3	57.2	3.22	0.41	0.14	64.1	54.4	3.23	-0.13
D0366	WOODSON	WOODSON	68.2	48.9	3.72	2.21	-1.23	64.2	49.9	3.93	3.26
D0367	OSAWATOMIE	MIAMI	58.8	48.0	3.63	-0.58	-2.11	61.6	49.7	3.48	-0.08
D0368	PAOLA	MIAMI	64.7	47.1	3.78	1.40	0.45	66.7	48.5	3.65	1.93
D0369	BURRTON	HARVEY	69.3	48.5	3.20	-0.31	1.22	68.1	50.6	3.22	0.08
D0371	MONTEZUMA	GRAY	61.2	42.1	3.36	-2.48	-0.73	63.8	45.5	3.57	0.22
D0372	SILVER LAKE	SHAWNEE	71.3	54.7	3.44	2.50	1.93	68.0	57.4	3.24	1.41
D0373	NEWTON	HARVEY	61.7	50.1	3.54	-0.01	-0.37	61.7	45.1	3.33	-1.79
D0374	SUBLETTE	HASKELL	67.4	49.0	3.39	0.33	-1.22	64.1	48.5	3.49	0.35
D0375	CIRCLE	BUTLER	67.5	55.2	3.31	1.03	1.42	65.8	51.4	3.31	0.21
D0376	STERLING	RICE	69.2	46.9	3.56	1.25	0.07	64.2	50.6	3.44	0.46
D0377	ATCHISON CO COMM SCHOOLS	ATCHISON	63.4	53.5	3.86	2.55	0.70	63.7	50.4	3.68	1.74
D0378	RILEY COUNTY	RILEY	68.8	60.1	3.10	1.11	1.45	65.7	49.2	3.16	-1.11
D0379	CLAY CENTER	CLAY	66.0	56.9	3.58	2.39	0.10	69.3	57.0	3.48	3.08
D0380	VERMILLION	MARSHALL	70.5	56.1	3.44	2.56	0.53	70.0	57.0	3.31	2.23
D0381	SPEARVILLE-WINDTHORST	FORD	65.6	44.7	3.05	-2.62	1.33	68.4	52.2	3.07	-0.46
D0382	PRATT	PRATT	65.1	51.2	3.45	0.50	0.30	67.1	49.3	3.47	1.10
D0383	MANHATTAN	RILEY	66.1	51.7	3.43	0.71	0.93	65.6	49.4	3.44	0.58
D0384	BLUE VALLEY	RILEY	68.3	50.9	3.87	3.37	0.55	69.1	51.0	3.60	2.66
D0385	ANDOVER	BUTLER	69.1	53.3	3.30	1.01	1.65	68.4	53.2	3.34	1.34
D0386	MADISON-VIRGIL	GREENWOOD	60.2	45.1	3.26	-2.70	-0.43	68.0	46.0	3.32	-0.18
D0387	ALTOONA-MIDWAY	WILSON	67.4	49.2	3.35	0.15	-0.06	68.8	55.5	3.31	1.67
D0388	ELLIS	ELLIS	68.9	52.4	3.52	1.95	0.84	69.3	54.8	3.61	3.46
D0389	EUREKA	GREENWOOD	61.8	50.9	3.65	0.73	-0.27	67.9	47.1	3.52	1.19
D0390	HAMILTON	GREENWOOD	71.1	50.1	3.60	2.47	-0.26	70.9	49.8	3.44	1.91
D0392	OSBORNE COUNTY	OSBORNE	68.7	51.1	3.39	1.00	-0.07	65.7	47.5	3.23	-1.00
D0393	SOLOMON	DICKINSON	66.8	43.4	3.38	-0.86	-0.15	65.7	44.3	3.16	-2.00
D0394	ROSE HILL PUBLIC SCHOOLS	BUTLER	62.9	51.8	3.24	-1.00	1.07	64.5	51.5	3.32	-0.02
D0395	LACROSSE	RUSH	68.1	51.3	3.47	1.31	-0.55	62.2	45.0	3.39	-1.33
D0396	DOUGLASS PUBLIC SCHOOLS	BUTLER	68.3	55.8	3.20	0.75	1.96	58.1	45.7	3.15	-3.62
D0397	CENTRE	MARION	63.9	55.3	3.39	0.64	-0.24	60.7	49.5	3.46	-0.46
D0398	PEABODY-BURNS	MARION	62.0	48.9	3.35	-1.14	0.26	64.3	46.4	3.16	-1.95
D0399	PARADISE	RUSSELL	67.1	50.8	3.58	1.57	-0.29	71.7	48.5	3.65	3.12
D0400	LINDSBORG	MCPHERSON	65.4	49.9	3.30	-0.44	1.88	64.7	49.9	3.40	0.21
D0401	CHASE	RICE	59.6	41.0	3.08	-4.50	-1.22	59.9	44.8	3.23	-2.87
D0402	AUGUSTA	BUTLER	63.2	47.0	3.30	-1.46	0.75	65.0	48.1	3.30	-0.64
D0403	OTIS-BISON	RUSH	68.5	52.6	3.49	1.74	-2.16	67.9	51.2	3.18	-0.10
D0404	RIVERTON	CHEROKEE	61.5	48.4	3.36	-1.29	-1.23	64.5	45.7	3.13	-2.21
D0405	LYONS	RICE	65.1	58.2	3.61	2.57	-0.43	65.0	57.9	3.53	2.51
D0400	WATHENA	DONIPHAN	65.7	45.3	3.26	-1.40	0.59	66.6	45.2	3.12	-1.86
D0400	RUSSELL COUNTY	RUSSELL	66.7	49.6	3.40	0.32	-0.34	65.3	51.9	3.31	0.18
D0400	MARION	MARION	66.9	52.2	3.20	-0.21	0.83	66.7	48.2	3.30	-0.21

237
137

District #	District	County	Reading Index 98-99	Math Power 98-99	Writing Composite 98-99	Actual Z-Score 98-99	Predicted Z-Score 98-99	Reading Index 97-98	Math Power 97-98	Writing Composite 97-98	Actual Z-Score 97-98
D0409	ATCHISON PUBLIC SCHOOLS	ATCHISON	63.0	45.3	3.22	-2.23	-2.04	54.9	42.0	3.17	-4.93
D0410	DURHAM-HILLSBORO-LEHIGH	MARION	69.2	61.3	3.79	5.01	1.94	70.7	55.8	3.70	4.51
D0411	GOESSEL	MARION	71.1	63.3	3.81	5.90	3.49	68.1	58.3	3.63	3.92
D0412	HOXIE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	SHERIDAN	69.9	53.1	3.73	3.40	1.12	71.5	54.5	3.65	4.17
D0413	CHANUTE PUBLIC SCHOOLS	NEOSHO	63.7	46.9	3.31	-1.31	-0.85	66.5	44.8	3.52	0.44
D0415	HIAWATHA	BROWN	68.1	48.9	3.24	-0.31	0.58	65.6	46.5	3.21	-1.32
D0416	LOUISBURG	MIAMI	63.7	47.7	3.64	0.55	1.51	61.4	45.0	3.36	-1.70
D0417	MORRIS COUNTY	MORRIS	67.2	49.0	3.33	-0.03	-0.16	66.3	46.3	3.14	-1.61
D0418	MCPHERSON	MCPHERSON	66.7	58.3	3.38	1.76	1.65	65.6	52.5	3.36	0.66
D0419	CANTON-GALVA	MCPHERSON	63.1	51.3	3.91	2.45	1.50	62.7	50.6	3.87	2.67
D0420	OSAGE CITY	OSAGE	60.4	50.7	3.44	-0.72	0.73	61.9	49.9	3.27	-1.23
D0421	LYNDON	OSAGE	63.9	50.0	3.53	0.43	1.10	66.9	46.5	3.35	-0.18
D0422	GREENSBURG	KIOWA	67.1	57.3	3.58	2.72	0.24	69.3	49.3	3.54	2.04
D0423	MOUNDRIDGE	MCPHERSON	70.5	58.0	3.31	2.22	3.51	73.6	63.6	3.24	3.87
D0424	MULLINVILLE	KIOWA	62.4	55.8	3.42	0.54	0.28	68.6	51.1	3.94	4.59
D0425	HIGHLAND	DONIPHAN	66.0	51.3	3.37	0.31	-0.11	71.4	54.1	3.47	2.99
D0426	PIKE VALLEY	REPUBLIC	62.6	51.9	3.06	-1.98	0.65	68.8	54.8	3.19	0.83
D0427	BELLEVILLE	REPUBLIC	70.0	55.7	3.27	1.49	0.61	73.3	50.0	2.97	-0.28
D0428	GREAT BEND	BARTON	65.2	48.8	3.62	0.98	-1.42	65.8	47.6	3.51	0.72
D0429	TROY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	DONIPHAN	67.1	47.2	3.63	1.19	1.06	66.6	45.1	3.60	0.99
D0430	BROWN COUNTY	BROWN	63.8	44.8	3.42	-1.09	-1.03	58.8	44.6	3.29	-2.81
D0431	HOISINGTON	BARTON	64.4	50.9	3.63	1.22	-0.35	61.9	44.3	3.33	-1.89
D0432	VICTORIA	ELLIS	69.3	51.6	3.77	3.21	1.84	67.9	55.9	3.64	3.50
D0433	MIDWAY SCHOOLS	DONIPHAN	66.2	52.4	3.26	-0.02	-0.99	67.7	49.8	3.51	1.57
D0434	SANTA FE TRAIL	OSAGE	65.5	54.8	3.32	0.55	0.62	66.1	51.4	3.50	1.42
D0435	ABILENE	DICKINSON	62.7	48.6	3.52	-0.15	0.39	63.5	49.0	3.18	-1.55
D0436	CANEY VALLEY	MONTGOMERY	64.1	45.2	3.56	-0.22	0.14	64.4	48.8	3.48	0.42
D0437	AUBURN WASHBURN	SHAWNEE	67.6	56.7	3.29	1.22	1.50	67.3	52.3	3.34	0.91
D0438	SKYLINE SCHOOLS	PRATT	62.8	47.2	3.89	1.55	0.17	66.6	50.4	3.47	1.18
D0439	SEDGWICK PUBLIC SCHOOLS	HARVEY	64.9	53.7	3.44	0.84	0.68	64.1	56.4	3.28	0.53
D0440	HALSTEAD	HARVEY	63.4	48.7	3.27	-1.27	0.19	68.0	46.0	3.12	-1.38
D0441	SABETHA	NEMAHA	66.7	54.8	3.45	1.51	1.57	69.1	52.1	3.63	3.04
D0442	NEMAHA VALLEY SCHOOLS	NEMAHA	64.4	55.6	3.45	1.12	0.76	63.6	58.1	3.48	1.92
D0443	DODGE CITY	FORD	60.8	45.5	3.26	-2.49	-1.71	62.1	45.9	3.38	-1.25
D0444	LITTLE RIVER	RICE	72.4	55.9	3.70	4.32	1.30	71.4	56.9	3.77	5.29
D0445	COFFEYVILLE	MONTGOMERY	61.5	44.3	3.33	-2.18	-1.61	61.8	43.0	3.08	-3.64
D0446	INDEPENDENCE	MONTGOMERY	63.0	49.3	3.21	-1.57	-0.65	62.4	47.3	3.26	-1.64
D0447	CHERRYVALE	MONTGOMERY	62.9	41.2	3.14	-3.40	-1.63	62.4	42.6	3.59	-0.52
D0448	INMAN	MCPHERSON	66.1	59.6	3.46	2.27	1.80	62.9	51.9	3.25	-0.75
D0449	EASTON	LEAVENWORTH	65.7	53.2	3.53	1.41	1.06	63.6	46.6	3.55	0.25
D0	SHAWNEE HEIGHTS	SHAWNEE	67.7	52.8	3.31	0.65	1.67	65.5	50.0	3.39	0.36
D0	B & B	NEMAHA	76.3	58.8	3.75	5.99	-0.69	74.6	53.6	3.52	3.97

District #	District	County	Reading Index 98-99	Math Power 98-99	Writing Composite 98-99	Actual Z-Score 98-99	Predicted Z-Score 98-99	Reading Index 97-98	Math Power 97-98	Writing Composite 97-98	Actual Z-Score 97-98
D0452	STANTON COUNTY	STANTON	60.8	48.4	3.49	-0.78	-0.54	72.8	50.9	3.58	3.40
D0453	LEAVENWORTH	LEAVENWORTH	61.2	46.8	3.38	-1.54	-0.73	60.5	46.1	3.25	-2.37
D0454	BURLINGAME PUBLIC SCHOOLS	OSAGE	67.1	50.7	3.26	-0.12	-1.82	60.7	42.6	2.96	-4.69
D0455	HILLCREST RURAL SCHOOLS	REPUBLIC	56.4	46.6	3.03	-4.51	-0.05	64.3	50.9	3.41	0.36
D0456	MARAIS DES CYGNES VALLEY	OSAGE	65.6	43.3	3.63	0.15	-1.42	59.5	42.6	3.43	-2.17
D0457	GARDEN CITY	FINNEY	61.1	42.2	3.28	-2.90	-1.44	60.4	44.4	3.22	-2.89
D0458	BASEHOR-LINWOOD	LEAVENWORTH	65.3	53.3	3.54	1.39	1.21	62.0	47.3	3.43	-0.72
D0459	BUCKLIN	FORD	65.9	47.8	3.64	1.07	-0.45	62.6	46.7	3.55	0.03
D0460	HESSTON	HARVEY	68.7	56.7	3.67	3.45	-0.22	66.1	54.1	3.50	1.91
D0461	NEODESHA	WILSON	57.8	42.6	3.20	-4.01	-0.16	57.7	43.3	3.44	-2.42
D0462	CENTRAL	COWLEY	62.1	48.3	3.46	-0.65	0.52	63.1	45.5	3.24	-1.92
D0463	UDALL	COWLEY	61.2	48.6	3.32	-1.54	0.88	59.7	54.0	3.61	1.02
D0464	TONGANOXIE	LEAVENWORTH	68.8	56.8	3.69	3.60	1.54	68.8	57.1	3.64	3.93
D0465	WINFIELD	COWLEY	62.8	45.8	3.58	-0.31	0.49	62.6	45.9	3.49	-0.48
D0466	SCOTT COUNTY	SCOTT	67.9	54.9	3.58	2.48	0.82	64.5	51.1	3.60	1.58
D0467	LEOTI	WICHITA	69.1	50.4	3.61	2.11	-0.14	68.2	50.4	3.55	2.04
D0468	HEALY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	LANE	69.1	50.5	3.51	1.61	2.12	68.1	53.3	3.26	0.81
D0469	LANSING	LEAVENWORTH	69.6	48.7	3.63	2.03	1.40	66.9	46.2	3.31	-0.47
D0470	ARKANSAS CITY	COWLEY	61.4	44.2	3.35	-2.11	-1.95	62.0	42.9	3.31	-2.24
D0471	DEXTER	COWLEY	69.4	54.2	3.67	3.17	0.47	67.4	54.7	3.49	2.27
D0473	CHAPMAN	DICKINSON	68.1	56.1	3.26	1.07	0.26	70.1	53.0	3.38	1.95
D0474	HAVILAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS	KIOWA	70.4	49.7	3.31	0.72	0.27	60.7	48.5	3.38	-1.11
D0475	JUNCTION CITY	GEARY	64.2	54.0	3.41	0.58	-1.74	63.7	51.7	3.27	-0.48
D0476	COPELAND	GRAY	63.1	55.4	3.33	0.16	1.04	65.7	53.6	3.44	1.36
D0477	INGALLS	GRAY	62.1	48.1	3.28	-1.63	0.36	65.0	46.3	3.31	-0.91
D0479	CREST	ANDERSON	65.0	54.4	3.41	0.84	-1.29	64.6	44.9	3.35	-1.02
D0480	LIBERAL	SEWARD	55.7	54.4	3.37	-1.52	-2.16	58.5	48.0	3.21	-2.75
D0481	RURAL VISTA	DICKINSON	62.6	47.2	3.18	-2.19	0.45	64.3	46.7	3.32	-0.94
D0482	DIGHTON	LANE	75.8	57.4	3.05	1.98	0.46	72.3	53.7	3.44	2.96
D0483	KISMET-PLAINS	SEWARD	64.5	46.3	3.40	-0.77	-0.35	66.8	44.3	3.22	-1.38
D0484	FREDONIA	WILSON	62.8	43.1	3.39	-1.78	-0.86	65.4	43.9	3.47	-0.29
D0486	ELWOOD	DONIPHAN	56.5	44.0	3.12	-4.48	-1.44	60.2	39.9	3.16	-4.11
D0487	HERINGTON	DICKINSON	65.8	48.7	3.39	-0.10	0.37	67.3	52.6	3.52	2.04
D0488	AXTELL	MARSHALL	65.9	46.9	3.54	0.39	2.41	68.0	49.7	3.05	-1.13
D0489	HAYS	ELLIS	65.0	51.4	3.52	0.88	1.82	65.5	53.8	3.46	1.47
D0490	EL DORADO	BUTLER	64.2	48.6	3.26	-1.16	-0.99	63.5	50.2	3.32	-0.50
D0491	EUDORA	DOUGLAS	67.8	51.6	3.58	1.87	-0.22	64.5	49.8	3.62	1.46
D0492	FLINTHILLS	BUTLER	61.6	48.2	3.34	-1.41	1.24	64.9	43.1	3.21	-2.11
D0493	COLUMBUS	CHEROKEE	64.1	54.6	3.40	0.61	-1.37	61.3	47.1	3.27	-1.88
D0494	SYRACUSE	HAMILTON	59.9	43.9	3.22	-3.19	-1.17	58.4	46.1	3.24	-2.94
D0495	FT LARNED	PAWNEE	60.4	43.7	3.21	-3.16	-0.48	63.2	45.6	3.31	-1.46
D0496	PAWNEE HEIGHTS	PAWNEE	67.4	56.0	3.53	2.30	2.75	69.0	56.4	3.33	2.00

1-138

1-140
H-139

District #	District	County	Reading Index 98-99	Math Power 98-99	Writing Composite 98-99	Actual Z-Score 98-99	Predicted Z-Score 98-99	Reading Index 97-98	Math Power 97-98	Writing Composite 97-98	Actual Z-Score 97-98
D0497	LAWRENCE	DOUGLAS	66.5	53.0	3.35	0.62	1.18	66.7	51.7	3.43	1.20
D0498	VALLEY HEIGHTS	MARSHALL	65.0	58.2	3.87	3.91	-0.49	67.2	49.2	3.57	1.70
D0499	GALENA	CHEROKEE	64.8	43.6	3.65	0.13	-3.18	65.5	44.3	3.47	-0.19
D0500	KANSAS CITY	WYANDOTTE	52.5	38.5	3.07	-6.63	-5.41	53.3	38.2	3.26	-5.47
D0501	TOPEKA PUBLIC SCHOOLS	SHAWNEE	61.0	47.0	3.20	-2.49	-3.06	60.3	45.4	3.14	-3.21
D0502	LEWIS	EDWARDS	72.9	53.7	3.35	2.22	0.08	67.3	44.6	3.34	-0.49
D0503	PARSONS	LABETTE	63.8	51.5	3.40	-0.01	-1.98	62.2	45.3	3.32	-1.70
D0504	OSWEGO	LABETTE	64.0	51.7	4.02	3.31	-1.03	69.3	51.8	3.84	4.29
D0505	CHETOPA	LABETTE	58.5	42.1	3.37	-3.05	-4.00	67.3	45.3	3.29	-0.66
D0506	LABETTE COUNTY	LABETTE	67.1	50.6	3.44	0.80	0.74	65.1	50.5	3.48	0.90
D0507	SATANTA	HASKELL	54.0	41.9	3.40	-3.97	-1.68	62.2	47.2	3.19	-2.13
D0508	BAXTER SPRINGS	CHEROKEE	57.9	46.0	3.43	-2.18	-1.89	58.5	46.2	3.34	-2.30
D0509	SOUTH HAVEN	SUMNER	57.3	40.5	3.36	-3.66	0.07	63.3	48.9	3.32	-0.78
D0511	ATTICA	HARPER	62.5	50.5	3.53	0.19	1.79	58.3	49.3	3.75	0.67
D0512	SHAWNEE MISSION PUBLIC SCHOOLS	JOHNSON	68.7	58.8	3.53	3.09	2.60	68.7	58.4	3.57	3.73

1-14/1-14-10

APPENDIX III

1998-99 SPENDING DATA FOR ALL DISTRICTS

District #	District	County	Instuctional Spending per Pupil	General Administration per Pupil	School Administration per Pupil	Plant M&O per Pupil	Total Spending per Pupil	Predicted Spending per Pupil
D0101	ERIE-ST PAUL	NEOSHO	\$3,442	\$371	\$361	\$675	\$4,849	\$5,353
D0102	CIMARRON-ENSIGN	GRAY	\$3,059	\$256	\$409	\$817	\$4,541	\$4,623
D0103	CHEYLIN	CHEYENNE	\$4,678	\$839	\$524	\$1,208	\$7,249	\$6,147
D0104	WHITE ROCK	JEWELL	\$4,879	\$404	\$402	\$1,178	\$6,864	\$6,610
D0200	GREELEY COUNTY	GREELEY	\$4,056	\$465	\$381	\$897	\$5,800	\$5,453
D0202	TURNER-KANSAS CITY	WYANDOTTE	\$3,091	\$263	\$454	\$826	\$4,634	\$4,506
D0203	PIPER-KANSAS CITY	WYANDOTTE	\$3,146	\$224	\$446	\$688	\$4,504	\$5,079
D0204	BONNER SPRINGS	WYANDOTTE	\$3,307	\$116	\$495	\$747	\$4,665	\$4,363
D0205	LEON	BUTLER	\$3,602	\$327	\$510	\$627	\$5,065	\$5,155
D0206	REMINGTON-WHITEWATER	BUTLER	\$4,281	\$308	\$446	\$722	\$5,757	\$5,504
D0207	FT LEAVENWORTH	LEAVENWORTH	\$2,923	\$217	\$265	\$469	\$3,874	
D0208	WAKEENEY	TREGO	\$3,831	\$363	\$342	\$922	\$5,458	\$4,891
D0209	MOSCOW PUBLIC SCHOOLS	STEVENS	\$5,665	\$969	\$893	\$1,120	\$8,647	\$7,565
D0210	HUGOTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS	STEVENS	\$3,417	\$236	\$392	\$820	\$4,866	\$5,695
D0211	NORTON COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	NORTON	\$3,661	\$272	\$428	\$640	\$5,002	\$4,865
D0212	NORTHERN VALLEY	NORTON	\$4,458	\$741	\$601	\$1,105	\$6,906	\$6,578
D0213	WEST SOLOMON VALLEY SCHOOLS	NORTON	\$5,640	\$1,377	\$356	\$1,342	\$8,714	\$7,055
D0214	ULYSSES	GRANT	\$3,334	\$273	\$434	\$618	\$4,659	\$4,851
D0215	LAKIN	KEARNY	\$3,520	\$319	\$416	\$768	\$5,023	\$5,490
D0216	DEERFIELD	KEARNY	\$3,968	\$452	\$493	\$863	\$5,777	\$5,908
D0217	ROLLA	MORTON	\$5,681	\$719	\$647	\$1,387	\$8,434	\$7,403
D0218	ELKHART	MORTON	\$4,639	\$469	\$509	\$917	\$6,534	\$5,610
D0219	MINNEOLA	CLARK	\$3,665	\$581	\$565	\$875	\$5,687	\$5,683
D0220	ASHLAND	CLARK	\$4,233	\$703	\$588	\$815	\$6,338	\$6,327
D0221	NORTH CENTRAL	WASHINGTON	\$4,628	\$827	\$550	\$917	\$6,921	\$6,430
D0222	WASHINGTON SCHOOLS	WASHINGTON	\$4,346	\$470	\$399	\$838	\$6,053	\$5,364
D0223	BARNES	WASHINGTON	\$4,258	\$476	\$375	\$714	\$5,823	\$6,258
D0224	REPUBLICAN VALLEY	WASHINGTON	\$4,165	\$370	\$490	\$895	\$5,920	\$5,951
D0225	FOWLER	MEADE	\$4,956	\$1,075	\$895	\$1,101	\$8,027	\$6,656
D0226	MEADE	MEADE	\$3,714	\$452	\$424	\$914	\$5,505	\$5,494
D0227	JETMORE	HODGEMAN	\$4,275	\$231	\$373	\$710	\$5,588	\$5,326
D0228	HANSTON	HODGEMAN	\$5,304	\$663	\$745	\$981	\$7,693	\$6,705
D0229	SOUTHEAST JOHNSON CO	JOHNSON	\$3,371	\$102	\$395	\$656	\$4,524	\$4,424
D0230	SPRING HILL	JOHNSON	\$3,340	\$417	\$488	\$728	\$4,974	\$5,090
D0231	GARDNER-EDGERTON-ANTIOCH	JOHNSON	\$3,038	\$361	\$325	\$654	\$4,378	\$4,521
D0232	DESOTO	JOHNSON	\$3,287	\$570	\$434	\$668	\$4,959	\$4,816

District #	District	County	Instuctional Spending per Pupil	General Administration per Pupil	School Administration per Pupil	Plant M&O per Pupil	Total Spending per Pupil	Predicted Spending per Pupil
D0233	OLATHE	JOHNSON	\$3,233	\$47	\$283	\$559	\$4,123	\$4,103
D0234	FT SCOTT	BOURBON	\$2,837	\$172	\$269	\$497	\$3,775	\$3,565
D0235	UNIONTOWN	BOURBON	\$3,724	\$463	\$472	\$772	\$5,431	\$4,616
D0237	SMITH CENTER	SMITH	\$4,004	\$354	\$438	\$1,059	\$5,854	\$4,592
D0238	WEST SMITH COUNTY	SMITH	\$5,141	\$759	\$407	\$628	\$6,935	\$5,847
D0239	NORTH OTTAWA COUNTY	OTTAWA	\$3,396	\$288	\$444	\$933	\$5,061	\$4,811
D0240	TWIN VALLEY	OTTAWA	\$3,620	\$309	\$573	\$708	\$5,210	\$5,269
D0241	WALLACE COUNTY SCHOOLS	WALLACE	\$3,750	\$373	\$589	\$833	\$5,545	\$5,330
D0242	WESKAN	WALLACE	\$4,841	\$1,152	\$38	\$1,447	\$7,478	\$7,199
D0243	LEBO-WAVERLY	COFFEY	\$3,419	\$293	\$561	\$856	\$5,129	\$5,553
D0244	BURLINGTON	COFFEY	\$4,106	\$280	\$463	\$905	\$5,755	\$6,547
D0245	LEROY-GRIDLEY	COFFEY	\$3,726	\$365	\$448	\$528	\$5,067	\$5,806
D0246	NORTHEAST	CRAWFORD	\$3,608	\$462	\$399	\$619	\$5,088	\$4,511
D0247	CHEROKEE	CRAWFORD	\$3,399	\$280	\$457	\$720	\$4,856	\$4,922
D0248	GIRARD	CRAWFORD	\$4,049	\$199	\$25	\$528	\$4,801	\$4,796
D0249	FRONTENAC PUBLIC SCHOOLS	CRAWFORD	\$3,120	\$286	\$372	\$728	\$4,506	\$4,461
D0250	PITTSBURG	CRAWFORD	\$3,001	\$285	\$253	\$533	\$4,072	\$3,743
D0251	NORTH LYON COUNTY	LYON	\$3,609	\$306	\$515	\$661	\$5,091	\$4,920
D0252	SOUTHERN LYON COUNTY	LYON	\$3,585	\$260	\$411	\$724	\$4,981	\$5,195
D0253	EMPORIA	LYON	\$2,754	\$189	\$312	\$649	\$3,904	\$3,924
D0254	BARBER COUNTY NORTH	BARBER	\$3,251	\$292	\$362	\$830	\$4,734	\$4,715
D0255	SOUTH BARBER	BARBER	\$3,737	\$427	\$520	\$1,025	\$5,709	\$5,801
D0256	MARMATON VALLEY	ALLEN	\$3,845	\$312	\$438	\$741	\$5,336	\$5,076
D0257	IOLA	ALLEN	\$3,114	\$151	\$395	\$913	\$4,572	\$4,593
D0258	HUMBOLDT	ALLEN	\$3,773	\$494	\$526	\$615	\$5,407	\$5,144
D0259	WICHITA	SEDGWICK	\$2,868	\$28	\$369	\$492	\$3,757	\$3,598
D0260	DERBY	SEDGWICK	\$2,797	\$95	\$260	\$561	\$3,713	\$3,692
D0261	HAYSVILLE	SEDGWICK	\$2,776	\$107	\$307	\$695	\$3,886	\$4,039
D0262	VALLEY CENTER PUBLIC SCHOOLS	SEDGWICK	\$3,131	\$201	\$343	\$416	\$4,091	\$4,121
D0263	MULVANE	SEDGWICK	\$2,661	\$218	\$370	\$511	\$3,760	\$4,251
D0264	CLEARWATER	SEDGWICK	\$3,304	\$159	\$410	\$539	\$4,411	\$4,848
D0265	GODDARD	SEDGWICK	\$2,767	\$232	\$300	\$609	\$3,908	\$3,962
D0266	MAIZE	SEDGWICK	\$3,329	\$252	\$288	\$521	\$4,389	\$4,072
D0267	RENWICK	SEDGWICK	\$3,123	\$195	\$420	\$565	\$4,302	\$5,113
D0268	CHENEY	SEDGWICK	\$3,399	\$467	\$477	\$657	\$5,000	\$5,113
D0269	PALCO	ROOKS	\$5,178	\$943	\$825	\$1,100	\$8,046	\$6,929
D0270	PLAINVILLE	ROOKS	\$3,357	\$709	\$442	\$835	\$5,343	\$5,441
D0271	STOCKTON	ROOKS	\$3,862	\$339	\$438	\$652	\$5,292	\$4,880
D0272	WACONDA	MITCHELL	\$3,975	\$375	\$542	\$827	\$5,719	\$5,917
D0273	BELOIT	MITCHELL	\$3,688	\$331	\$439	\$611	\$5,069	\$4,624

1-11-1

1-143
+42

District #	District	County	Instuctional Spending per Pupil	General Administration per Pupil	School Administration per Pupil	Plant M&O per Pupil	Total Spending per Pupil	Predicted Spending per Pupil
D0274	OAKLEY	LOGAN	\$3,635	\$988	\$488	\$869	\$5,979	\$5,652
D0275	TRIPLAINS	LOGAN	\$5,843	\$1,192	\$266	\$1,184	\$8,485	\$7,221
D0278	MANKATO	JEWELL	\$3,902	\$593	\$586	\$991	\$6,072	\$6,029
D0279	JEWELL	JEWELL	\$4,710	\$454	\$718	\$1,289	\$7,171	\$6,593
D0280	WEST GRAHAM-MORLAND	GRAHAM	\$6,628	\$1,724	\$805	\$1,770	\$10,928	\$7,640
D0281	HILL CITY	GRAHAM	\$4,002	\$417	\$428	\$869	\$5,717	\$5,596
D0282	WEST ELK	ELK	\$3,912	\$402	\$531	\$797	\$5,643	\$5,046
D0283	ELK VALLEY	ELK	\$4,494	\$662	\$708	\$767	\$6,631	\$5,359
D0284	CHASE COUNTY	CHASE	\$3,860	\$388	\$444	\$702	\$5,394	\$5,292
D0285	CEDAR VALE	CHAUTAUQUA	\$4,320	\$1,301	\$277	\$1,033	\$6,930	\$5,890
D0286	CHAUTAUQUA COUNTY COMMUNITY	CHAUTAUQUA	\$3,806	\$400	\$405	\$638	\$5,249	\$4,658
D0287	WEST FRANKLIN	FRANKLIN	\$3,593	\$304	\$483	\$914	\$5,294	\$5,177
D0288	CENTRAL HEIGHTS	FRANKLIN	\$3,282	\$265	\$360	\$734	\$4,641	\$4,239
D0289	WELLSVILLE	FRANKLIN	\$3,467	\$287	\$359	\$642	\$4,754	\$4,582
D0290	OTTAWA	FRANKLIN	\$2,824	\$234	\$348	\$484	\$3,890	\$4,159
D0291	GRINNELL PUBLIC SCHOOLS	GOVE	\$4,724	\$681	\$467	\$1,213	\$7,085	\$6,557
D0292	GRAINFIELD	GOVE	\$4,848	\$713	\$495	\$886	\$6,942	\$6,168
D0293	QUINTER PUBLIC SCHOOLS	GOVE	\$4,531	\$429	\$479	\$796	\$6,235	\$5,660
D0294	OBERLIN	DECATUR	\$3,893	\$343	\$377	\$642	\$5,256	\$4,918
D0295	PRAIRIE HEIGHTS	DECATUR	\$5,138	\$1,052	\$327	\$791	\$7,307	\$6,835
D0297	ST FRANCIS COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	CHEYENNE	\$3,696	\$301	\$378	\$627	\$5,002	\$4,804
D0298	LINCOLN	LINCOLN	\$3,957	\$432	\$467	\$683	\$5,540	\$4,981
D0299	SYLVAN GROVE	LINCOLN	\$4,455	\$483	\$480	\$1,072	\$6,490	\$5,747
D0300	COMMANCHE COUNTY	COMANCHE	\$4,711	\$669	\$672	\$998	\$7,050	\$6,532
D0301	NES TRES LA GO	NESS	\$7,301	\$698	\$257	\$2,184	\$10,441	\$7,797
D0302	SMOKY HILL	NESS	\$5,241	\$509	\$571	\$1,201	\$7,521	\$6,385
D0303	NESS CITY	NESS	\$3,720	\$626	\$454	\$1,100	\$5,900	\$5,878
D0304	BAZINE	NESS	\$5,040	\$1,129	\$267	\$1,168	\$7,604	\$6,725
D0305	SALINA	SALINE	\$3,062	\$41	\$271	\$498	\$3,872	\$3,852
D0306	SOUTHEAST OF SALINE	SALINE	\$3,705	\$317	\$306	\$810	\$5,139	\$4,667
D0307	ELL-SALINE	SALINE	\$3,278	\$459	\$391	\$865	\$4,994	\$5,196
D0308	HUTCHINSON PUBLIC SCHOOLS	RENO	\$2,842	\$58	\$362	\$811	\$4,073	\$4,209
D0309	NICKERSON	RENO	\$3,161	\$300	\$332	\$572	\$4,367	\$4,746
D0310	FAIRFIELD	RENO	\$3,704	\$485	\$594	\$901	\$5,684	\$5,906
D0311	PRETTY PRAIRIE	RENO	\$3,962	\$320	\$502	\$856	\$5,640	\$5,965
D0312	HAVEN PUBLIC SCHOOLS	RENO	\$3,491	\$147	\$518	\$784	\$4,940	\$5,513
D0313	BUHLER	RENO	\$2,944	\$290	\$374	\$619	\$4,227	\$4,521
D0314	BREWSTER	THOMAS	\$4,526	\$715	\$558	\$1,189	\$6,988	\$6,410
D0315	COLBY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	THOMAS	\$3,115	\$229	\$294	\$665	\$4,302	\$4,361
D0316	GOLDEN PLAINS	THOMAS	\$4,435	\$922	\$564	\$843	\$6,764	\$6,460

1-144
1-143

District #	District	County	Instuctional Spending per Pupil	General Administration per Pupil	School Administration per Pupil	Plant M&O per Pupil	Total Spending per Pupil	Predicted Spending per Pupil
D0317	HERNDON	RAWLINS	\$5,574	\$581	\$717	\$893	\$7,765	\$6,572
D0318	ATWOOD	RAWLINS	\$3,879	\$361	\$447	\$638	\$5,325	\$4,934
D0320	WAMEGO	POTTAWATOMIE	\$3,082	\$231	\$334	\$561	\$4,208	\$4,254
D0321	KAW VALLEY	POTTAWATOMIE	\$4,368	\$276	\$427	\$821	\$5,893	\$5,933
D0322	ONAGA-HAVENSVILLE-WHEATON	POTTAWATOMIE	\$3,985	\$478	\$653	\$662	\$5,778	\$5,615
D0323	WESTMORELAND	POTTAWATOMIE	\$3,661	\$341	\$484	\$709	\$5,195	\$4,619
D0324	EASTERN HEIGHTS	PHILLIPS	\$4,453	\$673	\$543	\$915	\$6,583	\$5,642
D0325	PHILLIPSBURG	PHILLIPS	\$3,801	\$294	\$502	\$708	\$5,305	\$5,008
D0326	LOGAN	PHILLIPS	\$4,761	\$493	\$583	\$1,095	\$6,932	\$6,033
D0327	ELLSWORTH	ELLSWORTH	\$3,713	\$393	\$468	\$995	\$5,569	\$4,961
D0328	LORRAINE	ELLSWORTH	\$3,721	\$388	\$665	\$683	\$5,457	\$5,744
D0329	ALMA	WABAUNSEE	\$3,648	\$334	\$579	\$980	\$5,541	\$5,824
D0330	WABAUNSEE EAST	WABAUNSEE	\$3,322	\$319	\$545	\$884	\$5,071	\$5,106
D0331	KINGMAN	KINGMAN	\$3,364	\$313	\$344	\$626	\$4,647	\$4,551
D0332	CUNNINGHAM	KINGMAN	\$3,817	\$513	\$623	\$538	\$5,491	\$5,866
D0333	CONCORDIA	CLOUD	\$3,212	\$203	\$335	\$760	\$4,511	\$4,505
D0334	SOUTHERN CLOUD	CLOUD	\$4,351	\$397	\$507	\$986	\$6,241	\$6,305
D0335	NORTH JACKSON	JACKSON	\$4,053	\$308	\$289	\$687	\$5,336	\$4,941
D0336	HOLTON	JACKSON	\$3,711	\$133	\$321	\$535	\$4,700	\$4,567
D0337	MAYETTA	JACKSON	\$3,371	\$422	\$550	\$1,148	\$5,491	\$4,884
D0338	VALLEY FALLS	JEFFERSON	\$3,334	\$552	\$397	\$1,036	\$5,319	\$4,929
D0339	JEFFERSON COUNTY NORTH	JEFFERSON	\$3,535	\$409	\$454	\$763	\$5,161	\$4,865
D0340	JEFFERSON WEST	JEFFERSON	\$3,311	\$413	\$473	\$559	\$4,755	\$4,876
D0341	OSKALOOSA PUBLIC SCHOOLS	JEFFERSON	\$3,586	\$318	\$525	\$1,538	\$5,966	\$4,991
D0342	MCLOUTH	JEFFERSON	\$3,497	\$404	\$543	\$639	\$5,084	\$5,010
D0343	PERRY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	JEFFERSON	\$3,295	\$339	\$546	\$530	\$4,710	\$5,131
D0344	PLEASANTON	LINN	\$3,749	\$465	\$458	\$746	\$5,418	\$4,885
D0345	SEAMAN	SHAWNEE	\$2,756	\$150	\$416	\$613	\$3,934	\$4,654
D0346	JAYHAWK	LINN	\$3,786	\$274	\$448	\$701	\$5,209	\$5,163
D0347	KINSLEY-OFFERLE	EDWARDS	\$4,357	\$474	\$494	\$917	\$6,242	\$6,292
D0348	BALDWIN CITY	DOUGLAS	\$3,329	\$159	\$491	\$863	\$4,843	\$4,985
D0349	STAFFORD	STAFFORD	\$4,325	\$443	\$560	\$798	\$6,125	\$5,765
D0350	ST JOHN-HUDSON	STAFFORD	\$3,594	\$302	\$402	\$901	\$5,198	\$5,479
D0351	MACKSVILLE	STAFFORD	\$3,603	\$559	\$576	\$677	\$5,415	\$5,442
D0352	GOODLAND	SHERMAN	\$3,276	\$221	\$443	\$736	\$4,676	\$4,993
D0353	WELLINGTON	SUMNER	\$2,868	\$101	\$374	\$470	\$3,813	\$4,535
D0354	CLAFLIN	BARTON	\$4,133	\$473	\$472	\$889	\$5,967	\$5,742
D0355	ELLINWOOD PUBLIC SCHOOLS	BARTON	\$3,629	\$357	\$520	\$682	\$5,189	\$5,146
D0356	CONWAY SPRINGS	SUMNER	\$3,623	\$356	\$620	\$794	\$5,392	\$5,313
D0357	BELLE PLAINE	SUMNER	\$3,900	\$310	\$449	\$678	\$5,337	\$4,604

5
1-144

District #	District	County	Instuctional Spending per Pupil	General Administration per Pupil	School Administration per Pupil	Plant M&O per Pupil	Total Spending per Pupil	Predicted Spending per Pupil
D0358	OXFORD	SUMNER	\$4,063	\$387	\$475	\$697	\$5,622	\$4,989
D0359	ARGONIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS	SUMNER	\$3,570	\$518	\$597	\$944	\$5,629	\$5,447
D0360	CALDWELL	SUMNER	\$3,932	\$627	\$577	\$630	\$5,765	\$5,401
D0361	ANTHONY-HARPER	HARPER	\$3,313	\$275	\$318	\$688	\$4,594	\$4,247
D0362	PRAIRIE VIEW	LINN	\$3,903	\$491	\$721	\$895	\$6,010	\$5,620
D0363	HOLCOMB	FINNEY	\$3,824	\$376	\$340	\$983	\$5,523	\$5,041
D0364	MARYSVILLE	MARSHALL	\$3,818	\$217	\$414	\$574	\$5,023	\$4,595
D0365	GARNETT	ANDERSON	\$3,120	\$178	\$448	\$593	\$4,339	\$4,920
D0366	WOODSON	WOODSON	\$3,278	\$185	\$428	\$1,317	\$5,208	\$4,463
D0367	OSAWATOMIE	MIAMI	\$2,662	\$296	\$419	\$832	\$4,209	\$4,326
D0368	PAOLA	MIAMI	\$2,682	\$235	\$326	\$758	\$4,001	\$4,277
D0369	BURRTON	HARVEY	\$4,754	\$704	\$559	\$1,163	\$7,181	\$6,380
D0371	MONTEZUMA	GRAY	\$4,472	\$613	\$715	\$837	\$6,637	\$6,390
D0372	SILVER LAKE	SHAWNEE	\$3,608	\$444	\$376	\$851	\$5,278	\$4,754
D0373	NEWTON	HARVEY	\$2,760	\$182	\$392	\$697	\$4,031	\$4,059
D0374	SUBLETTE	HASKELL	\$3,743	\$577	\$477	\$625	\$5,422	\$5,613
D0375	CIRCLE	BUTLER	\$3,260	\$172	\$383	\$548	\$4,362	\$4,569
D0376	STERLING	RICE	\$3,910	\$361	\$609	\$837	\$5,717	\$5,371
D0377	ATCHISON CO COMM SCHOOLS	ATCHISON	\$3,508	\$247	\$368	\$783	\$4,906	\$5,145
D0378	RILEY COUNTY	RILEY	\$3,691	\$382	\$528	\$711	\$5,311	\$4,823
D0379	CLAY CENTER	CLAY	\$2,846	\$215	\$356	\$548	\$3,964	\$4,872
D0380	VERMILLION	MARSHALL	\$3,531	\$387	\$346	\$976	\$5,239	\$5,200
D0381	SPEARVILLE-WINDTHORST	FORD	\$3,546	\$435	\$436	\$748	\$5,165	\$5,252
D0382	PRATT	PRATT	\$3,123	\$200	\$368	\$762	\$4,452	\$4,344
D0383	MANHATTAN	RILEY	\$2,893	\$75	\$291	\$599	\$3,857	\$3,954
D0384	BLUE VALLEY	RILEY	\$3,734	\$381	\$626	\$609	\$5,350	\$5,866
D0385	ANDOVER	BUTLER	\$2,924	\$227	\$327	\$554	\$4,033	\$4,108
D0386	MADISON-VIRGIL	GREENWOOD	\$3,807	\$628	\$326	\$764	\$5,525	\$5,483
D0387	ALTOONA-MIDWAY	WILSON	\$3,806	\$488	\$439	\$636	\$5,368	\$5,831
D0388	ELLIS	ELLIS	\$4,227	\$432	\$523	\$679	\$5,862	\$5,422
D0389	EUREKA	GREENWOOD	\$3,643	\$312	\$395	\$718	\$5,068	\$4,808
D0390	HAMILTON	GREENWOOD	\$5,325	\$694	\$601	\$776	\$7,397	\$6,270
D0392	OSBORNE COUNTY	OSBORNE	\$3,534	\$400	\$558	\$893	\$5,385	\$5,161
D0393	SOLOMON	DICKINSON	\$3,199	\$482	\$387	\$830	\$4,898	\$4,861
D0394	ROSE HILL PUBLIC SCHOOLS	BUTLER	\$2,594	\$168	\$276	\$769	\$3,807	\$4,384
D0395	LACROSSE	RUSH	\$3,782	\$414	\$651	\$713	\$5,561	\$5,845
D0396	DOUGLASS PUBLIC SCHOOLS	BUTLER	\$3,552	\$207	\$423	\$747	\$4,930	\$4,638
D0397	CENTRE	MARION	\$4,095	\$324	\$451	\$760	\$5,629	\$5,418
D0398	PEABODY-BURNS	MARION	\$3,556	\$401	\$510	\$869	\$5,336	\$5,311
D0399	PARADISE	RUSSELL	\$4,427	\$534	\$798	\$966	\$6,725	\$6,375

9/1-1
 5
 111

District #	District	County	Instuctional Spending per Pupil	General Administration per Pupil	School Administration per Pupil	Plant M&O per Pupil	Total Spending per Pupil	Predicted Spending per Pupil
D0400	LINDSBORG	MCPHERSON	\$3,345	\$246	\$373	\$543	\$4,507	\$4,693
D0401	CHASE	RICE	\$4,463	\$836	\$885	\$1,210	\$7,393	\$6,636
D0402	AUGUSTA	BUTLER	\$2,620	\$156	\$336	\$391	\$3,504	\$4,034
D0403	OTIS-BISON	RUSH	\$3,434	\$532	\$585	\$933	\$5,484	\$5,824
D0404	RIVERTON	CHEROKEE	\$3,609	\$206	\$393	\$803	\$5,011	\$4,596
D0405	LYONS	RICE	\$3,440	\$292	\$430	\$703	\$4,865	\$5,312
D0406	WATHENA	DONIPHAN	\$4,056	\$289	\$484	\$1,005	\$5,835	\$5,080
D0407	RUSSELL COUNTY	RUSSELL	\$3,272	\$271	\$278	\$595	\$4,416	\$5,224
D0408	MARION	MARION	\$3,457	\$284	\$342	\$585	\$4,668	\$4,621
D0409	ATCHISON PUBLIC SCHOOLS	ATCHISON	\$2,909	\$245	\$401	\$659	\$4,214	\$3,802
D0410	DURHAM-HILLSBORO-LEHIGH	MARION	\$3,972	\$279	\$547	\$1,000	\$5,798	\$5,151
D0411	GOESSEL	MARION	\$4,416	\$436	\$533	\$774	\$6,160	\$5,690
D0412	HOXIE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	SHERIDAN	\$3,702	\$530	\$412	\$671	\$5,314	\$5,152
D0413	CHANUTE PUBLIC SCHOOLS	NEOSHO	\$3,171	\$184	\$387	\$477	\$4,219	\$4,411
D0415	HIAWATHA	BROWN	\$3,385	\$299	\$395	\$575	\$4,653	\$4,203
D0416	LOUISBURG	MIAMI	\$3,126	\$269	\$416	\$722	\$4,534	\$4,653
D0417	MORRIS COUNTY	MORRIS	\$3,218	\$267	\$406	\$498	\$4,389	\$4,774
D0418	MCPHERSON	MCPHERSON	\$3,110	\$216	\$344	\$712	\$4,382	\$4,688
D0419	CANTON-GALVA	MCPHERSON	\$3,694	\$486	\$694	\$715	\$5,589	\$5,784
D0420	OSAGE CITY	OSAGE	\$3,395	\$286	\$269	\$540	\$4,490	\$4,187
D0421	LYNDON	OSAGE	\$3,500	\$476	\$335	\$747	\$5,059	\$4,692
D0422	GREENSBURG	KIOWA	\$3,938	\$575	\$657	\$1,052	\$6,222	\$5,830
D0423	MOUNDRIDGE	MCPHERSON	\$4,559	\$414	\$458	\$809	\$6,241	\$6,055
D0424	MULLINVILLE	KIOWA	\$5,014	\$1,630	\$759	\$1,362	\$8,765	\$7,318
D0425	HIGHLAND	DONIPHAN	\$3,730	\$469	\$668	\$1,143	\$6,011	\$5,584
D0426	PIKE VALLEY	REPUBLIC	\$4,078	\$479	\$548	\$558	\$5,662	\$5,720
D0427	BELLEVILLE	REPUBLIC	\$3,959	\$269	\$557	\$830	\$5,615	\$5,337
D0428	GREAT BEND	BARTON	\$2,750	\$265	\$355	\$522	\$3,891	\$4,049
D0429	TROY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	DONIPHAN	\$3,964	\$501	\$472	\$938	\$5,875	\$5,440
D0430	BROWN COUNTY	BROWN	\$3,481	\$348	\$410	\$911	\$5,149	\$4,843
D0431	HOISINGTON	BARTON	\$3,533	\$240	\$565	\$749	\$5,087	\$5,040
D0432	VICTORIA	ELLIS	\$3,995	\$454	\$540	\$786	\$5,774	\$5,607
D0433	MIDWAY SCHOOLS	DONIPHAN	\$3,729	\$401	\$503	\$787	\$5,419	\$5,520
D0434	SANTA FE TRAIL	OSAGE	\$3,520	\$326	\$426	\$629	\$4,902	\$4,694
D0435	ABILENE	DICKINSON	\$3,057	\$140	\$383	\$502	\$4,083	\$4,600
D0436	CANEY VALLEY	MONTGOMERY	\$3,162	\$228	\$305	\$618	\$4,313	\$3,910
D0437	AUBURN WASHBURN	SHAWNEE	\$2,756	\$142	\$314	\$466	\$3,677	\$3,843
D0438	SKYLINE SCHOOLS	PRATT	\$3,950	\$489	\$460	\$568	\$5,467	\$5,238
D0439	SEDGWICK PUBLIC SCHOOLS	HARVEY	\$3,221	\$397	\$368	\$929	\$4,915	\$5,123
D0440	HALSTEAD	HARVEY	\$3,332	\$330	\$662	\$762	\$5,086	\$4,917

1-147
1-146

District #	District	County	Instuctional Spending per Pupil	General Administration per Pupil	School Administration per Pupil	Plant M&O per Pupil	Total Spending per Pupil	Predicted Spending per Pupil
D0441	SABETHA	NEMAHA	\$3,573	\$365	\$428	\$632	\$4,997	\$5,056
D0442	NEMAHA VALLEY SCHOOLS	NEMAHA	\$3,531	\$435	\$369	\$946	\$5,282	\$4,896
D0443	DODGE CITY	FORD	\$2,889	\$271	\$373	\$575	\$4,107	\$3,725
D0444	LITTLE RIVER	RICE	\$4,082	\$573	\$649	\$705	\$6,009	\$6,288
D0445	COFFEYVILLE	MONTGOMERY	\$3,164	\$199	\$319	\$414	\$4,096	\$4,223
D0446	INDEPENDENCE	MONTGOMERY	\$3,063	\$213	\$283	\$501	\$4,060	\$3,969
D0447	CHERRYVALE	MONTGOMERY	\$3,375	\$443	\$413	\$714	\$4,944	\$4,438
D0448	INMAN	MCPHERSON	\$3,812	\$425	\$298	\$708	\$5,242	\$5,076
D0449	EASTON	LEAVENWORTH	\$3,407	\$300	\$710	\$567	\$4,983	\$5,259
D0450	SHAWNEE HEIGHTS	SHAWNEE	\$3,011	\$197	\$356	\$579	\$4,142	\$4,274
D0451	B & B	NEMAHA	\$3,791	\$341	\$430	\$1,298	\$5,860	\$5,553
D0452	STANTON COUNTY	STANTON	\$3,932	\$346	\$451	\$1,096	\$5,825	\$6,153
D0453	LEAVENWORTH	LEAVENWORTH	\$3,070	\$164	\$390	\$581	\$4,206	\$4,021
D0454	BURLINGAME PUBLIC SCHOOLS	OSAGE	\$3,372	\$463	\$495	\$867	\$5,197	\$5,400
D0455	HILLCREST RURAL SCHOOLS	REPUBLIC	\$4,920	\$835	\$585	\$817	\$7,157	\$6,126
D0456	MARAI DES CYGNES VALLEY	OSAGE	\$3,989	\$539	\$515	\$1,035	\$6,078	\$5,903
D0457	GARDEN CITY	FINNEY	\$2,639	\$79	\$345	\$579	\$3,642	\$3,761
D0458	BASEHOR-LINWOOD	LEAVENWORTH	\$2,684	\$430	\$328	\$694	\$4,137	\$4,497
D0459	BUCKLIN	FORD	\$3,484	\$498	\$348	\$626	\$4,957	\$5,080
D0460	HESSTON	HARVEY	\$2,880	\$320	\$430	\$766	\$4,396	\$4,919
D0461	NEODESHA	WILSON	\$3,735	\$361	\$557	\$565	\$5,220	\$4,633
D0462	CENTRAL	COWLEY	\$3,939	\$415	\$630	\$861	\$5,846	\$5,577
D0463	UDALL	COWLEY	\$3,898	\$698	\$431	\$829	\$5,857	\$5,175
D0464	TONGANOXIE	LEAVENWORTH	\$3,227	\$210	\$345	\$528	\$4,310	\$4,185
D0465	WINFIELD	COWLEY	\$3,094	\$183	\$359	\$527	\$4,162	\$4,828
D0466	SCOTT COUNTY	SCOTT	\$3,555	\$250	\$371	\$560	\$4,736	\$4,753
D0467	LEOTI	WICHITA	\$3,554	\$348	\$589	\$1,032	\$5,524	\$5,386
D0468	HEALY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	LANE	\$5,971	\$1,238	\$269	\$1,199	\$8,678	\$7,231
D0469	LANSING	LEAVENWORTH	\$2,649	\$225	\$305	\$507	\$3,687	\$4,307
D0470	ARKANSAS CITY	COWLEY	\$2,781	\$126	\$375	\$640	\$3,922	\$4,333
D0471	DEXTER	COWLEY	\$4,324	\$1,354	\$8	\$795	\$6,481	\$5,775
D0473	CHAPMAN	DICKINSON	\$3,043	\$226	\$448	\$799	\$4,516	\$5,084
D0474	HAVILAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS	KIOWA	\$4,410	\$938	\$550	\$1,123	\$7,020	\$6,527
D0475	JUNCTION CITY	GEARY	\$2,503	\$88	\$371	\$657	\$3,619	\$3,976
D0476	COPELAND	GRAY	\$5,205	\$1,121	\$284	\$1,363	\$7,973	\$7,024
D0477	INGALLS	GRAY	\$3,616	\$336	\$424	\$698	\$5,074	\$5,399
D0479	CREST	ANDERSON	\$3,894	\$400	\$485	\$873	\$5,651	\$5,604
D0480	LIBERAL	SEWARD	\$2,650	\$126	\$282	\$511	\$3,569	\$3,707
D0481	RURAL VISTA	DICKINSON	\$3,573	\$325	\$347	\$684	\$4,928	\$5,459
D0482	DIGHTON	LANE	\$3,973	\$514	\$555	\$901	\$5,943	\$6,024

1-149

District #	District	County	Instuctional Spending per Pupil	General Administration per Pupil	School Administration per Pupil	Plant M&O per Pupil	Total Spending per Pupil	Predicted Spending per Pupil
D0483	KISMET-PLAINS	SEWARD	\$3,807	\$213	\$462	\$775	\$5,256	\$4,753
D0484	FREDONIA	WILSON	\$3,489	\$286	\$645	\$647	\$5,066	\$4,667
D0486	ELWOOD	DONIPHAN	\$3,835	\$374	\$265	\$671	\$5,146	\$5,159
D0487	HERINGTON	DICKINSON	\$3,698	\$313	\$467	\$1,336	\$5,814	\$5,294
D0488	AXTELL	MARSHALL	\$4,019	\$368	\$548	\$682	\$5,617	\$6,264
D0489	HAYS	ELLIS	\$3,502	\$233	\$429	\$544	\$4,708	\$4,730
D0490	EL DORADO	BUTLER	\$2,712	\$93	\$372	\$798	\$3,975	\$4,478
D0491	EUDORA	DOUGLAS	\$2,810	\$274	\$387	\$1,121	\$4,592	\$4,850
D0492	FLINTHILLS	BUTLER	\$3,724	\$393	\$505	\$967	\$5,589	\$5,811
D0493	COLUMBUS	CHEROKEE	\$3,154	\$220	\$449	\$623	\$4,447	\$4,747
D0494	SYRACUSE	HAMILTON	\$3,531	\$469	\$338	\$1,263	\$5,601	\$5,127
D0495	FT LARNED	PAWNEE	\$3,232	\$356	\$428	\$1,283	\$5,299	\$5,595
D0496	PAWNEE HEIGHTS	PAWNEE	\$5,164	\$881	\$631	\$979	\$7,655	\$6,328
D0497	LAWRENCE	DOUGLAS	\$3,012	\$73	\$354	\$563	\$4,002	\$4,269
D0498	VALLEY HEIGHTS	MARSHALL	\$3,693	\$326	\$440	\$916	\$5,376	\$5,350
D0499	GALENA	CHEROKEE	\$3,485	\$340	\$633	\$971	\$5,430	\$5,535
D0500	KANSAS CITY	WYANDOTTE	\$2,692	\$48	\$352	\$732	\$3,825	\$3,798
D0501	TOPEKA PUBLIC SCHOOLS	SHAWNEE	\$2,744	\$49	\$334	\$494	\$3,621	\$3,978
D0502	LEWIS	EDWARDS	\$4,380	\$644	\$517	\$740	\$6,280	\$5,908
D0503	PARSONS	LABETTE	\$2,935	\$271	\$362	\$671	\$4,239	\$4,495
D0504	OSWEGO	LABETTE	\$3,403	\$476	\$712	\$504	\$5,095	\$5,520
D0505	CHETOPA	LABETTE	\$4,304	\$886	\$483	\$580	\$6,253	\$5,537
D0506	LABETTE COUNTY	LABETTE	\$2,900	\$161	\$293	\$664	\$4,018	\$4,598
D0507	SATANTA	HASKELL	\$3,875	\$548	\$425	\$1,012	\$5,861	\$5,886
D0508	BAXTER SPRINGS	CHEROKEE	\$3,164	\$318	\$433	\$811	\$4,726	\$4,599
D0509	SOUTH HAVEN	SUMNER	\$3,595	\$635	\$289	\$965	\$5,485	\$5,412
D0511	ATTICA	HARPER	\$4,874	\$737	\$614	\$846	\$7,071	\$6,058
D0512	SHAWNEE MISSION PUBLIC SCHOO	JOHNSON	\$3,242	\$56	\$330	\$634	\$4,262	\$4,036

844-1
641-1

APPENDIX IV

ENROLLMENT, CAPACITY AND YEAR BUILT FOR SCHOOLS

Distict Number	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Enrollment	Capacity	Year Built
D0101	Erie-St Paul	102	Erie Elem	349	300	1938
D0101	Erie-St Paul	104	Erie High	207	220	1953
D0101	Erie-St Paul	108	Galesburg Elem	105	141	1954
D0101	Erie-St Paul	116	St Paul Elem	115	140	1954
D0101	Erie-St Paul	118	St Paul High	159	120	1922
D0101	Erie-St Paul	120	Thayer Elem	111	150	1947
D0101	Erie-St Paul	122	Thayer High	131	130	1947
D0102	Cimarron-Ensign	124	Cimarron Elem	323	450	1967
D0102	Cimarron-Ensign	125	Cimarron High	307	350	1995
D0103	Cheylin	2780	Cheylin West Jr/Sr High	86	140	1921
D0103	Cheylin	3374	Cheylin West Elem	102	140	1921
D0104	White Rock	2306	White Rock Middle	43	80	1956
D0104	White Rock	2320	White Rock Elem	60	100	1968
D0104	White Rock	2322	White Rock High	65	120	1956
D0200	Greeley County Schools	132	Greeley County Elem School	172	250	1956
D0200	Greeley County Schools	134	Greeley County High School	144	250	1931
D0202	Turner-Kansas City	150	Highland Middle School	573	625	1964
D0202	Turner-Kansas City	152	Junction Elem	138	150	1929
D0202	Turner-Kansas City	154	Junction Primary	256	260	1955
D0202	Turner-Kansas City	156	Morris Elem	131	125	1952
D0202	Turner-Kansas City	158	Muncie Elem	353	410	1951
D0202	Turner-Kansas City	160	Oak Grove Elem	323	650	1950
D0202	Turner-Kansas City	162	Pierson Jr High	544	600	1964
D0202	Turner-Kansas City	164	Turner East Elem	352	300	1916
D0202	Turner-Kansas City	168	Turner High	680	700	1953
D0202	Turner-Kansas City	170	Career Opportunity Center	68	80	1931
D0203	Piper-Kansas City	180	Piper Elem School East	277	450	1994
D0203	Piper-Kansas City	188	Piper Elem School West	252	390	1920
D0203	Piper-Kansas City	189	Piper Middle	312	510	1990
D0203	Piper-Kansas City	190	Piper High	466	575	1965
D0204	Bonner Springs	210	Bonner Springs Elementary	487	525	1956
D0204	Bonner Springs	214	Bonner Springs High	729	775	1965
D0204	Bonner Springs	216	Edwardsville Elem	481	525	1958
D0204	Bonner Springs	221	Robert E Clark Middle	538	600	1983

Distict Number	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Enrollment	Capacity	Year Built
D0205	Bluestem	238	Leon Elem	203	200	
D0205	Bluestem	240	Bluestem High	256	300	1972
D0205	Bluestem	246	Haverhill Elem	154	200	1957
D0205	Bluestem	250	Bluestem Middle School	187	250	1978
D0206	Remington-Whitewater	260	Frederic Remington High	160	300	1963
D0206	Remington-Whitewater	272	Potwin Elem	203	300	1950
D0206	Remington-Whitewater	274	Whitewater Elem	190	250	1923
D0207	Ft Leavenworth	286	Bradley Elem	406	550	1965
D0207	Ft Leavenworth	288	Eisenhower Elem	536	550	1952
D0207	Ft Leavenworth	290	MacArthur Elem	567	550	1956
D0207	Ft Leavenworth	294	Patton Jr High	367	500	1958
D0208	Wakeeney	306	WaKeeney Elem	321	500	1950
D0208	Wakeeney	308	Trego Community High	215	400	1951
D0209	Moscow Public Schools	342	Moscow Elem	98	130	1936
D0209	Moscow Public Schools	344	Moscow High	108	200	1959
D0210	Hugoton Public Schools	356	Hugoton Elem	548	650	1947
D0210	Hugoton Public Schools	357	Hugoton Middle	175	200	1961
D0210	Hugoton Public Schools	358	Hugoton High	310	325	1931
D0211	Norton Community Schools	374	Eisenhower Elem	363	500	1957
D0211	Norton Community Schools	378	Norton Jr High	116	150	1937
D0211	Norton Community Schools	380	Norton High	260	375	1976
D0212	Northern Valley	404	Almena Elem	66	100	1924
D0212	Northern Valley	406	Northern Valley High	74	200	1923
D0212	Northern Valley	408	Long Island Elem	61	100	1917
D0213	West Solomon Valley Sch	424	Lenora Elem	71	160	1955
D0213	West Solomon Valley Sch	426	Lenora High	31	180	1924
D0214	Ulysses	443	Kepley Middle School	433	500	1951
D0214	Ulysses	444	Sullivan Elem	325	410	1954
D0214	Ulysses	446	Ulysses High	503	585	1969
D0214	Ulysses	450	Hickok Elem	408	475	1962
D0214	Ulysses	452	Red Rock Elem	111	200	1947
D0215	Lakin	466	Lakin Elem	428	300	1950
D0215	Lakin	467	Lakin Middle	138	350	1986
D0215	Lakin	468	Lakin High	209	300	1931
D0216	Deerfield	482	Deerfield Elem	171	240	1957
D0216	Deerfield	483	Deerfield Middle School	79	150	1992
D0216	Deerfield	484	Deerfield High	132	270	1950
D0217	Rolla	496	Rolla Elem. (K-8)	164	210	1946

051-1
6-1-1

District Number	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Enrollment	Capacity	Year Built
D0217	Rolla	498	Rolla High (9-12)	69	150	1925
D0218	Elkhart	514	Elkhart Middle School	188	250	1957
D0218	Elkhart	516	Elkhart Elem	204	300	1958
D0218	Elkhart	520	Elkhart High	190	250	1962
D0219	Minneola	536	Minneola Elem	182	252	1956
D0219	Minneola	538	Minneola High	100	200	1930
D0220	Ashland	552	Ashland Elem	144	165	1937
D0220	Ashland	553	Ashland Middle	38	150	1962
D0220	Ashland	554	Ashland High	96	150	1962
D0221	North Central	576	North Central Elem	99	150	1925
D0221	North Central	582	North Central High	51	200	1926
D0222	Washington Schools	594	Washington Elem	196	150	1931
D0222	Washington Schools	596	Washington High	184	350	1965
D0223	Barnes	620	Hanover Elem	178	s	1930
D0223	Barnes	622	Hanover High	92	140	1930
D0223	Barnes	628	Linn Elem	156	145	1950
D0223	Barnes	630	Linn High	77	150	1950
D0224	Clifton-Clyde	658	Clifton Elem K-5	80	150	1980
D0224	Clifton-Clyde	660	Clifton-Clyde Elem 6-8	90	250	1949
D0224	Clifton-Clyde	666	Clyde Elem K-5	81	200	1917
D0224	Clifton-Clyde	668	Clifton-Clyde Sr High	129	300	1958
D0225	Fowler	684	Fowler Elem	81	200	1965
D0225	Fowler	686	Fowler High	111	275	1950
D0226	Meade	700	Meade Elem	337	350	1926
D0226	Meade	702	Meade High	140	160	1971
D0227	Jetmore	722	Jetmore Elem	237	300	1960
D0227	Jetmore	724	Jetmore High	112	300	1951
D0228	Hanston	748	Hanston Elem	52	140	1954
D0228	Hanston	750	Hanston High	88	125	1984
D0229	Blue Valley	756	Lakewood Elementary	399	587	1999
D0229	Blue Valley	767	Oxford Middle	595	725	1988
D0229	Blue Valley	768	Stanley Elem	564	587	1988
D0229	Blue Valley	769	Blue Valley North High	1610	1600	1986
D0229	Blue Valley	770	Blue Valley High	1576	1470	1971
D0229	Blue Valley	771	Morse Elem	440	490	1980
D0229	Blue Valley	772	Valley Park Elem	303	587	1985
D0229	Blue Valley	773	Leawood Elem	398	529	1978
D0229	Blue Valley	774	Stilwell Elem	472	529	1955

1-151
1-150

Distict Number	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Enrollment	Capacity	Year Built
D0229	Blue Valley	775	Tomahawk Ridge Elem	418	529	1988
D0229	Blue Valley	776	Blue Valley Middle	484	750	1976
D0229	Blue Valley	777	Mission Trail Elem	524	587	1989
D0229	Blue Valley	778	Leawood Middle School	568	650	1981
D0229	Blue Valley	779	Overland Trail Elem	470	587	1990
D0229	Blue Valley	780	Indian Valley Elem	361	587	1982
D0229	Blue Valley	781	Overland Trail Middle	651	750	1990
D0229	Blue Valley	782	Oak Hill Elem	518	587	1987
D0229	Blue Valley	783	Cottonwood Point Elem	485	587	1990
D0229	Blue Valley	784	Harmony Middle	709	750	1992
D0229	Blue Valley	785	Harmony Elementary	500	587	1992
D0229	Blue Valley	7773	Prairie Star Elementary	378	587	1993
D0229	Blue Valley	7774	Blue Valley Northwest High	1609	1600	1993
D0229	Blue Valley	7775	Heartland Elementary	590	587	1995
D0229	Blue Valley	7776	Prairie Star Middle	561	750	1996
D0229	Blue Valley	7786	Blue River Elem	471	587	1997
D0229	Blue Valley	7787	Pleasant Ridge Middle School	457	750	1997
D0229	Blue Valley	7788	Sunset Ridge Elem	521	587	1998
D0230	Spring Hill	788	Spring Hill Elem	551	510	1993
D0230	Spring Hill	789	Hilltop Elem	106	106	1953
D0230	Spring Hill	790	Spring Hill High	435	527	1995
D0230	Spring Hill	792	Spring Hill Middle	330	500	1975
D0231	Gardner-Edgerton-Antioch	804	Gardner Elem	568	546	1996
D0231	Gardner-Edgerton-Antioch	806	Nike Middle	655	521	1958
D0231	Gardner-Edgerton-Antioch	808	Gardner Edgerton High	708	728	1979
D0231	Gardner-Edgerton-Antioch	812	Edgerton Elem	238	356	1954
D0231	Gardner-Edgerton-Antioch	814	Sunflower Elementary	499	498	1996
D0232	De Soto	825	Clear Creek Elem	554	550	1998
D0232	De Soto	832	De Soto High School	762	750	1995
D0232	De Soto	835	Monticello Trails Middle School	405	500	1995
D0232	De Soto	836	Lexington Trails Middle School	241	340	1968
D0232	De Soto	837	Starside Elem	593	550	1998
D0232	De Soto	838	Woodsonia Elem	394	413	1964
D0233	Olathe	846	Regency Place Elementary	413	576	1999
D0233	Olathe	847	Frontier Trail Jr High	812	880	1989
D0233	Olathe	849	Brougham Elem	489	576	1985
D0233	Olathe	850	Central Elem	260	312	1952
D0233	Olathe	851	Indian Creek Elem	431	576	1985

1-152
1-151

District Number	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Enrollment	Capacity	Year Built
D0233	Olathe	852	Fairview Elem	426	464	1964
D0233	Olathe	853	Briarwood Elem	483	576	1988
D0233	Olathe	854	Ridgeview Elem	248	480	1956
D0233	Olathe	855	Walnut Grove Elem	453	624	1985
D0233	Olathe	856	Prairie Center Elem	429	576	1980
D0233	Olathe	857	Pioneer Trail Jr High	590	800	1986
D0233	Olathe	858	Washington Elem	434	636	1975
D0233	Olathe	859	Countryside Elementary	529	576	1988
D0233	Olathe	860	Westview Elem	269	336	1954
D0233	Olathe	861	Santa Fe Trail Jr High	777	960	1968
D0233	Olathe	862	Oregon Trail Jr High	732	780	1976
D0233	Olathe	863	Indian Trail Jr High	734	900	1981
D0233	Olathe	864	Olathe North Sr High	1418	1520	1958
D0233	Olathe	865	Olathe South Sr High	1442	1560	1981
D0233	Olathe	867	Heartland Learning Center	144	125	1976
D0233	Olathe	868	Meadow Lane Elem	384	480	1951
D0233	Olathe	870	Rolling Ridge Elem	473	528	1972
D0233	Olathe	871	Northview Elem	335	456	1967
D0233	Olathe	872	Havencroft Elem	392	480	1972
D0233	Olathe	874	Scarborough Elem	592	576	1977
D0233	Olathe	875	Heritage Elementary	434	480	1988
D0233	Olathe	876	Black Bob Elem	504	576	1978
D0233	Olathe	877	Tomahawk Elem	399	552	1980
D0233	Olathe	885	Olathe East Sr High	1384	1540	1992
D0233	Olathe	2781	Green Springs Elem	432	552	1991
D0233	Olathe	2782	Mahaffie Elem	501	576	1991
D0233	Olathe	2783	Pleasant Ridge Elem	474	576	1991
D0233	Olathe	2784	Heatherstone Elem	530	576	1995
D0233	Olathe	2785	Bentwood Elem	564	576	1996
D0233	Olathe	2786	California Trail Jr High	921	850	1996
D0233	Olathe	2787	Cedar Creek Elem	341	576	1997
D0234	Fort Scott	898	Eugene Ware Elem	418	500	1934
D0234	Fort Scott	900	Winfield Scott Elem	502	540	1956
D0234	Fort Scott	902	Fort Scott Middle School	170	600	1918
D0234	Fort Scott	904	Fort Scott Sr High	707	700	1979
D0235	Uniontown	964	Uniontown High School	175	290	1958
D0235	Uniontown	966	West Bourbon Elementary	356	320	1975
D0237	Smith Center	1010	Smith Center Elem	268	400	1954

1-153
T-152

Distict Number	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Enrollment	Capacity	Year Built
D0237	Smith Center	1012	Smith Center Jr Sr High	311	400	1973
D0238	West Smith County	1030	Kensington Elem	113	175	1955
D0238	West Smith County	1032	Kensington High	101	230	1947
D0239	North Ottawa County	1050	Delphos Elem	219		1952
D0239	North Ottawa County	1060	Minneapolis Elementary	230	325	1938
D0239	North Ottawa County	1064	Minneapolis High	249	330	1961
D0240	Twin Valley	1078	Bennington Elem	316	500	1960
D0240	Twin Valley	1080	Bennington High	126	250	1995
D0240	Twin Valley	1088	Tescott Elem	145	250	1959
D0240	Twin Valley	1090	Tescott High	87	125	1915
D0241	Wallace County Schools	1104	Sharon Springs Elem	181	210	1955
D0241	Wallace County Schools	1106	Wallace County High	114	160	1997
D0242	Weskan	1120	Weskan Elem	90	90	1921
D0242	Weskan	1122	Weskan High	43	110	1921
D0243	Lebo-Waverly	1134	Lebo Elem	170	175	1982
D0243	Lebo-Waverly	1136	Lebo High	169	205	1927
D0243	Lebo-Waverly	1138	Waverly Elem	141	150	1957
D0243	Lebo-Waverly	1140	Waverly High	133	140	1936
D0244	Burlington	1152	Burlington Elem K-5	333	480	1957
D0244	Burlington	1154	Burlington High	356	340	1979
D0244	Burlington	1162	Burlington Middle 6-8	205	260	1980
D0245	LeRoy-Gridley	1174	LeRoy Elem	128	200	1932
D0245	LeRoy-Gridley	1176	LeRoy High	63	110	1928
D0245	LeRoy-Gridley	1178	Gridley Elem	109	200	1934
D0245	LeRoy-Gridley	1180	Gridley High	64	110	1922
D0246	Northeast	1194	Northeast Elem	366	475	1955
D0246	Northeast	1198	North East High	192	300	1977
D0247	Cherokee	1220	Cherokee Elem	232	265	1925
D0247	Cherokee	1226	McCune Elem	157	180	1924
D0247	Cherokee	1230	South East High	250	300	1960
D0247	Cherokee	1232	Weir Elem	140	175	1916
D0247	Cherokee	1234	West Mineral Elem	63	100	1936
D0248	Girard	1258	R V Haderlein Elem	505	600	1954
D0248	Girard	1260	Girard Middle	270	400	1963
D0248	Girard	1262	Girard High	396	500	1963
D0249	Frontenac Public Schools	1287	Frank Layden Elem	384		1971
D0249	Frontenac Public Schools	1292	Frontenac Jr/Sr High	306	350	1995
D0250	Pittsburg	1302	Geo E Nettels Elem	385	340	1954

1-154
1-153

HSH
5/1-1

District Number	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Enrollment	Capacity	Year Built
D0250	Pittsburg	1304	Lakeside Elem	552	575	1926
D0250	Pittsburg	1310	Westside Elem	301	265	1951
D0250	Pittsburg	1314	Pittsburg Middle School	570	800	1921
D0250	Pittsburg	1316	Pittsburg High	853	900	1978
D0251	North Lyon County	1346	Admire Elem	150	200	1925
D0251	North Lyon County	1350	Americus Elem	231	250	1940
D0251	North Lyon County	1358	Northern Heights	249	275	1955
D0251	North Lyon County	1360	Reading Elem	94	125	1995
D0252	Southern Lyon County	1382	Hartford High	114	130	1915
D0252	Southern Lyon County	1388	Neosho Rapids K Thru 8	248	320	1936
D0252	Southern Lyon County	1392	Olpe Elem K-8	184	220	1968
D0252	Southern Lyon County	1394	Olpe High	131	130	1952
D0253	Emporia	1410	Mary Herbert Elem	256	288	1929
D0253	Emporia	1412	Maynard Elem	223	245	1951
D0253	Emporia	1414	Village Elem	386	365	1963
D0253	Emporia	1415	Lowther South Intermediate School 5th	318	350	1924
D0253	Emporia	1416	Walnut Elem	254	305	1950
D0253	Emporia	1418	W A White Elem	312	305	1949
D0253	Emporia	1420	Emporia Alternative School	31	80	1942
D0253	Emporia	1422	Emporia Middle School	762	750	1993
D0253	Emporia	1423	Lowther North Intermediate School 6th	358	350	1923
D0253	Emporia	1424	Emporia High	1589	1350	1974
D0253	Emporia	1428	Logan Ave Elem	277	288	1973
D0253	Emporia	1450	Butcher Children's School	122	131	1961
D0254	Barber County North	1470	Medicine Lodge Middle School	212	250	1919
D0254	Barber County North	1472	Medicine Lodge Primary Elem	277	300	1950
D0254	Barber County North	1474	Medicine Lodge High	248	305	1960
D0255	South Barber	1508	South Barber Middle	86	150	1951
D0255	South Barber	1516	South Barber Elem	124	220	1935
D0255	South Barber	1518	South Barber High	131	200	1973
D0256	Marmaton Valley	1536	Marmaton Valley Elem	205	350	1937
D0256	Marmaton Valley	1538	Marmaton Valley High	226	360	1951
D0257	Iola	1556	Jefferson Elem	267	306	1939
D0257	Iola	1558	Lincoln Elem	275	312	1939
D0257	Iola	1560	McKinley Elem	139	160	1950
D0257	Iola	1562	Iola Middle School	390	275	1924
D0257	Iola	1564	Iola Sr High	515	500	1916
D0257	Iola	1566	LaHarpe Elem	70	125	1977

1-156
+755

Distict Number	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Enrollment	Capacity	Year Built
D0257	Iola	1578	Crossroads Alternative School	22	966	1970
D0258	Humboldt	1590	Humboldt Elem School	200	500	1962
D0258	Humboldt	1592	Humboldt High School	178	500	1922
D0258	Humboldt	1600	Humboldt Middle School	130	700	1996
D0259	Wichita	1614	Adams Elem	290	450	1948
D0259	Wichita	1616	Alcott/Burger King Academy	81	123	1926
D0259	Wichita	1618	Allen Elem	292	300	1952
D0259	Wichita	1622	Benton Elem	370	450	1957
D0259	Wichita	1623	Beech Elem	554	600	1984
D0259	Wichita	1624	Black Traditional Magnet Elem	332	332	1954
D0259	Wichita	1626	Booth Early Childhood	234	300	1954
D0259	Wichita	1632	Bryant Core Knowledge Magent	367	480	1956
D0259	Wichita	1634	Buckner Performing Arts Magnet Elem	314	600	1955
D0259	Wichita	1636	Caldwell Elem	438	450	1950
D0259	Wichita	1640	Cessna Elem	365	300	1960
D0259	Wichita	1644	Chisholm Trail Elem	529	600	1954
D0259	Wichita	1646	Clark Elem	285	300	1956
D0259	Wichita	1648	Cleaveland Traditional Magnet Elementary	316	300	1956
D0259	Wichita	1650	Cloud Elem	753	600	1954
D0259	Wichita	1652	College Hill Elem	462	475	1977
D0259	Wichita	1653	Colvin Elem	743	850	1978
D0259	Wichita	1654	Dodge/Edison Partnership	626	625	1938
D0259	Wichita	1658	Earhart Environ Magnet Elem	322	330	1946
D0259	Wichita	1659	Emerson Open Magnet Elem	238	300	1953
D0259	Wichita	1660	Enterprise Elem	413	450	1919
D0259	Wichita	1674	Franklin Elem	340	350	1941
D0259	Wichita	1676	Funston Elem	408	450	1926
D0259	Wichita	1677	Gammon Elem	615	600	1984
D0259	Wichita	1678	Gardiner Elem	472	500	1927
D0259	Wichita	1682	Greiffenstein Special Ed Center	60	100	1950
D0259	Wichita	1684	Griffith Elem	338	333	1958
D0259	Wichita	1686	Price/Harris Communications Magnet	231	200	1956
D0259	Wichita	1688	Harry Street Elem	277	300	1889
D0259	Wichita	1690	Hyde Intl Studies/Commun Elem Magnet	314	333	1930
D0259	Wichita	1692	Ingalls Edison Academy	666	700	1926
D0259	Wichita	1694	Horace Mann/Irving Foreign Lang Mag	405	419	1941
D0259	Wichita	1696	Isely Edison Academy	274	450	1949
D0259	Wichita	1698	Jefferson Elem	373	450	1942

District Number	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Enrollment	Capacity	Year Built
D0259	Wichita	1702	Kellogg Science/Tech Magnet Elem	292	300	1941
D0259	Wichita	1704	Kelly Liberal Arts Academy	539	600	1957
D0259	Wichita	1706	Kensler Elem	557	600	1958
D0259	Wichita	1708	Bostic Traditional Magnet Elem	343	450	1956
D0259	Wichita	1710	Lewis Open Magnet Elem	211	200	1954
D0259	Wichita	1712	Lawrence Elem	468	450	1952
D0259	Wichita	1715	Levy Sp Ed Center	118	115	1981
D0259	Wichita	1716	Lincoln Elem	251	300	1938
D0259	Wichita	1718	Linwood Elementary	258	300	1910
D0259	Wichita	1720	Little Early Childhood Ed Ctr	205	250	1954
D0259	Wichita	1724	L'Ouverture Computer Technology Magnet	370	450	1951
D0259	Wichita	1736	McCollom Elem	402	450	1959
D0259	Wichita	1740	McLean Science/Tech Magnet Elem	304	300	1955
D0259	Wichita	1742	Metro Meridian Alt High	180	200	1924
D0259	Wichita	1744	Minneha Elem	649	700	1948
D0259	Wichita	1746	Mueller Elem	573	600	1952
D0259	Wichita	1754	O K Elem	301	300	1924
D0259	Wichita	1756	Horace Mann/Park Foreign Lang Magnet Ele	194	450	1921
D0259	Wichita	1758	Payne Elem	343	450	1954
D0259	Wichita	1760	Peterson Elem	508	520	1932
D0259	Wichita	1764	Price/Harris Communications Magnet	226	200	1956
D0259	Wichita	1766	Riverside Cultural Arts / History Magnet	262	300	1910
D0259	Wichita	1772	Seltzer Elem	341	700	1951
D0259	Wichita	1778	Pleasant Valley Elem	322	450	1948
D0259	Wichita	1780	Sowers Special Education Center	116	100	1952
D0259	Wichita	1782	Stanley Elem	368	450	1930
D0259	Wichita	1790	Washington Accelerated Learning Elem	410	470	1919
D0259	Wichita	1792	Wells Alternative Middle School	101	85	1956
D0259	Wichita	1796	White Elem	267	300	1957
D0259	Wichita	1798	Anderson Elem	554	600	1953
D0259	Wichita	1800	Woodland Health / Wellness Magnet Elem	291	300	1889
D0259	Wichita	1802	Woodman Elem	650	600	1962
D0259	Wichita	1804	Allison Traditional Magnet Middle	499	500	1919
D0259	Wichita	1805	Arkansas Gateway Middle School	21	90	1942
D0259	Wichita	1806	Brooks Magnet Middle School	688	750	1956
D0259	Wichita	1808	Curtis Middle School	833	800	1953
D0259	Wichita	1810	Coleman Middle School	1019	800	1965
D0259	Wichita	1812	Hadley Middle School	692	750	1957

1-157
4-756

District Number	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Enrollment	Capacity	Year Built
D0259	Wichita	1814	Hamilton Middle School	553	600	1919
D0259	Wichita	1816	Jardine/Edison Partnership Middle	822	900	1957
D0259	Wichita	1818	Horace Mann Foreign Lang Elem Magnet	468	600	1917
D0259	Wichita	1820	Marshall Middle School	554	600	1939
D0259	Wichita	1823	Northeast Magnet High & Downtown Law Cam	570	530	1951
D0259	Wichita	1824	Mayberry Magnet Middle School	631	750	1954
D0259	Wichita	1826	Mead Middle School	495	600	1951
D0259	Wichita	1828	Pleasant Valley Middle School	600	750	1955
D0259	Wichita	1830	Robinson Middle School	709	750	1932
D0259	Wichita	1833	Wilbur Middle School	916	1000	1966
D0259	Wichita	1834	Truesdell Middle School	1036	1051	1955
D0259	Wichita	1836	East High	2181	2200	1922
D0259	Wichita	1837	Metro Blvd Alt High	180	180	1924
D0259	Wichita	1838	North High	1691	1750	1929
D0259	Wichita	1840	South High	1597	1750	1959
D0259	Wichita	1842	Southeast High	1808	1800	1957
D0259	Wichita	1844	West High	1469	1600	1953
D0259	Wichita	1846	Heights High	1477	1800	1961
D0259	Wichita	1847	Northwest High	1563	1800	1978
D0259	Wichita	1852	Metro Midtown Alt High	165	180	1913
D0259	Wichita	1947	Arkansas Avenue Gateway High School	11		1947
D0259	Wichita	1948	Chisholm Life Skills Center	107	130	1949
D0260	Derby	1926	Derby Middle Sch	1098	1118	1951
D0260	Derby	1927	El Paso Elem	375	364	1966
D0260	Derby	1928	Oaklawn Elem	226	294	1954
D0260	Derby	1929	Derby Sixth Grade Center	524	546	1951
D0260	Derby	1930	Paul B Cooper Elem	255	272	1954
D0260	Derby	1932	Pleasantview Elem	310	362	1954
D0260	Derby	1934	Swaney Elem	389	408	1956
D0260	Derby	1936	Wineteer Elem	533	518	1959
D0260	Derby	1938	Carlton Math Science Magnet	238	229	1960
D0260	Derby	1941	Derby Hills Elem	440	432	1985
D0260	Derby	1942	Derby High School	2079	1850	1994
D0260	Derby	1944	Tanglewood Elem	350	408	1982
D0261	Haysville	1956	Campus High Haysville	1091	1400	1960
D0261	Haysville	1957	Haysville Alternative High	335	170	1997
D0261	Haysville	1958	Haysville Middle School	1008	1200	1960
D0261	Haysville	1960	Freeman Elem	412	400	1961

1-158
1-157

1-159
H58

District Number	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Enrollment	Capacity	Year Built
D0261	Haysville	1964	Nelson Elem	540	500	1953
D0261	Haysville	1966	Oatville Elem	401	400	1953
D0261	Haysville	1967	Early Childhood Center Haysville	132	70	1960
D0261	Haysville	1968	Rex Elem	485	500	1955
D0262	Valley Center Pub Sch	1980	Abilene Elem	340	360	1952
D0262	Valley Center Pub Sch	1981	Wheatland Elem	374	400	1992
D0262	Valley Center Pub Sch	1984	West Elem	353	400	1960
D0262	Valley Center Pub Sch	1985	Valley Center Middle School	522	700	1957
D0262	Valley Center Pub Sch	1986	Valley Center High	763	1000	1968
D0263	Mulvane	1992	Mulvane Elem W D Munson	421	450	1960
D0263	Mulvane	1994	Mulvane Intermediate 5-6	302	400	1936
D0263	Mulvane	1996	Mulvane High	672	750	1997
D0263	Mulvane	1997	Mulvane Middle School 7-8	329	400	1954
D0263	Mulvane	1998	Mulvane Grade School	285	400	1986
D0264	Clearwater	2010	Clearwater Elementary East	156	212	1952
D0264	Clearwater	2011	Clearwater Elementary West	367	410	1989
D0264	Clearwater	2012	Clearwater Middle	288	300	1974
D0264	Clearwater	2014	Clearwater High	348	400	1960
D0265	Goddard	2025	Clark Davidson Elem	555	750	1990
D0265	Goddard	2026	Goddard Primary Learning Ctr	492	575	1953
D0265	Goddard	2027	Goddard Middle School	569	650	1971
D0265	Goddard	2028	Goddard Intermediate Learning Ctr	863	1000	1966
D0265	Goddard	2030	Goddard High	1082	1400	1997
D0266	Maize	2043	Pray-Woodman Elementary 2-4	668	840	1995
D0266	Maize	2044	Maize East Elementary 5-6	849	850	1983
D0266	Maize	2045	Maize Elementary 2-4	618	800	1998
D0266	Maize	2046	Vermillion Primary K-1	743	900	1958
D0266	Maize	2047	Maize Middle School	824	900	1953
D0266	Maize	2050	Maize Sr High	1499	1600	1996
D0267	Renwick	2062	Andale Elem-Middle	329	425	1964
D0267	Renwick	2064	Andale High	316	350	1938
D0267	Renwick	2066	Colwich Elem	342	450	1958
D0267	Renwick	2068	Garden Plain Elem	316	600	1973
D0267	Renwick	2070	Garden Plain High	250	300	1947
D0267	Renwick	2072	St Joseph Elem	68	100	1922
D0267	Renwick	2074	St Marks Elem	297	375	1962
D0268	Cheney	2090	Cheney Elem	346	450	1953
D0268	Cheney	2091	Cheney Middle School 6-8	200	300	1970

Distict Number	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Enrollment	Capacity	Year Built
D0268	Cheney	2092	Cheney High	221	225	1996
D0269	Palco	2110	Damar Jr High	38	150	1937
D0269	Palco	2114	Palco Elem	68	180	1922
D0269	Palco	2116	Palco High	64	250	1954
D0270	Plainville	2136	Plainville Elem	307	450	1938
D0270	Plainville	2138	Plainville High	164	350	1951
D0271	Stockton	2156	Stockton Elem	304	450	1995
D0271	Stockton	2158	Stockton High	145	200	1954
D0272	Waconda	2170	Cawker City Elem	56	155	1961
D0272	Waconda	2172	Waconda East High	77	147	1950
D0272	Waconda	2174	Downs Elem	157	198	1962
D0272	Waconda	2176	Downs High	93	161	1929
D0272	Waconda	2178	Glen Elder Elem	90	125	1938
D0272	Waconda	2186	Tipton Elem	79	141	1976
D0273	Beloit	2214	Beloit Elem	410	456	1954
D0273	Beloit	2218	Beloit Jr-Sr High	414	520	1976
D0274	Oakley	2258	Monument Elem	73	136	1928
D0274	Oakley	2262	Oakley Elem	79	166	1961
D0274	Oakley	2266	Oakley Sr High	189	229	1954
D0274	Oakley	2268	Oakley Middle School	142	161	1923
D0275	Triplains	2286	Winona Elem	52	175	1926
D0275	Triplains	2288	Winona High	40	175	1926
D0278	Mankato	2346	Mankato Elem	135	325	1956
D0278	Mankato	2348	Mankato Jr High	48	150	1969
D0278	Mankato	2350	Mankato High	101	150	1969
D0279	Jewell	2370	Randall Elem	83	130	1924
D0279	Jewell	2372	Jewell Senior High	66	125	1922
D0279	Jewell	2374	Jewell Jr High	37	125	1924
D0280	West Graham-Morland	2390	Morland Elem	40	150	1951
D0280	West Graham-Morland	2392	Morland High	47	225	1957
D0281	Hill City	2412	Hill City Elem	174	250	1946
D0281	Hill City	2414	Longfellow Middle	91	120	1922
D0281	Hill City	2416	Hill City High	150	300	1959
D0282	West Elk	2442	Howard West Elk Jr-Sr High	234	550	1978
D0282	West Elk	2444	Moline Elem	141	165	1952
D0282	West Elk	2448	Severy Elem	134	165	1956
D0283	Elk Valley	2470	Elk Valley Elementary	104	120	1958
D0283	Elk Valley	2472	Elk Valley High School	113	200	1924

1-160
1-159

1-16-11
1-16-11

District Number	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Enrollment	Capacity	Year Built
D0284	Chase County	2488	Chase Co Middle	158	200	1973
D0284	Chase County	2490	Chase Co Elem	181	300	1904
D0284	Chase County	2492	Chase County High	177	325	1927
D0285	Cedar Vale	2518	Cedar Vale Elem	116	160	1974
D0285	Cedar Vale	2520	Cedar Vale High	107	190	1977
D0286	Chautauqua Co Community	2544	Sedan Elem	365	788	1949
D0286	Chautauqua Co Community	2546	Sedan High	184	425	1961
D0287	West Franklin	2558	Appanoose Elem	216	300	1989
D0287	West Franklin	2566	Pomona Elem	271	360	1960
D0287	West Franklin	2566	Pomona High	239	280	1965
D0287	West Franklin	2568	Pomona High	186	180	1958
D0287	West Franklin	2570	Williamsburg Elem	84	105	1958
D0287	West Franklin	2572	Williamsburg High	330	300	1968
D0288	Central Heights	2584	Central Heights High	346	450	1968
D0288	Central Heights	2585	Central Heights Elem	436	500	1954
D0289	Wellsville	2620	Wellsville Elem	351	350	1971
D0289	Wellsville	2622	Wellsville High	151	150	1969
D0290	Ottawa	2641	Eisenhower Elem	210	250	1937
D0290	Ottawa	2642	Eugene Field Elem	267	350	1952
D0290	Ottawa	2644	Garfield Elem	157	225	1926
D0290	Ottawa	2646	Hawthorne Elem	284	300	1952
D0290	Ottawa	2648	Lincoln Elem	585	800	1918
D0290	Ottawa	2650	Ottawa Middle School	658	750	1966
D0290	Ottawa	2652	Ottawa Sr High	65	120	1923
D0291	Grinnell Public Schools	2666	Grinneil Grade School	33	60	1953
D0291	Grinnell Public Schools	2670	Grinnell Middle	51	200	1930
D0291	Grinnell Public Schools	2672	Grinnell High	106	160	1931
D0292	Wheatland	2688	Wheatland Elem	88	225	1968
D0292	Wheatland	2690	Wheatland Middle/Senior High	201	300	1927
D0293	Quinter Public Schools	2710	Quinter Elem	193	275	1939
D0293	Quinter Public Schools	2712	Quinter Jr-Sr High	281	350	1926
D0294	Oberlin	2738	Oberlin Elem	267	400	1938
D0294	Oberlin	2740	Decatur Community Jr/Sr High	55	125	1922
D0295	Prairie Heights	2764	Jennings Elem	38	100	1922
D0295	Prairie Heights	2766	Jennings High	217	350	1919
D0297	St Francis Comm Sch	2812	St Francis Elem	231	375	1930
D0297	St Francis Comm Sch	2816	St Francis High	224	400	1951
D0298	Lincoln	2840	Lincoln Elem	200	350	
D0298	Lincoln	2842	Lincoln Jr/Sr High			

Distict Number	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Enrollment	Capacity	Year Built
D0299	Sylvan Grove	2866	Sylvan Unified Elem	98	250	1952
D0299	Sylvan Grove	2868	Sylvan Unified High	111	450	1967
D0300	Comanche County	2890	South Central High School	92	275	1964
D0300	Comanche County	2892	South Central Elementary School	152	180	1954
D0300	Comanche County	2894	South Central Middle School	79	170	1927
D0301	Nes Tre La Go	2908	Utica Elem	34	60	1936
D0301	Nes Tre La Go	2910	Utica High	39	80	1928
D0302	Smoky Hill	2926	Ransom Elem	72	150	1954
D0302	Smoky Hill	2928	Ransom Jr/Sr High	81	250	1968
D0303	Ness City	2948	Ness City Elem	189	320	1941
D0303	Ness City	2952	Ness City High	127	250	1964
D0304	Bazine	2966	Bazine Elem	40	120	1956
D0304	Bazine	2968	Bazine High	60	120	1926
D0305	Salina	2985	Coronado Elem	305	260	1964
D0305	Salina	2986	Franklin-Lowell Elementary	354	312	1926
D0305	Salina	2988	Frank Hageman Elem	392	292	1954
D0305	Salina	2992	Hawthorne Elem	212	348	1912
D0305	Salina	2994	Heusner Elem	455	443	1950
D0305	Salina	2996	John F Kennedy Early Learning Cntr	60	84	1965
D0305	Salina	3000	Meadowlark Ridge Elem	342	289	1963
D0305	Salina	3002	Oakdale Elem	253	196	1931
D0305	Salina	3008	Schilling Elem	282	394	1957
D0305	Salina	3014	Stewart Elem	432	443	1960
D0305	Salina	3018	Sunset Elem	445	437	1954
D0305	Salina	3020	Whittier-Bartlett	540	391	1919
D0305	Salina	3022	Roosevelt Lincoln Middle	560	655	1915
D0305	Salina	3024	Salina South Middle	654	527	1959
D0305	Salina	3026	Salina High Central	1235	1048	1952
D0305	Salina	3027	Salina High South	1216	1041	1970
D0306	Southeast Of Saline	3052	Southeast Saline High	363	350	1978
D0306	Southeast Of Saline	3056	Southeast Saline Elem	314	s	1978
D0307	Ell-Saline	3079	Ell-Saline Middle School	79	140	1926
D0307	Ell-Saline	3080	Ell-Saline High	142	260	1926
D0307	Ell-Saline	3082	Happy Corner Elem	244	260	1964
D0308	Hutchinson Public Schools	3100	Allen Elem	247	350	1939
D0308	Hutchinson Public Schools	3102	Avenue A Elem	194	250	1939
D0308	Hutchinson Public Schools	3106	Faris Elem	214	250	1961
D0308	Hutchinson Public Schools	3108	Graber Elem	300	400	1953

1-1625

District Number	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Enrollment	Capacity	Year Built
D0308	Hutchinson Public Schools	3114	Lincoln Elem	227	300	1972
D0308	Hutchinson Public Schools	3116	McCandless Elem	485	450	1950
D0308	Hutchinson Public Schools	3118	Morgan Elem	372	400	1950
D0308	Hutchinson Public Schools	3122	Roosevelt Elem	247	300	1920
D0308	Hutchinson Public Schools	3124	Wiley Elem	217	250	1953
D0308	Hutchinson Public Schools	3126	Winans Elem	122	300	1920
D0308	Hutchinson Public Schools	3130	Liberty Middle	451	500	1983
D0308	Hutchinson Public Schools	3132	Sherman Middle	337	500	1983
D0308	Hutchinson Public Schools	3134	Hutchinson High	1397	1500	1960
D0309	Nickerson	3162	Mitchell Elem	65	125	1960
D0309	Nickerson	3164	Nickerson Elem	318	400	1955
D0309	Nickerson	3166	Nickerson High	444	600	1956
D0309	Nickerson	3168	North Reno Elem	185	350	1955
D0309	Nickerson	3170	South Hutchinson Elem	341	400	1956
D0310	Fairfield	3186	Fairfield East Elem	93	120	1956
D0310	Fairfield	3188	Fairfield High	138	160	1963
D0310	Fairfield	3194	Fairfield West Elem	102	120	1926
D0310	Fairfield	3195	Fairfield Middle	96	120	1993
D0311	Pretty Prairie	3218	Pretty Prairie Elem	104	200	1956
D0311	Pretty Prairie	3220	Pretty Prairie High	117	160	1921
D0311	Pretty Prairie	3222	Pretty Prairie Middle	97	160	1977
D0312	Haven Public Schools	3231	Elreka Elem	54	140	1958
D0312	Haven Public Schools	3232	Haven Elem	261	200	1951
D0312	Haven Public Schools	3233	Haven Middle School	110	160	1990
D0312	Haven Public Schools	3234	Haven High	354	375	1970
D0312	Haven Public Schools	3238	Yoder Elem	91	105	1955
D0312	Haven Public Schools	3240	Partridge Elem	70	125	1955
D0312	Haven Public Schools	3244	Mt Hope Elem	151	240	1997
D0313	Buhler	3252	Buhler Elem	308	300	1956
D0313	Buhler	3254	Buhler High	777	900	1931
D0313	Buhler	3258	Obee Elem	181	180	1939
D0313	Buhler	3260	Prosperity Elem	191	200	1954
D0313	Buhler	3262	Prairie Hills Middle	365	400	1980
D0313	Buhler	3264	Union Valley Elem	495	600	1953
D0314	Brewster	3276	Brewster Elem	79	150	1923
D0314	Brewster	3278	Brewster High	83	150	1923
D0315	Colby Public Schools	3290	Colby Elem	445	650	1949
D0315	Colby Public Schools	3292	Colby Middle School	278	375	1962

Distict Number	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Enrollment	Capacity	Year Built
D0315	Colby Public Schools	3294	Colby Senior High	411	550	1996
D0316	Golden Plains	3314	Golden Plains Middle	11	150	1924
D0316	Golden Plains	3316	Golden Plains High	57	200	1924
D0316	Golden Plains	3318	Golden Plains Elem	88	175	1965
D0317	Herndon	3328	Herndon Elem	49	100	1950
D0317	Herndon	3330	Herndon High	58	100	1950
D0318	Atwood	3348	Atwood Elem	256	400	1965
D0318	Atwood	3350	Atwood High	149	320	1925
D0320	Wamego	3388	Wamego Middle School	342	400	1992
D0320	Wamego	3396	Central Elem	293	360	1963
D0320	Wamego	3398	Wamego High	470	360	1939
D0320	Wamego	3399	West Elem	314	480	1980
D0321	Kaw Valley	3416	Delia Elem	65	68	1955
D0321	Kaw Valley	3420	Emmett Elem	82	101	1974
D0321	Kaw Valley	3426	Rossville Elem	323	457	1944
D0321	Kaw Valley	3428	Rossville High	181	304	1980
D0321	Kaw Valley	3430	St Marys Elem	236	416	1975
D0321	Kaw Valley	3432	St Marys High	213	364	1980
D0322	Onaga-Havensville-Wheaton	3452	Havensville Elem	53	80	1937
D0322	Onaga-Havensville-Wheaton	3456	Onaga Elem	198	400	1959
D0322	Onaga-Havensville-Wheaton	3458	Onaga Junior/Senior High	150	250	1951
D0323	Rock Creek	3488	St George Elem	269	250	1960
D0323	Rock Creek	3492	Westmoreland Elem	169	250	1927
D0323	Rock Creek	3495	Rock Creek Jr/Sr High School	379	415	1991
D0324	Eastern Heights	3504	Eastern Heights Elem	108	120	1919
D0324	Eastern Heights	3508	Eastern Heights High	87	140	1948
D0325	Phillipsburg	3538	Phillipsburg Elem	243	380	1953
D0325	Phillipsburg	3540	Phillipsburg Middle	235	300	1939
D0325	Phillipsburg	3542	Phillipsburg High	223	300	1961
D0326	Logan	3562	Logan Elem	108	160	1954
D0326	Logan	3564	Logan High	113	200	1969
D0327	Ellsworth	3594	Ellsworth Elem	236	550	1952
D0327	Ellsworth	3598	Ellsworth High	260	725	1955
D0327	Ellsworth	3600	Kanopolis Middle	224	475	1922
D0328	Lorraine	3634	Wilson Elem	111	1248	1998
D0328	Lorraine	3636	Wilson Jr/Sr High	135		1998
D0328	Lorraine	3638	Quivira Heights Elem/Jr Hi	208		1998
D0328	Lorraine	3640	Quivira Heights High	118	647	1998

4
1-162

5
1-1-64

District Number	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Enrollment	Capacity	Year Built
D0329	Mill Creek Valley	3650	Alma Grade School	140	200	1956
D0329	Mill Creek Valley	3652	Wabaunsee Sr High	195	250	1937
D0329	Mill Creek Valley	3664	Paxico Grade School	82	175	1954
D0329	Mill Creek Valley	3665	Mill Creek Valley Junior High	88	120	1929
D0329	Mill Creek Valley	3667	Maple Hill Elem	54	150	1952
D0330	Wabaunsee East	3680	Dover Elem	146	217	1950
D0330	Wabaunsee East	3684	Eskridge Elem	131	264	1921
D0330	Wabaunsee East	3686	Mission Valley High	212	240	1970
D0330	Wabaunsee East	3688	Harveyville Elem	109	242	1940
D0331	Kingman - Norwich	3714	Kingman Elem	681	650	1980
D0331	Kingman - Norwich	3716	Kingman High	306	500	1963
D0331	Kingman - Norwich	3722	Norwich Elem	207	300	1955
D0331	Kingman - Norwich	3724	Norwich High	106	200	1983
D0332	Cunningham	3748	Cunningham Elem	156	220	1948
D0332	Cunningham	3750	Cunningham High	94	160	1917
D0332	Cunningham	3760	Zenda Elem	69	160	1988
D0333	Concordia	3780	Concordia Elementary	353	600	1996
D0333	Concordia	3786	Lincoln Elem	105	100	1957
D0333	Concordia	3793	Concordia Middle	190	275	1962
D0333	Concordia	3794	Concordia Jr-Sr High	626	575	1929
D0334	Southern Cloud	3832	Glasco Elem	79	160	1950
D0334	Southern Cloud	3834	Glasco High	45	120	1921
D0334	Southern Cloud	3836	Miltonvale Elem	54	140	1958
D0334	Southern Cloud	3838	Miltonvale High	81	120	1963
D0335	North Jackson	3861	Jackson Heights High	140	291	1969
D0335	North Jackson	3870	Jackson Heights Elem	291	425	1975
D0336	Holton	3886	Central Elem	235	250	1955
D0336	Holton	3887	Colorado Elem	229	250	1955
D0336	Holton	3890	Holton Middle	250	280	1975
D0336	Holton	3892	Holton High	357	400	1994
D0337	Royal Valley	3916	Royal Valley Elementary	324	425	1964
D0337	Royal Valley	3918	Royal Valley High	268	512	1971
D0337	Royal Valley	3921	Royal Valley Middle School	306	512	1979
D0338	Valley Falls	3936	Valley Falls Elem	299	310	1958
D0338	Valley Falls	3938	Valley Falls High	171	390	1925
D0339	Jefferson County North	3948	Jefferson Co North High	171	280	1980
D0339	Jefferson County North	3950	Jefferson County North Elem/Middle	332	475	1997
D0340	Jefferson West	3968	Jefferson West Elem	250		1939

Distict Number	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Enrollment	Capacity	Year Built
D0340	Jefferson West	3969	Jefferson West Intermediate	142		1966
D0340	Jefferson West	3970	Jefferson West High	306		1996
D0340	Jefferson West	3972	Jefferson West Middle	260		1968
D0341	Oskaloosa Public Schools	3988	Oskaloosa Elem	334	400	1972
D0341	Oskaloosa Public Schools	3989	Oskaloosa Middle School	177	235	1990
D0341	Oskaloosa Public Schools	3990	Oskaloosa High	246	300	1961
D0342	McLouth	4006	McLouth Elem	259	400	1957
D0342	McLouth	4007	McLouth Middle	150	300	1981
D0342	McLouth	4008	McLouth High	168	200	1981
D0343	Perry Public Schools	4020	Grantville Elem	74	80	1956
D0343	Perry Public Schools	4022	Lecompton Elem	183	230	1960
D0343	Perry Public Schools	4028	Perry Elem	188	230	1948
D0343	Perry Public Schools	4029	Perry Middle	168	240	1971
D0343	Perry Public Schools	4030	Perry Lecompton High	335	400	1971
D0343	Perry Public Schools	4032	Williamstown Elem	95	100	1954
D0344	Pleasanton	4038	Pleasanton Elem	229	200	1962
D0344	Pleasanton	4040	Pleasanton High	194	200	1966
D0345	Seaman	4056	East Indianola Elem	243	400	1950
D0345	Seaman	4058	Elmont Elem	154	340	1959
D0345	Seaman	4060	Indian Creek Elem	167	280	1954
D0345	Seaman	4064	Lyman Elem	147	260	1956
D0345	Seaman	4066	North Fairview Elem	189	380	1958
D0345	Seaman	4068	Pleasant Hill Elem	285	340	1955
D0345	Seaman	4070	Rochester Elem	268	340	1952
D0345	Seaman	4072	West Indianola Elem	253	380	1970
D0345	Seaman	4073	Logan Jr High	329	640	1954
D0345	Seaman	4074	Northern Hills Jr High	457	620	1963
D0345	Seaman	4076	Seaman High	744	1240	1970
D0346	Jayhawk	4088	Blue Mound Elem	57	110	1942
D0346	Jayhawk	4092	Mound City Elem	190	260	1922
D0346	Jayhawk	4094	Jayhawk-Linn High	301	400	1972
D0346	Jayhawk	4096	Prescott Elem	59	90	1925
D0347	Kinsley-Offerle	4112	Lincoln Elem	54	124	1928
D0347	Kinsley-Offerle	4114	Southside Elem	56	176	1930
D0347	Kinsley-Offerle	4118	Kinsley Sr High	135	300	1942
D0347	Kinsley-Offerle	4120	Offerle Middle	101	250	1956
D0348	Baldwin City	4140	Baldwin Elem	399	450	1923
D0348	Baldwin City	4141	Baldwin Junior High School	323	300	1969

6
1-165

7
1-166

Distict Number	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Enrollment	Capacity	Year Built
D0348	Baldwin City	4142	Baldwin High	408	500	1994
D0348	Baldwin City	4144	Marion Springs	91	100	1963
D0348	Baldwin City	4146	Vinland Elem	112	120	1993
D0349	Stafford	4158	Stafford Elementary	163	220	1955
D0349	Stafford	4164	Stafford Middle School/High School	176	280	1999
D0350	St John-Hudson	4176	Hudson Elem	65	100	1953
D0350	St John-Hudson	4180	St John Elem	162	190	1939
D0350	St John-Hudson	4182	St John High	199	250	1939
D0351	Macksville	4196	Macksville Elem	194	300	1961
D0351	Macksville	4200	Macksville High	94	280	1925
D0352	Goodland	4222	Central Elementary School	186	288	1950
D0352	Goodland	4224	Grant Junior High	197	374	1927
D0352	Goodland	4228	Goodland High	366	825	1937
D0352	Goodland	4231	North Elem Goodland	278	260	1969
D0352	Goodland	4239	West Elem Goodland	169	260	1969
D0353	Wellington	4260	Eisenhower Elem	246	454	1970
D0353	Wellington	4265	Kennedy Elem	228	341	1970
D0353	Wellington	4266	Lincoln Elem	243	308	1954
D0353	Wellington	4272	Roosevelt Elem	149	218	1954
D0353	Wellington	4274	Washington Elem	137	180	1918
D0353	Wellington	4276	Wellington Jr High	471	789	1928
D0353	Wellington	4278	Wellington High	473	650	1959
D0354	Clafin	4294	Clafin Elem	172	250	1912
D0354	Clafin	4296	Clafin Junior/Senior High	169	250	1964
D0355	Ellinwood Public Schools	4318	Ellinwood Elem	284	300	1952
D0355	Ellinwood Public Schools	4320	Ellinwood Middle School	86	120	1926
D0355	Ellinwood Public Schools	4322	Ellinwood High	223	280	1926
D0356	Conway Springs	4340	Conway Springs Kyle Trueblood	181	250	1959
D0356	Conway Springs	4341	Conway Springs Middle School	151	250	1987
D0356	Conway Springs	4342	Conway Springs High School	227	400	1997
D0357	Belle Plaine	4362	Belle Plaine Elem	420	450	1950
D0357	Belle Plaine	4363	Belle Plaine Middle	204	250	1985
D0357	Belle Plaine	4364	Belle Plaine High	245	250	1924
D0358	Oxford	4388	Oxford Elem	228	300	1929
D0358	Oxford	4390	Oxford Jr/Sr High	224	300	1968
D0359	Argonia Public Schools	4404	Argonia Elem	137	180	1957
D0359	Argonia Public Schools	4406	Argonia High	123	180	1964
D0360	Caldwell	4420	Caldwell Elem	178	250	1926

Distict Number	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Enrollment	Capacity	Year Built
D0360	Caldwell	4422	Caldwell High	166	600	1916
D0361	Anthony-Harper	4438	Anthony Elem	359	450	1928
D0361	Anthony-Harper	4442	Chaparral High Anthony	367	600	1970
D0361	Anthony-Harper	4458	Harper Elem	346	450	1938
D0362	Prairie View	4490	Fontana Elem	85	100	1955
D0362	Prairie View	4496	Lacygne Elem	261	225	1988
D0362	Prairie View	4502	Parker Elem	153	175	1987
D0362	Prairie View	4504	Prairie View Jr Hi (7-8)	159		1970
D0362	Prairie View	4505	Prairie View High	314	450	1970
D0363	Holcomb	4516	Holcomb Elem K-5	488	500	1954
D0363	Holcomb	4517	Holcomb Elementary (6-8)	227	450	1954
D0363	Holcomb	4518	Holcomb High	238	600	1983
D0364	Marysville	4530	Beattie Elem	46	180	1959
D0364	Marysville	4545	Marysville Elem	351	475	1989
D0364	Marysville	4548	Marysville Jr/Sr High	575	600	1939
D0365	Garnett	4586	Irving Primary	131	144	1938
D0365	Garnett	4590	Garnett Elem	322	325	1921
D0365	Garnett	4592	Greeley Elem	60	72	1949
D0365	Garnett	4600	Mont Ida Elem	26	36	1929
D0365	Garnett	4610	Westphalia	127	180	1941
D0365	Garnett	4612	Anderson County Jr/Sr High School	496	560	1992
D0366	Woodson	4639	Yates Center Elem	363	500	1969
D0366	Woodson	4646	Yates Center High	229	320	1924
D0367	Osawatomie	4662	Trojan Elem	494	600	1998
D0367	Osawatomie	4664	Swenson Early Childhood Education Center	139	200	1956
D0367	Osawatomie	4665	Osawatomie Middle School	289	350	1983
D0367	Osawatomie	4666	Osawatomie High	380	490	1969
D0368	Paola	4690	Sunflower Elem	370	450	1985
D0368	Paola	4692	Hillsdale Elem	151	250	1982
D0368	Paola	4694	Paola Middle	637	700	1970
D0368	Paola	4696	Paola North Elem	232	450	1935
D0368	Paola	4700	Paola High	725	750	1992
D0369	Burrton	4734	Burrton Elem	182	250	1923
D0369	Burrton	4736	Burrton High	86	175	1923
D0371	Montezuma	4762	Montezuma Elem	103	120	1929
D0371	Montezuma	4764	South Gray High	118	130	1925
D0372	Silver Lake	4776	Silver Lake Elem	388	480	1961
D0372	Silver Lake	4778	Silver Lake Jr-Sr High	357	400	1953

1-16D

District Number	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Enrollment	Capacity	Year Built
D0373	Newton	4796	Northridge Elem	263	300	1955
D0373	Newton	4799	Slate Creek Elementary	439	450	1997
D0373	Newton	4800	South Breeze Elem	307	350	1957
D0373	Newton	4802	Sunset Elem	468	450	1954
D0373	Newton	4805	Chisholm Middle	407	450	1958
D0373	Newton	4807	Santa Fe Middle	399	450	1914
D0373	Newton	4810	Newton Sr High	1159	1100	1973
D0373	Newton	4816	Walton Elem	99	150	1963
D0374	Sublette	4834	Sublette Elem	255	275	1953
D0374	Sublette	4836	Sublette High	169	250	1961
D0374	Sublette	4838	Sublette Middle	78	100	1989
D0375	Circle	4850	Benton Elem	356	350	1954
D0375	Circle	4852	Circle High	470	450	1962
D0375	Circle	4854	Oil Hill Elem	152	200	1957
D0375	Circle	4856	Towanda Elem	498	400	1954
D0376	Sterling	4864	Sterling Grade School	290	200	1927
D0376	Sterling	4865	Sterling Junior High	90	325	1995
D0376	Sterling	4866	Sterling High	165	200	1955
D0377	Atchison Co Comm Schools	4888	Cummings Elem	49	120	1961
D0377	Atchison Co Comm Schools	4890	Effingham Elem	137	140	1938
D0377	Atchison Co Comm Schools	4894	Atchison Co Community High	294	420	1976
D0377	Atchison Co Comm Schools	4906	Lancaster Elem	78	100	1936
D0377	Atchison Co Comm Schools	4916	Atchison Co Community Middle	258	400	1929
D0378	Riley County	4950	Riley County Grade Sch	398	588	1982
D0378	Riley County	4952	Riley County High School	223	400	1959
D0379	Clay Center	4970	Garfield Elem	150	200	1941
D0379	Clay Center	4972	Lincoln Elem	282	300	1939
D0379	Clay Center	4974	Clay Center Community Middle	302	400	1993
D0379	Clay Center	4976	Clay Center High	436	500	1963
D0379	Clay Center	4982	Green Elem	43	100	1930
D0379	Clay Center	4994	Longford Elem	21	100	1929
D0379	Clay Center	4998	Morganville Elem	72	100	1926
D0379	Clay Center	5014	Wakefield Elem	184	120	1957
D0379	Clay Center	5016	Wakefield High	96	105	1948
D0380	Vermillion	5032	Centralia Elem	156	185	1953
D0380	Vermillion	5034	Centralia High	157	220	1953
D0380	Vermillion	5036	Frankfort Elem	171	250	1998
D0380	Vermillion	5038	Frankfort High	158	245	1958

9
1-168

District Number	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Enrollment	Capacity	Year Built
D0381	Spearville	5058	Spearville Elem	171	350	1925
D0381	Spearville	5060	Spearville Jr/Sr High	199	350	1937
D0382	Pratt	5084	Mattie O Haskins Elem	224	240	1950
D0382	Pratt	5088	Southwest Elem	263	270	1962
D0382	Pratt	5090	Liberty Middle School	321	380	1983
D0382	Pratt	5092	Pratt Sr High	454	520	1938
D0383	Manhattan	5112	Amanda Arnold Elem	363	480	1985
D0383	Manhattan	5113	Frank V Bergman Elem	432	456	1995
D0383	Manhattan	5118	Bluemont Elem	303	336	1910
D0383	Manhattan	5122	Eugene Field Elem	142	144	1917
D0383	Manhattan	5124	Lee Elem	276	336	1951
D0383	Manhattan	5126	Marlatt Elem	443	456	1960
D0383	Manhattan	5128	Northview Elem	377	480	1957
D0383	Manhattan	5130	Theo Roosevelt Elem	241	336	1922
D0383	Manhattan	5132	Woodrow Wilson Elem	276	336	1922
D0383	Manhattan	5135	Susan B Anthony Middle School	479	600	1996
D0383	Manhattan	5136	Manhattan High School West/East Campus	1936	2300	1956
D0383	Manhattan	5137	Dwight D Eisenhower Middle School	495	600	1996
D0383	Manhattan	5138	Ogden Elem	191	216	1918
D0384	Blue Valley	5160	Olsburg Elem	106	115	1959
D0384	Blue Valley	5164	Randolph Middle	99	115	1961
D0384	Blue Valley	5166	Blue Valley High	84	110	1961
D0385	Andover	5177	Andover Intermediate	461	422	1997
D0385	Andover	5179	Andover Middle School	711	750	1996
D0385	Andover	5180	Andover High	954	850	1980
D0385	Andover	5181	Martin Primary North Campus K-3	389	370	1989
D0385	Andover	5182	Martin Primary South Campus K-3	447	400	1959
D0386	Madison-Virgil	5198	Madison Elem	132	250	1962
D0386	Madison-Virgil	5202	Madison High	138	350	1982
D0387	Altoona-Midway	5214	Altoona Elem	60	120	1954
D0387	Altoona-Midway	5216	Altoona-Midway Middle	79	130	1958
D0387	Altoona-Midway	5220	Midway Elem	78	150	1957
D0387	Altoona-Midway	5222	Altoona-Midway High School	127	120	1957
D0388	Ellis	5236	Washington Elem	219	300	1960
D0388	Ellis	5238	Ellis High	145	250	1977
D0389	Eureka	5260	Mulberry Elem	336	400	1917
D0389	Eureka	5265	Eureka Kindergarten	61	80	1952
D0389	Eureka	5266	Eureka Jr High	128	260	1984

1-176
1-169

District Number	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Enrollment	Capacity	Year Built
D0389	Eureka	5268	Eureka Sr High	273	260	1984
D0390	Hamilton	5296	Hamilton Elem	84	120	1951
D0390	Hamilton	5298	Hamilton High	41	80	1981
D0392	Osborne County	5322	Alton Osborne Jr Hi	90	220	1914
D0392	Osborne County	5332	Osborne Elem	244	420	1954
D0392	Osborne County	5334	Osborne High	160	340	1929
D0393	Solomon	5354	Solomon Elem	223	225	1965
D0393	Solomon	5356	Solomon High	208	218	1996
D0394	Rose Hill Public Schools	5370	Rose Hill Primary	408	400	1949
D0394	Rose Hill Public Schools	5371	Rose Hill Middle	475	425	1978
D0394	Rose Hill Public Schools	5372	Rose Hill High	551	600	1995
D0394	Rose Hill Public Schools	5374	Rose Hill Intermediate	442	500	1940
D0395	LaCrosse	5389	LaCrosse Elementary	146	174	1927
D0395	LaCrosse	5390	LaCrosse High	116	239	1955
D0395	LaCrosse	5396	McCracken Middle Sch	88	146	1928
D0396	Douglass Public Schools	5411	Leonard C Seal Elem	462		1953
D0396	Douglass Public Schools	5413	Marvin Sisk Middle School	169		1994
D0396	Douglass Public Schools	5414	Douglass High	296		1972
D0397	Centre	5434	Centre Elem	151	125	1928
D0397	Centre	5436	Centre Jr/Sr High	150	250	1958
D0398	Peabody-Burns	5456	Burns Elem	36	100	1921
D0398	Peabody-Burns	5460	Peabody Elem	214	250	1973
D0398	Peabody-Burns	5462	Peabody-Burns Jr/Sr High School	235	300	1997
D0399	Paradise	5486	Natoma Elem	83	154	1950
D0399	Paradise	5488	Natoma High (7-12)	72	160	1951
D0400	Smoky Valley	5504	Soderstrom Elem	282	325	1962
D0400	Smoky Valley	5505	Lindsborg Middle School	259	325	1954
D0400	Smoky Valley	5506	Smoky Valley High	369	450	1998
D0400	Smoky Valley	5508	Marquette Elem	149	180	1986
D0401	Chase-Raymond	5534	Chase Elem	80	130	1936
D0401	Chase-Raymond	5536	Chase High	72	150	1923
D0401	Chase-Raymond	5538	Raymond Jr High	46	100	1924
D0402	Augusta	5554	Garfield Elem	237	350	1955
D0402	Augusta	5555	Ewalt Elementary	331	450	1994
D0402	Augusta	5556	Lincoln Elem	206	350	1955
D0402	Augusta	5558	Robinson Elem	226	350	1961
D0402	Augusta	5560	Augusta Middle School	578	750	1995
D0402	Augusta	5562	Augusta Sr High	690	1000	1970

1-171
7-770

Distict Number	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Enrollment	Capacity	Year Built
D0403	Otis-Bison	5588	Otis-Bison Middle	74	200	1920
D0403	Otis-Bison	5598	Otis-Bison Elementary	105	200	1916
D0403	Otis-Bison	5600	Otis-Bison High	128	200	1932
D0404	Riverton	5620	Riverton Elem	388	450	1951
D0404	Riverton	5621	Riverton Middle	198	200	1981
D0404	Riverton	5622	Riverton High	240	350	1982
D0405	Lyons	5636	Lyons Central Elementary	194	200	1956
D0405	Lyons	5638	Lyons Park Elementary	117	200	1973
D0405	Lyons	5640	Lyons Middle School	210	300	1930
D0405	Lyons	5642	Lyons High	391	500	1968
D0405	Lyons	5646	Lyons South Elementary	85	200	1952
D0406	Wathena	5674	Wathena Elem	286	400	1964
D0406	Wathena	5676	Wathena High	121	220	1930
D0407	Russell County	5708	Lucas-Luray High	57	150	1959
D0407	Russell County	5710	Luray-Lucas Elem	105	200	1960
D0407	Russell County	5718	Bickerdyke Elem	244	400	1952
D0407	Russell County	5720	Simpson Elem	195	300	1952
D0407	Russell County	5722	Ruppenthal Middle	221	400	1938
D0407	Russell County	5724	Russell High	308	500	1962
D0408	Marion-Florence	5746	Marion Middle	120	180	1998
D0408	Marion-Florence	5748	Marion High	230	250	1921
D0408	Marion-Florence	5750	Marion Elem	389	450	1960
D0409	Atchison Public Schools	5761	Atchison Elementary School	793	1050	1997
D0409	Atchison Public Schools	5770	Atchison High School	556	500	1976
D0409	Atchison Public Schools	5776	Atchison Middle School	397	600	1908
D0410	Durham-Hillsboro-Lehigh	5812	Hillsboro Elem	325	450	1961
D0410	Durham-Hillsboro-Lehigh	5814	Hillsboro High	240	300	1937
D0410	Durham-Hillsboro-Lehigh	5820	Hillsboro Middle School	163	300	1995
D0411	Goessel	5834	Goessel Elem	170	350	1959
D0411	Goessel	5836	Goessel High	151	225	1935
D0412	Hoxie Community Schools	5852	Hoxie Elem	291	400	1920
D0412	Hoxie Community Schools	5854	Hoxie High	160	300	1920
D0413	Chanute Public Schools	5870	Alcott Elem	155	125	1938
D0413	Chanute Public Schools	5872	Hutton Elem	302	400	1951
D0413	Chanute Public Schools	5874	Lincoln Elem	99	125	1966
D0413	Chanute Public Schools	5876	Murray Elem	281	400	1950
D0413	Chanute Public Schools	5880	Royster Middle School	491	600	1968
D0413	Chanute Public Schools	5882	Chanute High	651	750	1914

1-17-12

District Number	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Enrollment	Capacity	Year Built
D0415	Hiawatha	5936	Hiawatha Elem	360	500	1956
D0415	Hiawatha	5940	Hiawatha Sr High	362	450	1972
D0415	Hiawatha	5949	Robinson Middle School	343	400	1921
D0416	Louisburg	5968	Circle Grove Elem	133	135	1959
D0416	Louisburg	5970	Louisburg Elem	432	400	1977
D0416	Louisburg	5972	Louisburg High	420	400	1992
D0416	Louisburg	5978	Louisburg Middle	348	275	1977
D0417	Morris County	5987	Prairie Heights Middle School	94	160	1986
D0417	Morris County	5990	Council Grove Elem	428	550	1949
D0417	Morris County	5994	Council Grove High	366	425	1917
D0417	Morris County	5998	Prairie Heights Elem	77	160	1954
D0417	Morris County	6005	Wilsey Elem	68	150	1929
D0418	McPherson	6028	Eisenhower Elementary	269	315	1996
D0418	McPherson	6030	Lincoln Elem	244	430	1980
D0418	McPherson	6032	Roosevelt Elem	344	430	1980
D0418	McPherson	6034	Washington Elem	255	290	1936
D0418	McPherson	6038	McPherson Middle School	637	800	1938
D0418	McPherson	6040	McPherson High	951	1100	1963
D0419	Canton-Galva	6064	Canton Elem	117	240	1959
D0419	Canton-Galva	6066	Canton High	129	407	1964
D0419	Canton-Galva	6068	Galva Elem	112	250	1957
D0419	Canton-Galva	6070	Galva Middle	52	210	1972
D0420	Osage City	6088	Osage City Elem	585	600	1957
D0420	Osage City	6090	Osage City High	209	325	1935
D0421	Lyndon	6102	Lyndon Elem	318	350	1920
D0421	Lyndon	6104	Lyndon High	176	200	1930
D0422	Greensburg	6118	Delmer Day Elem/Middle School	174	250	1955
D0422	Greensburg	6122	Greensburg High	88	250	1922
D0423	Moundridge	6140	Moundridge Elem	168	200	1956
D0423	Moundridge	6142	Moundridge High	167	200	1965
D0423	Moundridge	6146	Moundridge Middle	130	180	1976
D0424	Mullinville	6156	Mullinville Elem	64	120	1950
D0424	Mullinville	6158	Mullinville Junior High	11	100	1925
D0425	Highland	6170	Highland Elem	146	252	1895
D0425	Highland	6172	Highland High	130	280	1977
D0426	Pike Valley	6192	Pike Valley Elem	124	225	1966
D0426	Pike Valley	6194	Pike Valley Jr High	74	225	1939
D0426	Pike Valley	6206	Pike Valley High	96	180	1963

1-172

Distict Number	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Enrollment	Capacity	Year Built
D0427	Republic County	6220	Belleville East Elem	188	250	1951
D0427	Republic County	6222	Belleville Middle	192	250	1931
D0427	Republic County	6224	Belleville High	213	250	1962
D0428	Great Bend	6256	Eisenhower Elem	143	325	1954
D0428	Great Bend	6268	Jefferson Elem	296	325	1958
D0428	Great Bend	6270	Lincoln Elem	261	325	1958
D0428	Great Bend	6272	Morrison Elem	64		1937
D0428	Great Bend	6274	Park Elem	281	325	1953
D0428	Great Bend	6276	Riley Elem	369	325	1956
D0428	Great Bend	6278	Washington Elem	142	300	1919
D0428	Great Bend	6280	Great Bend Middle School	550	525	1958
D0428	Great Bend	6284	Great Bend High School	1080	1100	1950
D0429	Troy Public Schools	6324	Troy Elem	202	200	1926
D0429	Troy Public Schools	6326	Troy High and Middle School	212	270	1927
D0430	South Brown County	6344	Everest Middle	214	330	1951
D0430	South Brown County	6348	Horton Elem	301	450	1973
D0430	South Brown County	6350	Horton High	232	600	1917
D0431	Hoisington	6374	Lincoln Elem	114	120	1926
D0431	Hoisington	6376	Roosevelt Elem	202	220	1954
D0431	Hoisington	6378	Hoisington Middle	168	250	1956
D0431	Hoisington	6380	Hoisington High	254	400	1938
D0432	Victoria	6400	Victoria Elem	187	440	1961
D0432	Victoria	6402	Victoria High	104	325	1950
D0433	Midway Schools	6422	Midway Elem	125	200	1978
D0433	Midway Schools	6426	Midway Jr/Sr High	113	201	1958
D0434	Santa Fe Trail	6440	Carbondale Elem	435	500	1983
D0434	Santa Fe Trail	6444	Overbrook Elem	0	375	1996
D0434	Santa Fe Trail	6446	Santa Fe Trail High	459	500	1970
D0434	Santa Fe Trail	6448	Scranton Elem	164	200	1996
D0435	Abilene	6464	Garfield Elem	213	350	1941
D0435	Abilene	6466	Kennedy Elem	206	350	1963
D0435	Abilene	6470	McKinley Elem	222	350	1951
D0435	Abilene	6475	Abilene Middle School	376	450	1975
D0435	Abilene	6476	Abilene High School	483	600	1955
D0436	Caney Valley	6490	Lincoln Memorial Elem	505	500	1954
D0436	Caney Valley	6492	Caney Valley High	457	436	1973
D0437	Auburn Washburn	6512	Auburn Elementary	442	524	1951
D0437	Auburn Washburn	6517	Indian Hills Elementary	515	588	1988

4
1-178

District Number	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Enrollment	Capacity	Year Built
D0437	Auburn Washburn	6518	Pauline Central Primary	384	480	1960
D0437	Auburn Washburn	6522	Pauline South Intermediate	294	326	1958
D0437	Auburn Washburn	6527	Washburn Rural Middle School	819	1000	1990
D0437	Auburn Washburn	6528	Wanamaker Elem	499	517	1940
D0437	Auburn Washburn	6530	Jay Shideler Elementary	545	708	1952
D0437	Auburn Washburn	6532	Washburn Rural High	1511	1800	1964
D0437	Auburn Washburn	6533	Washburn Rural Alternative High School	67	70	1964
D0438	Skyline Schools	6559	Skyline Elem	230	230	1967
D0438	Skyline Schools	6560	Skyline High	130	140	1967
D0439	Sedgwick Public Schools	6572	R L Wright Elem	333	415	1957
D0439	Sedgwick Public Schools	6574	Sedgwick High	143	185	1969
D0440	Halstead	6586	Bentley Primary School	202	227	1942
D0440	Halstead	6592	Halstead Middle School	284	422	1956
D0440	Halstead	6594	Halstead High	263	358	1970
D0441	Sabetha	6618	Sabetha Elem	361	400	1959
D0441	Sabetha	6619	Sabetha Middle School	199	350	1991
D0441	Sabetha	6620	Sabetha High	306	350	1969
D0441	Sabetha	6622	Wetmore Elem	145	160	1929
D0441	Sabetha	6624	Wetmore High	61	100	1929
D0442	Nemaha Valley Schools	6652	Seneca Elem	339	350	1938
D0442	Nemaha Valley Schools	6654	Nemaha Valley High	222	300	1970
D0443	Dodge City	6674	Central Elem	363	300	1927
D0443	Dodge City	6678	Miller Elem	334	400	1950
D0443	Dodge City	6680	Northwest Elem	542	450	1958
D0443	Dodge City	6682	Sunnyside Elem	461	450	1950
D0443	Dodge City	6684	Dodge City Middle School	786	800	1957
D0443	Dodge City	6686	Dodge City High School	1436	1250	1928
D0443	Dodge City	6687	Beeson Elementary	421	450	1995
D0443	Dodge City	6688	Linn Elementary	524	450	1994
D0443	Dodge City	6689	Soule 6th Grade Center	413	400	1995
D0443	Dodge City	6702	Wilroads Gardens Elem	144	150	1954
D0444	Little River	6726	Little River Junior High	57	90	1937
D0444	Little River	6728	Little River High	94	150	1937
D0444	Little River	6734	Windom Elem	125	150	1954
D0445	Coffeyville	6758	Edgewood Elem	258	360	1954
D0445	Coffeyville	6760	Garfield Elem	425	390	1953
D0445	Coffeyville	6762	Longfellow Elem	132	240	1953
D0445	Coffeyville	6766	Whittier Elem	214	320	1953

5
1-17A

District Number	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Enrollment	Capacity	Year Built
D0445	Coffeyville	6768	McKinley Middle School	175	180	1949
D0445	Coffeyville	6770	Roosevelt Middle	358	380	1923
D0445	Coffeyville	6772	Field Kindley High	707	780	1931
D0446	Independence	6821	Eisenhower Elem	506	625	1991
D0446	Independence	6822	Lincoln Elem	303	350	1939
D0446	Independence	6826	Washington Elem	167	280	1939
D0446	Independence	6828	Independence Middle	535	710	1922
D0446	Independence	6830	Independence Sr High	789	785	1953
D0447	Cherryvale	6870	Lincoln Central Elem	364	378	1936
D0447	Cherryvale	6876	Cherryvale Sr / Middle School	330	380	1974
D0448	Inman	6896	Inman Elem	251	500	1954
D0448	Inman	6898	Inman Jr/Sr High School	247	585	1929
D0449	Easton	6916	Easton Elementary	138	140	1936
D0449	Easton	6917	Pleasant Ridge Middle	160	180	1994
D0449	Easton	6918	Pleasant Ridge High	235	200	1974
D0449	Easton	6924	Salt Creek Valley Intermediate	159	170	1958
D0450	Shawnee Heights	6938	Berryton Elem	420	450	1952
D0450	Shawnee Heights	6940	Shawnee Heights Elem	453	475	1974
D0450	Shawnee Heights	6942	Shawnee Heights Sr High	526	650	1979
D0450	Shawnee Heights	6944	Shawnee Heights High	574	650	1970
D0450	Shawnee Heights	6945	Shawnee Heights Middle	546	600	1962
D0450	Shawnee Heights	6946	Tecumseh North Elem	424	450	1928
D0450	Shawnee Heights	6948	Tecumseh South Elem	452	450	1963
D0451	B & B	6962	Baileyville-St. Benedict High	134	180	1952
D0451	B & B	6964	St Benedict Elem	131	180	1912
D0452	Stanton County	6980	Big Bow Elem	32	90	1959
D0452	Stanton County	6982	Johnson Elem	214	214	1951
D0452	Stanton County	6984	Stanton County High	192	186	1978
D0452	Stanton County	6986	Manter Elem	35	150	1937
D0452	Stanton County	6990	Stanton County Middle	85	200	1930
D0453	Leavenworth	7002	Anthony Elem	244	450	1951
D0453	Leavenworth	7004	David Brewer Elem	384	450	1956
D0453	Leavenworth	7008	Earl M Lawson Elem	266	300	1950
D0453	Leavenworth	7012	Ben Day Elem	56	250	1923
D0453	Leavenworth	7014	Howard Wilson Elem	370	400	1941
D0453	Leavenworth	7016	Nettie Hartnett Elem	250	460	1923
D0453	Leavenworth	7017	Leavenworth East Middle School	432	600	1932
D0453	Leavenworth	7018	Leavenworth West Middle School	439	500	1969

6/1-17/8

District Number	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Enrollment	Capacity	Year Built
D0453	Leavenworth	7020	Leavenworth Sr High	1419	1500	1959
D0453	Leavenworth	7022	Muncie Elem	246	300	1961
D0454	Burlingame Public School	7056	Lincoln Middle School	107	230	1926
D0454	Burlingame Public School	7057	Schuyler Elem	145	240	1902
D0454	Burlingame Public School	7058	Burlingame High	117	220	1959
D0455	Hillcrest Rural Schools	7074	Hillcrest Elem	106	142	1962
D0455	Hillcrest Rural Schools	7076	Hillcrest High	51	140	1962
D0456	Marais Des Cygnes Valley	7094	Marais Des Cygnes Valley Elem	100	100	1924
D0456	Marais Des Cygnes Valley	7096	Marais Des Cygnes Valley High	106	100	1924
D0456	Marais Des Cygnes Valley	7104	Marais Des Cygnes Valley Middle	94	120	1960
D0457	Garden City	7115	Edith Scheuerman Elem	324	300	1985
D0457	Garden City	7118	Alta Brown Elem	322	300	1949
D0457	Garden City	7119	Florence Wilson Elem	369	300	1981
D0457	Garden City	7120	Garfield Elem	344	300	1976
D0457	Garden City	7124	Buffalo Jones Elem	408	350	1958
D0457	Garden City	7126	Georgia Matthews Elem	312	300	1958
D0457	Garden City	7128	Abe Hubert Middle School	554	600	1963
D0457	Garden City	7130	Garden City Sr High	1887	1500	1953
D0457	Garden City	7131	Gertrude Walker Elem	307	300	1974
D0457	Garden City	7132	Jennie Barker Elem	111	125	1955
D0457	Garden City	7133	Jennie Wilson Elem	358	300	1966
D0457	Garden City	7138	Kenneth Henderson Middle	594	600	1976
D0457	Garden City	7140	Pierceville-Plymell Elem	99	125	1952
D0457	Garden City	7142	Theoni Elem	15	40	1954
D0457	Garden City	7143	Victor Ornelas Elem	592	500	1989
D0457	Garden City	7147	Bernadine Sitts Intermediate Ctr	634	700	1996
D0457	Garden City	7148	Charles O Stones Intermediate Ctr	550	700	1996
D0458	Basehor-Linwood	7160	Basehor Elem School	622	450	1938
D0458	Basehor-Linwood	7164	Basehor-Linwood High School	577	1000	1963
D0458	Basehor-Linwood	7170	Linwood Elem	202	285	1962
D0458	Basehor-Linwood	7172	Basehor-Linwood Middle School	297	400	1920
D0459	Bucklin	7184	Bucklin Elem	147	200	1952
D0459	Bucklin	7186	Bucklin High	189	200	1962
D0460	Hesston	7206	Hesston Elem	326	400	1954
D0460	Hesston	7208	Hesston Middle	255	400	1964
D0460	Hesston	7210	Hesston High	262	400	1970
D0461	Neodesha	7226	Heller Elem	293	305	1968
D0461	Neodesha	7228	North Lawn Elem	174	180	1981

7
1-17-16

Distict Number	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Enrollment	Capacity	Year Built
D0461	Neodesha	7232	Neodesha High	394	415	1987
D0462	Central	7246	Central Elem	237	425	1999
D0462	Central	7254	Central Jr-Sr High	207	326	1972
D0463	Udall	7270	Udall Elem	193	350	1957
D0463	Udall	7272	Udall High & Junior High	132	450	1956
D0464	Tonganoxie	7296	Tonganoxie Elem	697	700	1955
D0464	Tonganoxie	7297	Tonganoxie Jr High	395	400	1988
D0464	Tonganoxie	7298	Tonganoxie High	372	400	1963
D0465	Winfield	7310	Country View Elem	153	180	1961
D0465	Winfield	7312	Pleasant Valley Elem	70	100	1949
D0465	Winfield	7314	South Vernon Elem	51	60	1955
D0465	Winfield	7324	Irving Elem	264	380	1963
D0465	Winfield	7326	Lowell Elem	239	360	1957
D0465	Winfield	7329	Webster Elem	117	120	1938
D0465	Winfield	7330	Whittier Elem	320	320	1954
D0465	Winfield	7331	Winfield Middle School	663	790	1953
D0465	Winfield	7332	Winfield High	877	1287	1974
D0466	Scott County	7356	Scott City Lower Elem	314	400	1987
D0466	Scott County	7358	Scott City Middle	269	325	1960
D0466	Scott County	7360	Scott City High	350	350	1930
D0466	Scott County	7362	Shallow Water Elem School	147	200	1963
D0467	Leoti	7382	R B Stewart Elem	221	350	1924
D0467	Leoti	7383	Wichita Co Jr High	112	225	1926
D0467	Leoti	7384	Wichita Co High	160	300	1970
D0468	Healy Public Schools	7402	Healy Elem	43	60	1938
D0468	Healy Public Schools	7404	Healy High	63	130	1986
D0469	Lansing	7420	Lansing Middle 6-8	522	515	1997
D0469	Lansing	7422	Lansing Intermediate 4-5th	296	286	1927
D0469	Lansing	7426	Lansing High 9-12	669	661	1988
D0469	Lansing	7428	Lansing Elem K-3	463	467	1977
D0470	Arkansas City	7440	Adams Elem	270	375	1954
D0470	Arkansas City	7442	Frances Willard Elem	190	300	1954
D0470	Arkansas City	7443	Jefferson Elem	260	325	1957
D0470	Arkansas City	7448	Roosevelt Elem	270	250	1923
D0470	Arkansas City	7454	Arkansas City Middle Sch	680	900	1967
D0470	Arkansas City	7456	Arkansas City High	911	1200	1982
D0470	Arkansas City	7458	C 4 Elem	116	150	1963
D0470	Arkansas City	7466	I X L Elem	228	275	1957

1-119

9
1-178

District Number	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Enrollment	Capacity	Year Built
D0471	Dexter	7492	Dexter Elem	110	125	1971
D0471	Dexter	7494	Dexter High	103	145	1980
D0473	Chapman	7534	Blue Ridge Elem	62	145	1960
D0473	Chapman	7540	Chapman Elem	267	350	1935
D0473	Chapman	7541	Chapman Middle School	218	350	1963
D0473	Chapman	7542	Chapman High	427	600	1961
D0473	Chapman	7546	Enterprise Elem	145	150	1953
D0473	Chapman	7552	Rural Center Elem	69	110	1951
D0473	Chapman	7554	Talmage Elem	46	50	1930
D0474	Haviland	7574	Haviland Elem	107	240	1952
D0474	Haviland	7576	Haviland High	76	160	1922
D0475	Geary County Schools	7592	Grandview Elem	97	127	1956
D0475	Geary County Schools	7596	Custer Hill Elem	306	367	1963
D0475	Geary County Schools	7598	Eisenhower Elem	277	410	1979
D0475	Geary County Schools	7600	Fort Riley Elem	295	277	1952
D0475	Geary County Schools	7602	Franklin Elem	211	242	1929
D0475	Geary County Schools	7604	Jefferson Elem	282	306	1960
D0475	Geary County Schools	7606	Lincoln Elem	214	268	1953
D0475	Geary County Schools	7608	Morris Hill Elem	227	365	1957
D0475	Geary County Schools	7610	Sheridan Elem	249	310	1959
D0475	Geary County Schools	7612	Washington Elem	234	436	1929
D0475	Geary County Schools	7614	Westwood Elem	315	375	1957
D0475	Geary County Schools	7616	Fort Riley Middle School	593	713	1963
D0475	Geary County Schools	7618	Junction City Middle School	817	824	1929
D0475	Geary County Schools	7620	Junction City Sr High	1382	1588	1957
D0475	Geary County Schools	7624	Milford Elem	87	129	1964
D0475	Geary County Schools	7628	K.S. Hauge Alt Ed Ctr	22	70	1981
D0475	Geary County Schools	7630	Ware Elem	789	1008	1983
D0475	Geary County Schools	7631	Max O Heim Early Childhood Ed Ctr	49	177	1991
D0476	Copeland	7648	Copeland Elem	50	200	1956
D0476	Copeland	7651	South Gray Jr High	77	100	1920
D0477	Ingalls	7664	Ingalls Elem	204	200	1952
D0477	Ingalls	7666	Ingalls High	98	120	1972
D0479	Crest	7692	Crest West Elem	63	78	1959
D0479	Crest	7694	Crest High	108	224	1959
D0479	Crest	7696	Crest East Elem	125	259	1936
D0480	Liberal	7714	Garfield Elem	333	300	1957
D0480	Liberal	7716	Lincoln Elem	244	300	1958

Distict Number	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Enrollment	Capacity	Year Built
D0480	Liberal	7718	MacArthur Elem	277	330	1964
D0480	Liberal	7720	McDermott Elem	300	350	1929
D0480	Liberal	7722	McKinley Elem	280	380	1934
D0480	Liberal	7724	Southlawn Elem	511	425	1955
D0480	Liberal	7726	Washington Elem	258	410	1953
D0480	Liberal	7728	Liberal South Middle	474	610	1965
D0480	Liberal	7730	Liberal West Middle	483	660	1961
D0480	Liberal	7732	Liberal Sr High	1118	1400	1983
D0481	Rural Vista	7750	Hope Elem	144	320	1921
D0481	Rural Vista	7752	Hope High	69		1921
D0481	Rural Vista	7758	White City Elem	142	320	1923
D0481	Rural Vista	7760	White City High	70		1958
D0482	Dighton	7778	Dighton Elem	123	250	1928
D0482	Dighton	7780	Lincoln Primary	103	200	1960
D0482	Dighton	7782	Dighton High	124	250	1936
D0483	Kismet-Plains	7798	Kismet Elem	214	230	1952
D0483	Kismet-Plains	7800	Plains Elem	212	235	1960
D0483	Kismet-Plains	7804	Southwestern Heights Jr/Sr High	347	375	1965
D0484	Fredonia	7832	Lincoln Elementary	396	455	1907
D0484	Fredonia	7836	Fredonia Middle	221	275	1956
D0484	Fredonia	7838	Fredonia Sr High	316	390	1990
D0486	Elwood	7874	Elwood Elem	214	275	1977
D0486	Elwood	7876	Elwood High	87	235	1952
D0487	Herington	7888	Herington Elem	242	400	1954
D0487	Herington	7890	Herington Middle Sch	143	200	1996
D0487	Herington	7892	Herington High	197	300	1965
D0488	Axtell	7912	Axtell High	123	150	1942
D0488	Axtell	7914	Bern Elem	70	140	1971
D0488	Axtell	7916	Bern High	88	125	1951
D0488	Axtell	7920	Summerfield Elem	70	150	1955
D0489	Hays	7942	Kennedy Middle	388	436	1949
D0489	Hays	7946	Lincoln Elem	211	227	1925
D0489	Hays	7948	Washington Elem	132	170	1926
D0489	Hays	7950	Woodrow Wilson Elem	317	321	1959
D0489	Hays	7952	Felten Middle	530	512	1964
D0489	Hays	7954	Hays High	1141	1048	1981
D0489	Hays	7956	Kathryn O'Loughlin McCarthy Elem	322	340	1960
D0489	Hays	7958	Munjor Elem	20	60	1962

081-1

District Number	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Enrollment	Capacity	Year Built
D0489	Hays	7959	Roosevelt Elem	376	378	1967
D0490	El Dorado	7990	Grandview Elem	213	260	1954
D0490	El Dorado	7992	Jefferson Elem	206	300	1954
D0490	El Dorado	7994	Lincoln Elem	211	300	1953
D0490	El Dorado	7996	Skelly Elem	196	300	1952
D0490	El Dorado	7998	Washington Elem	227	300	1955
D0490	El Dorado	8000	El Dorado Middle	538	650	1937
D0490	El Dorado	8002	El Dorado High	599	750	1968
D0491	Eudora	8023	Eudora High School	341	350	1995
D0491	Eudora	8025	Nottingham Elem School	368	400	1966
D0491	Eudora	8028	Eudora West Elem School	285	300	1994
D0491	Eudora	8029	Eudora Middle School	183	220	1949
D0492	Flinthills	8038	Flinthills Primary School	49	80	1951
D0492	Flinthills	8046	Flinthills Intermediate School	109	180	1981
D0492	Flinthills	8048	Flinthills Middle School-High School	180	180	1967
D0493	Columbus	8064	Highland Elem	120	160	1937
D0493	Columbus	8066	Park Elem	157	150	1957
D0493	Columbus	8068	Central Elem	445	450	1957
D0493	Columbus	8070	Columbus High	446	500	1961
D0493	Columbus	8073	Greenlawn Elem	71	100	1968
D0493	Columbus	8086	Scammon Elem	108	140	1970
D0493	Columbus	8090	Spencer Elem	68	140	1960
D0494	Syracuse	8110	Syracuse Elem	279	325	1960
D0494	Syracuse	8114	Syracuse High	256	440	1950
D0495	Ft Larned	8132	Hillside Elem	118	150	1955
D0495	Ft Larned	8134	Northside Elem	154	200	1962
D0495	Ft Larned	8138	Phinney Elem	116	150	1951
D0495	Ft Larned	8140	Larned Middle School	249	450	1995
D0495	Ft Larned	8142	Larned Sr High	340	400	1953
D0495	Ft Larned	8146	Pawnee Rock Elem	56	150	1956
D0495	Ft Larned	8147	Pawnee Rock Middle	34	125	1956
D0496	Pawnee Heights	8166	Pawnee Heights West	103	150	1920
D0496	Pawnee Heights	8170	Pawnee Heights High	63	120	1949
D0497	Lawrence	8186	Grant Elem	65	96	1962
D0497	Lawrence	8189	Sunflower Elementary	517	528	1994
D0497	Lawrence	8190	Prairie Park Elem	416	525	1994
D0497	Lawrence	8191	Broken Arrow Elem	253	312	1968
D0497	Lawrence	8192	Centennial Elem	230	328	1955

081-1
181

Distict Number	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Enrollment	Capacity	Year Built
D0497	Lawrence	8194	Cordley Elem	221	391	1915
D0497	Lawrence	8195	Deerfield Elem	506	552	1968
D0497	Lawrence	8196	East Heights Elem	214	220	1954
D0497	Lawrence	8198	Hillcrest Elem	362	384	1953
D0497	Lawrence	8200	Kennedy Elem	361	483	1960
D0497	Lawrence	8202	Quail Run Elementary	626	552	1987
D0497	Lawrence	8204	New York Elem	134	242	1937
D0497	Lawrence	8206	Pinckney Elem	264	336	1931
D0497	Lawrence	8208	Schwegler Elem	502	552	1957
D0497	Lawrence	8210	Sunset Hill Elem	345	288	1955
D0497	Lawrence	8212	Woodlawn Elem	170	350	1924
D0497	Lawrence	8214	Lawrence Central Jr Hi	529	567	1923
D0497	Lawrence	8215	Lawrence South Jr Hi	673	587	1968
D0497	Lawrence	8216	Lawrence West Jr Hi	610	520	1961
D0497	Lawrence	8217	Southwest Jr High	630	567	1995
D0497	Lawrence	8218	Lawrence High	1262	1400	1954
D0497	Lawrence	8220	Riverside Elem	137	120	1955
D0497	Lawrence	8222	Wakarusa Valley Elem	272	264	1960
D0497	Lawrence	8224	Lawrence Free State High	1172	1400	1997
D0498	Valley Heights	8238	Valley Heights Elem	126	180	1972
D0498	Valley Heights	8246	Valley Heights Elem	104	180	1958
D0498	Valley Heights	8252	Valley Heights Jr/Sr High	257	350	1972
D0499	Galena	8264	Liberty Elem	180	175	1941
D0499	Galena	8268	Spring Grove Primary Center	185	200	1939
D0499	Galena	8270	Galena Middle School	198	175	1941
D0499	Galena	8272	Cornerstone High	25	40	1993
D0499	Galena	8274	Galena High	219	225	1964
D0500	Kansas City	8279	Banneker Elem	488	578	1972
D0500	Kansas City	8282	Silver City Elem	175	278	1970
D0500	Kansas City	8284	Chelsea Elem	199	626	1923
D0500	Kansas City	8285	Douglass Elem	249	411	1963
D0500	Kansas City	8287	Thomas A Edison Elem	206	256	1954
D0500	Kansas City	8288	Emerson Elem	274	292	1960
D0500	Kansas City	8290	John Fiske Elem	471	351	1984
D0500	Kansas City	8292	Grant Elem	309	358	1956
D0500	Kansas City	8293	Hawthorne Elem	353	658	1909
D0500	Kansas City	8297	Fairfax Learning Center	42	135	1972
D0500	Kansas City	8298	Mark Twain Elem	175	228	1923

District Number	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Enrollment	Capacity	Year Built
D0500	Kansas City	8302	Parker Elem	150	258	1915
D0500	Kansas City	8303	Noble Prentis Elem	292	376	1954
D0500	Kansas City	8305	Quindaro Elem	418	611	1972
D0500	Kansas City	8307	Roosevelt Elem	175	251	1923
D0500	Kansas City	8308	Frank Rushton Elem	463	424	1956
D0500	Kansas City	8309	New Stanley Elem	355	367	1913
D0500	Kansas City	8311	Eugene Ware Elem	310	273	1949
D0500	Kansas City	8312	Wm A White Elem	268	287	1959
D0500	Kansas City	8313	Whittier Elem	709	725	1991
D0500	Kansas City	8315	Frances Willard Elem	342	272	1955
D0500	Kansas City	8316	Central Middle	712	988	1915
D0500	Kansas City	8317	Northwest Middle	553	983	1923
D0500	Kansas City	8319	West Middle	429	752	1955
D0500	Kansas City	8320	Argentine Middle	555	1142	1930
D0500	Kansas City	8321	Rosedale Middle	500	1090	1926
D0500	Kansas City	8322	Sumner Academy of Arts & Science	946	999	1939
D0500	Kansas City	8323	Wyandotte High	1187	2041	1935
D0500	Kansas City	8324	Arrowhead Middle	487	609	1961
D0500	Kansas City	8326	Bethel Elem	264	239	1956
D0500	Kansas City	8327	J C Harmon High	1190	1697	1973
D0500	Kansas City	8328	Coronado Middle	431	645	1961
D0500	Kansas City	8329	F L Schlagle High	1067	1386	1973
D0500	Kansas City	8330	Claude A Huyck Elem	292	256	1965
D0500	Kansas City	8331	D D Eisenhower Middle	722	1031	1973
D0500	Kansas City	8332	Hazel Grove Elem	464	469	1933
D0500	Kansas City	8340	John F Kennedy Elem	482	514	1965
D0500	Kansas City	8342	Lindbergh Elem	219	286	1950
D0500	Kansas City	8346	Stony Point South	405	488	1972
D0500	Kansas City	8348	Stony Point North	375	404	1958
D0500	Kansas City	8350	Washington High	1185	1531	1931
D0500	Kansas City	8352	Welborn Elem	527	589	1914
D0500	Kansas City	8354	White Church Elem	297	294	1924
D0500	Kansas City	8358	M E Pearson Elem	695	700	1977
D0501	Topeka Public Schools	8442	Avondale East Elem	239	330	1954
D0501	Topeka Public Schools	8444	Shaner Elem	180	285	1957
D0501	Topeka Public Schools	8446	Avondale West Elem	166	255	1954
D0501	Topeka Public Schools	8452	Chase Middle School	497	600	1979
D0501	Topeka Public Schools	8462	Highland Park Central	323	425	1966

5281-1

Distict Number	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Enrollment	Capacity	Year Built
D0501	Topeka Public Schools	8465	Ross Elementary	270	355	1955
D0501	Topeka Public Schools	8471	Linn Elem	175	280	1964
D0501	Topeka Public Schools	8472	Lowman Hill Elem	346	400	1958
D0501	Topeka Public Schools	8474	Lundgren Elem	218	255	1949
D0501	Topeka Public Schools	8478	Maude Bishop Elem	293	350	1965
D0501	Topeka Public Schools	8480	McCarter Elem	332	385	1957
D0501	Topeka Public Schools	8482	McClure Elem	319	270	1962
D0501	Topeka Public Schools	8484	McEachron Elem	297	305	1959
D0501	Topeka Public Schools	8486	Meadows Elementary	606	600	1996
D0501	Topeka Public Schools	8494	Quincy Elem	244	355	1962
D0501	Topeka Public Schools	8496	Quinton Heights Elem	177	260	1953
D0501	Topeka Public Schools	8498	Randolph Elem	400	510	1926
D0501	Topeka Public Schools	8499	Scott Computer Technology Magnet	534	600	1996
D0501	Topeka Public Schools	8501	Robinson Middle School	511	600	1969
D0501	Topeka Public Schools	8504	State Street Elem	294	325	1939
D0501	Topeka Public Schools	8506	Stout Elem	216	325	1955
D0501	Topeka Public Schools	8512	Whitson Elem	403	375	1951
D0501	Topeka Public Schools	8513	Williams Science and Fine Arts Magnet Sc	581	600	1996
D0501	Topeka Public Schools	8516	Topeka Education Center	71	219	1999
D0501	Topeka Public Schools	8524	Eisenhower Middle School	466	600	1960
D0501	Topeka Public Schools	8530	Jardine Middle School	517	600	1960
D0501	Topeka Public Schools	8532	Landon Middle School	446	550	1963
D0501	Topeka Public Schools	8533	Marjorie French Middle School	590	600	1970
D0501	Topeka Public Schools	8536	Highland Park High	955	1500	1950
D0501	Topeka Public Schools	8538	Topeka High	2119	2100	1931
D0501	Topeka Public Schools	8540	Topeka West High	1209	1600	1961
D0501	Topeka Public Schools	8541	Parkdale Preschool Center	46	70	1962
D0501	Topeka Public Schools	8552	Capital City	157	165	1997
D0502	Lewis	8580	Lewis Elem	89	120	1910
D0502	Lewis	8582	Lewis High	100	120	1914
D0503	Parsons	8586	Garfield Elem	241	300	1954
D0503	Parsons	8587	Guthridge Elem	274	300	1972
D0503	Parsons	8588	Lincoln Elem	265	300	1971
D0503	Parsons	8594	Parsons Middle School	414	600	1924
D0503	Parsons	8596	Parsons Sr High	530	600	1954
D0504	Oswego	8620	Oswego Middle	98	120	1921
D0504	Oswego	8622	Oswego Neosho Hgts Elem	199	250	1968
D0504	Oswego	8623	Service Valley Elem	101	110	1956

4
1-182

5
481-1

District Number	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Enrollment	Capacity	Year Built
D0504	Oswego	8624	Oswego High	47	200	1994
D0505	Chetopa	8636	Chetopa Elem	156	200	1976
D0505	Chetopa	8638	Chetopa High	120	220	1976
D0506	Labette County	8652	Altamont Elem	240	225	1933
D0506	Labette County	8654	Labette County High School	634	700	1940
D0506	Labette County	8658	Bartlett Elem	129	190	1951
D0506	Labette County	8666	Edna Elem	210	225	1970
D0506	Labette County	8680	Meadowview Elem	387	430	1959
D0506	Labette County	8684	Mound Valley Elem	205	200	1921
D0506	Labette County	8694	Satanta Elem	242	300	1961
D0507	Satanta	8696	Satanta Jr-Sr High	202	250	1979
D0507	Satanta	8702	Central Elem	192	300	1950
D0508	Baxter Springs	8704	Lincoln Elem	209	300	1957
D0508	Baxter Springs	8708	Baxter Springs Middle	216	400	1918
D0508	Baxter Springs	8710	Baxter Springs High	264	400	1975
D0508	Baxter Springs	8742	South Haven Elem	197	225	1955
D0509	South Haven	8744	South Haven High	78	100	1955
D0511	Attica	8762	Puls Elem	95	180	1955
D0511	Attica	8764	Attica High	51	250	1982
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8774	East Antioch Elem	352	365	1958
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8775	West Antioch Elem	212	275	1970
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8776	Apache Elem	329	400	1958
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8778	Arrowhead Elem	178	250	1956
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8782	Belinder Elem	417	450	1952
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8784	Bluejacket-Flint	583	750	1996
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8786	Briarwood Elem	528	575	1959
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8787	Broken Arrow Elem	645	675	1990
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8788	Brookridge Elem	499	600	1967
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8790	Brookwood Elem	417	450	1960
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8791	Christa McAuliffe Elem	611	550	1987
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8792	Cherokee Elem	292	390	1955
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8793	Comanche Elem	415	550	1969
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8794	Corinth Elem	343	550	1936
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8796	Crestview Elem	318	425	1954
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8798	Dorothy Moody Elem	312	475	1966
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8804	Hickory Grove AEP	158	250	1916
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8806	Highlands Elem	324	275	1951
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8808	John Diemer Elem	261	325	1964

Distict Number	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Enrollment	Capacity	Year Built
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8810	Katherine Carpenter Elem	255	330	1962
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8812	Shawanoë Elem	398	550	1960
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8814	Bonjour Elem	327	575	1954
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8816	Ray Marsh Elem	364	375	1969
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8817	Merriam Elem	193	265	1969
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8819	Mill Creek Elem	500	600	1978
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8820	Nall Hills Elem	273	275	1961
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8822	Nieman Elem	361	440	1954
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8823	Oak Park Elem	275	500	1974
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8826	Overland Park Elem	319	550	1998
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8828	Pawnee Elem	351	365	1965
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8832	Prairie Elem	490	550	1936
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8834	Rhein Benninghoven Elem	605	625	1966
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8836	Rising Star Elem	505	800	1991
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8838	Roesland Elem	357	400	1926
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8840	Roeland Park Elem	190	200	1951
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8842	Rosehill Elem	600	725	1966
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8844	Rushton Elem	339	425	1954
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8846	Santa Fe Trail Elem	313	455	1953
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8854	Somerset Elem	301	375	1953
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8856	South Park Elem	263	375	1947
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8857	Sunflower Elem	616	780	1995
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8858	Tomahawk Elem	382	425	1954
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8860	Trailwood Elem	258	375	1962
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8864	Westwood View Elem	303	380	1968
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8868	Westridge Middle	986	1175	1962
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8870	Hocker Grove Middle	597	800	1955
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8874	Indian Hills Middle	623	900	1955
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8876	Mission Valley Middle	713	885	1958
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8878	Antioch Middle	527	770	1955
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8880	Indian Woods Middle	880	965	1961
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8884	Trailridge Middle	696	900	1967
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8886	Shawnee Mission East High	2023	2190	1958
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8888	Shawnee Mission North High	1923	2175	1921
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8890	Shawnee Mission Northwest High	2132	2325	1969
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8892	Shawnee Mission South High	1841	2425	1966
D0512	Shawnee Mission Pub Sch	8894	Shawnee Mission West High	1923	2325	1962

9
281-1

9/8/16
1-18/16

APPENDIX V

SELF REPORTED CONDITION OF BUILDINGS FOR THE 90 DISTRICTS THAT WERE ASKED TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

District	District Number	# of Buildings	Condition of Buildings			
			% Excellent	% Good	% Fair	% Poor
CHEYLIN	D0103	2	0%	0%	0%	100%
WHITE ROCK	D0104	3	0%	100%	0%	0%
TURNER-KANSAS CITY	D0202	10				
BONNER SPRINGS	D0204	4	50%	50%	0%	0%
WAKEENEY	D0208	2	0%	0%	50%	50%
MOSCOW PUBLIC SCHOOLS	D0209	3	33%	66%	0%	0%
HUGOTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS	D0210	4	50%	50%	0%	0%
NORTHERN VALLEY	D0212	3	0%	0%	100%	0%
WEST SOLOMON VALLEY SCH	D0213	2	0%	100%	0%	0%
DEERFIELD	D0216	3	33%	67%	0%	0%
ROLLA	D0217	2	0%	0%	100%	0%
ELKHART	D0218	3	100%	0%	0%	0%
NORTH CENTRAL	D0221	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
WASHINGTON SCHOOLS	D0222	4	0%	50%	25%	25%
BARNES	D0223	2	0%	0%	0%	100%
CLIFTON-CLYDE	D0224	4	0%	25%	75%	0%
FOWLER	D0225	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
JETMORE	D0227	2	0%	0%	100%	0%
HANSTON	D0228	2	0%	0%	100%	0%
WESKAN	D0242					
LEROY-GRIDLEY	D0245	5	0%	100%	0%	0%
SOUTH BARBER	D0255	3	0%	33%	66%	0%
OAKLEY	D0274	4	0%	100%	0%	0%
TRIPPLAINS	D0275	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
MANKATO	D0278	2	0%	100%	0%	0%
JEWELL	D0279	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
WEST GRAHAM-MORLAND	D0280	2	0%	100%	0%	0%

District	District Number	# of Buildings	Condition of Buildings			
			% Excellent	% Good	% Fair	% Poor
HILL CITY	D0281	3	0%	100%	0%	0%
ELK VALLEY	D0283	2	0%	50%	0%	50%
CHASE COUNTY	D0284	3	0%	100%	0%	0%
CEDAR VALE	D0285	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
QUINTER PUBLIC SCHOOLS	D0293	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
OBERLIN	D0294	3	0%	100%	0%	0%
PRAIRIE HEIGHTS	D0295	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
ST FRANCIS COMM SCH	D0297	2	0%	0%	100%	0%
NES TRE LA GO	D0301	2	0%	0%	50%	50%
SMOKY HILL	D0302	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
NESS CITY	D0303	2	0%	100%	0%	0%
BAZINE	D0304	2	0%	100%	0%	0%
NICKERSON	D0309	5	0%	100%	0%	0%
BREWSTER	D0314	2	0%	0%	100%	0%
HERNDON	D0317	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
ATWOOD	D0318	2	0%	100%	0%	0%
EASTERN HEIGHTS	D0324	2	0%	0%	0%	100%
PHILLIPSBURG	D0325	3	100%	0%	0%	0%
SOUTHERN CLOUD	D0334	4	0%	75%	25%	0%
PLEASANTON	D0344	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
KINSLEY-OFFERLE	D0347	4	0%	25%	75%	0%
STAFFORD	D0349	3	100%	0%	0%	0%
WELLINGTON	D0353	7	0%	0%	71%	29%
CONWAY SPRINGS	D0356	3	33%	33%	33%	0%
BELLE PLAINE	D0357	3	0%	100%	0%	0%
OXFORD	D0358	3	33%	33%	0%	33%
ARGONIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS	D0359	2	0%	0%	100%	0%
CALDWELL	D0360	2	0%	0%	0%	100%
MARYSVILLE	D0364	3	0%	33%	66%	0%
BURRTON	D0369	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
MONTEZUMA	D0371	3	33%	0%	66%	0%
CIRCLE	D0375	4	0%	25%	50%	25%
STERLING	D0376	3	33%	66%	0%	0%

9
1-188

District	District Number	# of Buildings	Condition of Buildings			
			% Excellent	% Good	% Fair	% Poor
SPEARVILLE	D0381	3	0%	33%	66%	0%
MADISON-VIRGIL	D0386	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
Ellis	D0388	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
CHASE-RAYMOND	D0401	6	66%	33%	0%	0%
OTIS-BISON	D0403	3	0%	33%	33%	33%
LYONS	D0405	5	0%	0%	80%	20%
WATHENA	D0406	3	66%	33%	0%	0%
HOXIE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	D0412	2	0%	100%	0%	0%
LYNDON	D0421	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
GREENSBURG	D0422	2	0%	0%	100%	0%
PIKE VALLEY	D0426	4	25%	50%	25%	0%
REPUBLIC COUNTY	D0427	3	0%	100%	0%	0%
TROY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	D0429	3	0%	33%	66%	0%
VICTORIA	D0432	3	0%	66%	33%	0%
LITTLE RIVER	D0444	2	0%	100%	0%	0%
HILLCREST RURAL SCHOOLS	D0455	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
NEODESHA	D0461	3	0%	66%	33%	0%
UDALL	D0463	2	0%	100%	0%	0%
WINFIELD	D0465	9	0%	44%	22%	33%
CHAPMAN	D0473	7	0%	71%	29%	0%
RURAL VISTA	D0481	2	0%	100%	0%	0%
DIGHTON	D0482	4	75%	25%	0%	0%
AXTELL	D0488	4	0%	0%	50%	50%
FLINTHILLS	D0492	3	0%	0%	100%	0%
PAWNEE HEIGHTS	D0496	3	0%	33%	33%	33%
LEWIS	D0502	2	0%	100%	0%	0%
CHETOPA	D0505	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
SATANTA	D0507	2	0%	100%	0%	0%
SOUTH HAVEN	D0509	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
ATTICA	D0511	2	0%	100%	0%	0%