

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION.

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Senator Dwayne Umbarger at 1:30 p.m. on January 23, 2001 in Room 123-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except:

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

Conferees appearing before the committee:

Others attending: See Attached List

On behalf of the School Finance Coalition, Mark Tallman and Craig Grant, presented an overview. Mark and Craig shared the presentation of the testimony covered in the attached, "Recommendations of the School Finance Coalition" ([Attachment 1](#)), "Statement of the School Finance Coalition" ([Attachment 2](#)) and "Comparison of Positions: Coalition, State Board, Task Force and Governor". ([Attachment 3](#))

Discussion resulting from the presentation was whether or not there was a constitutional problem with taking the cap off the Local Option Budget (LOB) if that effort was more than 25% of the total available to the district. It is believed that it was a federal impact aid issue. The committee also wanted to know what the coalition was suggesting in terms of state assistance so the burden would not rely so heavily on property tax. A specific recommendation was not made in this area because their first hope is that with more accurately funding the base, this won't be so much of an issue. They are just identifying the problem right now.

Concerning the coalition's position on the Governor's proposal to cut \$2 million from in service programs, the coalition would favor restoring the funds in the base. School districts do bring people in from their communities for in service technology and they get information from the internet that does not cost hard dollars, but it isn't known that a study has every been made on what things the districts are doing. Goals are needed for the years to come to know what we want for our schools and know where we want to be in the future.

The taxpayers are not interested in investing more money in the school system unless they can see a return on their investment. The coalition responded that they feel they have a pretty good system of accountability with QPA. They are willing to do whatever is wanted, but they need to know what it is that is expected. They have seen improvement on the state and national assessment levels, have seen more kids come out of unsatisfactory levels and more kids taking upper level subjects. Measurable improvement came out of the last cycle. The coalition is pretty confident that if results are viewed over the next several years that you will be able to see that the job is getting done.

The public probably does not understand QPA, but they need to understand the results of what is happening. Perhaps they need a marketing specialist to interpret the progress that their students are making. That progress is now dictated by how the local news media interprets it. The QPA standards were set very high at the beginning and it is taking a long time to reach that standard, but we are getting there. It is very important to have those standards out there. The schools need to be able to see where they started and where they are going. It is time for discussion for setting a long range plan for education.

Meeting was adjourned. Next meeting is scheduled for January 24, 2001.

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE GUEST LIST

DATE - _____

<u>NAME</u>	<u>REPRESENTING</u>
Josie Torres	KCOD
Sharon Huffman	KCDC
Alex Kobayantz	KS Academy of Science
Ladame Cole	Sen. Tyson Office Staff
Martee Carpenter	KCCI
Tom Lawson	USD #389
Bill Hourill	Governor's Office
Trent LeDoux	Sen Maj Ldr Off.
Elaine Frisbie	Div. of the Budget
Aaron Hunkler	Intern Sen. Euler
Gary George	Olathe Dist. Schools
Bill Truck	Shawnee Mission Public Schools
HELPY Mick	USD 501
Denise Ayt	USA / USD 500
Bill Light	Leg.
Mark Dazetti	KINEA
BRAD LICKTEG	
Bob Vancrum	Blue Valley USD 229
Bill Brady	Schools for Field Funding

TO: House Subcommittee on School Finance
Senate Committee on Education

FROM: Mark Tallman, Assistant Executive Director,
Kansas Association of School Boards

Craig Grant, Director of Political Action
Kansas National Education Association

DATE: January 23, 2001

RE: **Recommendations of the School Finance Coalition**

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

I am Mark Tallman, representing both KASB and the organizations participating in the School Finance Coalition for this session. Joining me in this presentation is Craig Grant of the Kansas NEA. Craig and I have been designated spokesman for the coalition, along with Brilla Scott, executive director of the United School Administrators. Brilla cannot be with us today because she is in Wichita preparing for the USA annual conference.

With our testimony today is a two-column sheet headed "Statement of the School Finance Coalition." This is the first of a four-page statement adopted September 20, 2000. The organizations that have agreed to this position include KASB, KNEA and USA, the three statewide groups presenting school board members, administrators and teachers. Also endorsing this position are three organizations representing small and rural districts: Schools for Quality Education, the Kansas Education Coalition and Kansans for Local Control. Finally, the six largest school districts in the state – Wichita, Shawnee Mission, Kansas City, Olathe, Blue Valley and Topeka – have joined in support. The coalition has also had input from other organizations and districts, such as the state's education service centers and the USA School Finance Task Force.

The process of developing this statement began at the end of last session, following the appointment of the Governor's Task Force on K-12 Finance. We met monthly from May to September, working to reach an agreement to present to the Task Force. We made that presentation in September, and are pleased that many of our recommendations were included in its final report. We also carefully considered the ideas presented by the State Board of Education this summer.

Our goal was to develop a broad consensus on the steps that Kansas should take to improve funding for its schools, and to improve the quality of those schools. I would refer you to the "Guiding Principles" at the beginning of coalition statement.

Our position includes five broad objectives and a number of specific recommendations. We chose not to limit our focus to on a single budget year or to existing resources, but to respond to Governor Graves' challenge to his task force: what are both the needs of the education system and the aspirations we have for it? We can simplify this message to three basic goals: first, to sustain the high quality education system already in place; second, to increase student achievement to even higher levels; and third, to provide a safe, appropriate physical environment for all students. I will discuss the first and third goals; Graig will discuss the second. To help explain our position, we have also provided you with a four-column chart comparing the positions of the coalition, the State Board's budget request, the Governor's Task Force recommendations and the Governor's Budget message.

Senate Education
1-23-01
Attachment 1

Our first objective is to sustain the high quality system we already have in Kansas by ensuring competitive salaries and support for regular instructional costs.

Base Budget. We believe the goal for the base budget per pupil should be \$4,500 to fund a "suitable" education for all students. We determined that figure in two ways. First, if the base had kept up with inflation since it was adopted for the 1992-93 school year, it would be at approximately \$4,500 in FY 2001-02. In 1992, the Legislature and State Board adopted major new expectations for schools. If \$3,600 was the appropriate base at that point \$4,500 certainly represents the minimum level at this point.

Second, because the Legislature has not adjusted the base with inflation, school districts have been forced to increase their local option budgets to keep up with rising costs and demands for service. Last year, the average budget per pupil (combining the base, weightings and local option budget) exceeded \$5,000 per pupil for largest districts in the state and rose from that point for smaller districts. If the base simply represents the average minimum cost of providing education, it should be at least \$4,500. That is why we are disappointed that the State Board recommended a base adjustment of just \$88. The Task Force came closer by recommending at \$4,000 base. The Governor's budget recommendation of \$50 would fall far short of the inflation rate in the current year.

Correlation Weighting. The next area we address is correlation weighting. The coalition agrees that this weighting should be increased to achieve greater equity among school districts. We believe that the correlation weighting cut-off point should be 1,500 students (compared to the current 1,725). We further believe that adjustments to the base and correlation weighting should be made in a fixed two-to-one ratio until it reaches that point. In other words, if the base is increased \$50, as the Governor's budget proposes for FY 2002, we believe that correlation weighting should be adjusted by 25 students. Only the coalition addresses correlation weighting.

Local Option Budget. Some members of the coalition believe that the maximum use of LOB should be expanded or made unlimited. Others believe it should be phased out altogether. Our compromise position would keep the LOB with its present limitations, but would allow local boards to use any amount of LOB up to the limit without being subject to protest petition. We also suggest that state assistance for the LOB should be increased so the burden does not fall so heavily on property taxes.

Declining Enrollment. The coalition also believes that the declining enrollment provision should be enhanced to allow districts to use enrollment from the highest of three years for budget purposes. Again, ours is the only proposal to address this issue.

Annual Adjustments in the Base. The coalition, the State Board and the Task Force all agree that the base budget should be adjusted annually to keep up with rising costs.

Special Education. Turning to page two of the chart, note that the coalition, the State Board and the Task Force all agree on the need to fully fund 100% of the "excess cost" of special education. However, three different formulas for distributing special education aid are represented. The coalition supports the current system, which reimburses districts for transportation costs and teacher positions. The State Board would incorporate special education aid into the base budget, which means districts would no longer receive separate aid based on special education costs. The task force proposes converting special education aid into a weighting system, similar to bilingual and vocation aid. There would one weight for very high cost special education students and a lower weight for all other special education students. The coalition is strongly opposed to the State Board's proposal because we believe it ignores legitimate differences in special education costs among districts. We believe no change in the formula should be considered until excess cost is fully funded.

Continuing with the coalition positions on school finance, I would like to concentrate my remarks on the broad area of student achievement. The Kansas education organizations have committed themselves to the goal of making Kansas first in the nation in teaching and learning. We support a public education system that helps all students reach the highest educational standards in the United States and the world. These are the world class standards that have been endorsed by this Legislature, the State Board of Education, our Governor, the 21st Century Task Force, the Kansas Chamber of Commerce and Industry, and other groups that have a genuine desire to provide our children and grandchildren with the best possible education system.

So what should the plan be to meet our shared objective? The coalition suggests that in the area of student achievement, the following goals should be set:

- **Base Budget** – as Mark indicated, the base budget is crucial to the entire package. School boards, administrators, teachers, and the public need to be able to concentrate on student achievement rather than having to concentrate on finding enough money to pay the heating bills and keep up with rising fixed costs. Having the good teachers, as Mark indicated, is a key also to student achievement.
- **Preschool at-risk** – The coalition, the State Board, and the task force all support a proposal to serve the four-year-old at-risk children not currently receiving services. This would help children begin formal schooling on a more equal basis.
- **All day kindergarten** – The State Board and the coalition proposes, and the task force supports, that the state fund all-day kindergarten for districts that choose to provide the program. Districts now provide such services and are being forced to use scarce resources from other parts of the general fund budget. The districts which have instituted such programs have found parent and teacher support in addition to progress in student performance.

- **At-risk and extended learning programs** – All four groups included in your chart ask for an enhancement in at-risk and extended learning opportunities for students who are performing below the standards and who are at-risk of failing in our public schools. Whether it is summer school programs, including truant students in our definition, or identifying students who are not making satisfactory progress toward graduation, all groups believe that more must be done to close the performance gap between high- and low-achieving students. We must do this: not by pulling down the high-performing student but by bringing up the performance of all students. We must adopt the goal that all students can read by the third grade – and put the resources in place to ensure that the goal is reached.
- **Technology** – We have worked for at least two years to try to establish a technology network, or backbone, for our Kansas schools. We hope that this year's efforts will result in significant progress toward our goal. The only thing that has changed from where we were last year is that we are further behind other states in connectivity. In addition to the network, we hope that some assistance could be given to districts for equipment and instruction so we are ready to utilize the network to its fullest when implemented.
- **Inservice programs** – If we are to keep the best practices and continue to improve the offerings to our students, we need to have our educators continue to improve their knowledge of subject matter and pedagogy. The State Board and the coalition would disagree with the Governor's proposal to cut \$2 million from the inservice funding line item.

The school finance coalition believes that these areas under the general heading of student achievement are important pieces of any plan to place and keep Kansas first in education. We believe that "financing for results" means that we set the goals for student achievement, determine the resources needed to reach our goals, and then apply those resources to our strategic plan. To fail to plan and allocate will result in a slide to educational mediocrity. That is not acceptable to us or, we believe, to you.

The final area we will discuss concerns a safe learning environment conducive to learning.

Transportation Aid. One of the most outdated features of the current school finance act limits transportation aid to students who live more than 2.5 miles from school. Few parents are comfortable with the idea that their children should walk 2.5 miles, whether along country roads or city streets. As a result, many districts provide bus service to these students without receiving transportation aid, which means they must shift funding from other instructional areas of the budget. The coalition believes the mileage threshold should be lowered. The State Board proposes reducing the limit from 2.5 to 1.0 over a three year period. The task force endorses this idea, but does not including it as a funding recommendation.

Capital Outlay. Finally, we believe that the state should provide aid for capital outlay as it does for bond and interest in school construction projects. Currently, capital outlay is funded entirely by a local property tax. The proceeds may be used for construction, remodeling or equipment. As a result, districts with low property valuation are extremely disadvantaged in school modernization, technology and other equipment purchases. The Task Force recommends this step.

In conclusion, the coalition fully recognizes that these goals cannot be achieved within the current resources of the state. Any significant increase in school support, whether its is the coalition's plan, the State Board's more modest request or the Task Force recommendations, would require a tax increase. But please remember, even the Governor's plan will result in a tax increase: a tax increase at the local level. Since 1992, local option budgets have increased over \$300 million as school districts have struggled to keep up with rising costs. Without strong state action, that pressure will continue.

Only the Legislature can make a decision about the best way to fund education, including all possible revenue sources. Only the Legislature can commit the resources to provide a quality education in every district, regardless of wealth or circumstances. Only the Legislature can fund schools for the results we all want for the children of Kansas.

The coalition is not asking you to simply raise taxes and spend money for "more of the same." We are asking for a commitment that will keep Kansas at the very top end of the United States in educational performance, and significantly raise the level of student achievement.

Thank you for your consideration.

Statement of the School Finance Coalition

September 20, 2000

Guiding Principles:

Kansas education organizations have committed themselves to the goal of making Kansas first in the nation in teaching and learning. We support a public education system that helps all students reach the highest educational standards in the United States and the world. While there are many components of such a system, finance is one of the most important.

Addressing the critical issues in school funding must begin with the recognition that the basic resources provided by the state are not adequate to meet the needs of Kansas students. Equity among schools cannot be achieved without adequate funding for all schools.

This five-point plan is intended to improve funding for all districts and students. We do not believe that any district is overfunded. No district can reduce its budget without harm to the educational programs and services it provides to its students and community. We will oppose any changes in the school finance system that would reduce funding for any district.

We support the basic framework of the current school finance system. Our recommendations are designed to improve that framework. Unless specifically noted, we support continuation of current weighting factors and other features of the school finance system.

The theme of the School Finance Task Force appointed by the Governor is "Financing For Results." Without significant improvements to our state's school finance system, the result will be a slide into educational mediocrity. With our plan, the result will be a state school system at the top of the nation in teaching and learning.

Summary of Objectives and Recommendations

1. All districts must be able to provide competitive salaries and benefits in order to attract and retain high quality employees and to provide them the material support necessary to do their jobs.
 - Raise the base to \$4,500 to fund the cost of providing a quality education; increase correlation weighting at a one-to-two ratio to base increases until it reaches 1,500 students; allow local boards to adopt local option budgets without protest and increase state assistance for LOB funding.
 - Provide annual adjustments in the base.
 - Provide methods to assist districts experiencing declining enrollment.
2. All districts must receive full funding for the mandatory costs of special education services.
 - Fully fund the current special education formula.
 - Support maintaining the current special education formula that recognizes differences in costs.
3. All children must have access to early education programs to help them begin schooling on a more equal basis. All children with special needs must receive additional educational support and assistance to reach academic standards.
 - Provide publicly funded preschool for all at-risk children.
 - Offer universal all day kindergarten.
 - Expand at-risk and extended learning programs.
4. All districts must be able to implement the use of new learning tools and strategies.
 - Expand inservice (professional development programs) for teachers, administrators and board members.
 - Establish a state technology network for education.
 - Provide assistance for district technology equipment and instruction.
5. All districts must be able to provide a safe environment conducive to learning.
 - Lower transportation mileage requirement for state funding.
 - Provide state assistance for capital outlay funding similar to bond and interest aid.

Objective 1:

All districts must be able to provide competitive salaries and benefits to attract and retain high quality employees and to provide them the material support necessary to do their jobs.

Recommendations:

- A. Increase base funding so that it meets the cost of providing a quality education in every school district.**
- The base budget should be set at \$4,500 to cover the cost of educating most general education students in regular programs, including the increase in costs since the system was adopted in 1992.
 - Correlation weighting should be increased at a one-to-two ratio to base increases until it reaches 1,500 students. (For example, correlation weighting would be adjusted by 50 students for every base increase of \$100.) The current low enrollment weighting formula should be maintained.
 - Local school boards should continue to have the ability to supplement the base budget determined by the state through the use of the local option budget. State aid for local option budgets should be increased. Use of the LOB should be determined by the locally elected school board without protest petition.
- B. Provide for automatic annual adjustments in the base budget.**
- The base should be automatically adjusted each year to reflect changes in school district operating expenses, including salaries, benefits utilities and supplies.
 - The adjustment rate could be determined annually to reflect the inflation rate (CPI), changes in personal income or other factors as appropriate.
- C. Assist districts in managing the financial challenges of declining enrollment.**
- Because it is very difficult to reduce fixed educational costs (classroom teacher, administrative and instructional overhead, building costs) even when the number of students decreases, the school finance system should have a component to help districts manage these reductions.
 - Districts should be allowed to use the highest enrollment of the current year, the previous year or the next prior year for budget purposes. Currently, districts can use the highest of the current year, previous year or a three-year average.

Objective 2:

All districts must receive full funding for the mandatory excess costs of special education services.

Recommendation:

Provide special education funding that supports educational services for all students.

- Special education programs are largely determined by laws and regulations imposed on school districts by the state and federal government. School districts must provide funding for these programs regardless of state or federal aid. When state aid does not cover the mandated cost of these programs, districts must shift funding from general education programs.
- The state should fully fund the difference between total special education costs and the revenues provided for regular education students. State aid should cover 100% of mandated cost.
- The state should continue to fund special education through a separate program. Funding should not be included in the base budget. The current special education system recognizes the different costs faced by districts in meeting the unique needs of special education students.

Objective 3:

All children must have access to early education programs to help them begin schooling on a more equal basis. All children with special needs must receive additional educational support and assistance to reach academic standards.

Recommendations:

A. Provide free public preschool for all at-risk children.

- Allowing all children who meet Head Start eligibility to receive high quality preschool programs would help address the learning readiness needs of these children.
- If all students enter kindergarten with ready-to-learn basic skills, the range of student needs in each class would be narrowed. This would allow primary grade teachers to better serve the needs of all students, not just those at-risk.

B. Provide full-time state funding for all children in full-time kindergarten.

- Full-time kindergarten is another tool to help all children begin school ready to learn. It provides additional learning time for children who may need additional help or are ready to move ahead.
- While the decision to offer or to enroll in full-time programs should remain the choice of local boards and parents, once the decision is made the state should fund the full cost of these programs.

C. Expand at-risk and extended learning programs.

- The at-risk weighting factor should be increased to more closely reflect the real cost of reducing the gap in student performance.
- The at-risk weighting factor should be modified to include factors other than poverty.
- State aid should be provided to offer additional learning time (extended day or longer school year) for students who are not meeting grade or course standards and outcomes; and to support alternative programs for students who are not succeeding in the regular classroom structure.

Objective 4:

All districts must be able to implement the use of new learning tools and strategies.

Recommendations:

A. Expand inservice funding for teachers, administrators and board members.

- Decisions from the classroom to the board room should be made after receiving the best training and research-based information. Districts should be encouraged to expand continuing education programs for staff and leadership.
- Increased state funding will result in increased local commitment to professional development, and to higher levels of student achievement.
- To ensure consistent funding for professional development, the inservice aid should be incorporated into the school finance formula instead of continuing as a separate categorical program.

B. Establish a state technology network for education.

- The state, working with telecommunications providers, should establish a technology infrastructure that provides each district with free access to the Internet and compatible connections for distance learning programs.
- The state should provide districts with technical support for Internet access and online services.

C. Assist districts in funding technology equipment and instruction.

- The school finance system must recognize and fund the costs of acquiring new technology, ongoing maintenance, technical support and staff training.

Objective 5:

All districts must be able to provide a safe environment conducive to learning.

Recommendations:

A. Lower the transportation weighting mileage requirement.

- Getting to school safely shouldn't depend on where a child lives. Districts shouldn't have to choose between safe transportation and money in the classroom.
- Decreasing the mileage requirement would free funds in districts that are already transporting children because of safety. These funds could be either restored for educational purposes or used to pay for other safety initiatives.

B. Provide state aid for capital outlay funding similar to bond and interest aid.

- Capital costs are as important to educational quality as other costs. The quality of a student's physical environment at school should not be dependent on location. The state must ensure that all districts receive adequate resources for buildings and equipment by providing assistance to low wealth districts.

Comparison of Positions: Coalition, State Board, Task Force and Governor

Coalition Position	State Board Budget Request	Gov. Task Force Recommendations	Governor's Recommendations
Salaries, Base, Enrollment and Local Option Budgets: All districts must be able to provide competitive salaries and benefits in order to attract and retain high quality employees and to provide them the material support necessary to do their jobs.			
> Raise the base to \$4,500 to fund the cost of a quality education. (\$388.6 million)	Increase base state aid per pupil by \$88 as a catch-up for inflation in prior years and to assist in current year funding. (\$28.5 million)	Until the professional evaluation of the cost of a suitable education is completed and implemented, Kansas needs to increase funding of the current formula and should: (a) Increase the base state aid (BSAPP) by \$180 (approx. 4.7%) to \$4,000 per student. (\$102.9 million)	Increase base state aid per pupil by \$50. (\$28.7 million.)
> Increase correlation weighting at a one-to-two ratio to base increases until it reaches 1,500 students. (\$93.6 million)			<i>Senate Education 1-23-01 Attachment 3</i>
> Allow local boards to adopt local option budgets without protest and increase state assistance for LOB funding.			
> Provide methods to assist districts with declining enrollment. (\$12.0 million)			
> Provide annual adjustments in the base.	Increase the base state aid per pupil based upon the preceding year's consumer price index formula.	Determine an appropriate annual adjustment for inflation.	
		The Governor and the Legislature should create an on-going "School Finance Council" to conduct the evaluation of the cost of a suitable education and then to annually monitor and make recommendations regarding school funding.	
		Kansas must re-evaluate the 1992 school finance formula to address inadequacies and inequities in the current system. The state needs to determine the cost of a "suitable" education to enable students to reach high standards. The state should conduct a professional evaluation to be initiated in January, 2001, and completed by December 1, 2001, with the following objectives: (i) Determine funding needed to provide a suitable education in typical K-12 schools of various sizes and locations; (ii) Determine additional support needed for special education, at-risk, limited English proficient students and other special circumstances; (iii) Determine funding adjustments to ensure comparable purchasing power for all districts, regardless of size or location. (\$450,000)	Supports study. (\$450,000)

3-2

Coalition Position	State Board Budget Request	Task Force Recommendations	Governor's Recommendations
Salaries, Base, Enrollment and Local Option Budgets, continued from previous page			
		To enhance teacher compensation, Kansas should: (a) Increase funding to allow local districts greater opportunity to recruit and retain quality teachers; (b) Provide \$1 million in matching grants to districts for the purpose of developing alternative compensation plans for teachers; and (c) Provide annual incentive funding with an initial investment of \$10 million in grants to districts that implement alternative compensation plans that include components of peer mentoring and peer evaluation and that provide additional compensation to teachers who demonstrate excellence or significant improvement in skills, knowledge, and performance.	
Special Education: All districts must receive full funding for the mandatory costs of special education services.			
Fully fund the current special education formula. (\$52.3 million)	Fund special education at 100% of excess cost. (\$52.3 million)	The state should fully fund the "excess" costs of serving students with special needs. (\$52.3 million)	Fund special education at 85.3% of excess cost. (\$8.0 million)
➤ Support maintaining the current special education formula that recognizes differences in costs.	Include funding for special education in the base budget under a "census-based" system.	As an alternative to the current staffing reimbursement system, the state should finance special education costs based on a two-tiered pupil weighting system. A census-based method of funding special education should be considered in the future, based upon the professional evaluation of the cost of a suitable education.	Supports using a two-tiered weighting system.
Early Childhood and At-Risk Programs: All children must have access to early education programs to help them begin schooling on a more equal basis. All children with special needs must receive additional educational support and assistance to reach academic standards.			
➤ Provide publicly funded preschool for all at-risk children. (\$7.5 million)	Provide funding in the school finance formula to serve four-year-old at-risk children not currently receiving services. (\$7.5 million)	The Task Force also notes support for the State Board of Education's budget proposals for all-day kindergarten, four-year-old at-risk, Parents as Teachers, and extended school year, but does not include as recommendations with funding attached.	
➤ Offer universal all day kindergarten. (\$52.5 million)	Fund all-day kindergarten for districts that choose to provide the program and include in school finance formula. (\$52.5 million)		
	Increase funding for parents as teachers by weighting the students at 0.2 and include in the school finance formula. (\$8.5 million)		Expand Parents as Teacher program to reduce waiting lists. (\$1 million) Allow 3-year-olds to be served by the program. (\$1 million)

3-3

Coalition Position	State Board Budget Request	Task Force Recommendations	Governor's Recommendations
Elementary Childhood and At-Risk Programs, continued from previous page			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Expand at-risk and extended learning programs. 	Broad the definition of the at-risk weighting to include students who are not making satisfactory progress toward graduation or have truancy/attendance problems. <i>(\$4 million)</i>	Broaden the definition of "at-risk" to include truant students and those not making progress towards graduation as proposed by the State Board of Education, <i>(\$4 million)</i>	
	Include summer school students in the Sept. 20 enrollment count if such students do not meet state or local standards and summer school is provided. <i>(\$24 million)</i>		
		Increase the weighting for "at-risk" students from 0.09 to 0.10. <i>(\$4 million)</i>	Increase the "at-risk" weighting factor from 0.09 to 0.10. <i>(\$4 million)</i>
Technology, Professional Development: All districts must be able to implement the use of new learning tools and strategies.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Expand inservice (professional development programs) for teachers, administrators and board members. <i>(\$1.1 million)</i> 	Provide additional funding for inservice education to keep teachers and administrators up to date and include in school finance formula. <i>(\$1.1 million)</i>		Reduces inservice funding by \$2 million from the current year.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Establish a state technology network for education. <i>(\$4.5 million)</i> ➤ Provide assistance for district technology equipment and instruction. 	Fund a statewide technology backbone system. <i>(\$4.5 million)</i>	The Task Force also notes support for the State Board of Education's budget proposals for the state's technology backbone system, but does not include as recommendations with funding attached.	Supports study of school district technology needs. <i>(\$500,000)</i>
Safety and Capital Outlay Funding: All districts must be able to provide a safe environment conducive to learning.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Lower transportation mileage requirement for state funding. <i>(\$23.1 million)</i> 	Lower the state aid transportation mileage limit from 2.5 to 2.0 miles & 0.5 every year until the limit reaches 1.0 miles. <i>(\$6.6 in FY 2002)</i>	The Task Force also notes support for the State Board of Education's budget proposals transportation, but does not include as recommendations with funding attached.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Provide state assistance for capital outlay funding similar to bond and interest aid. 		Equalize the capital outlay mill levy so that less wealthy districts are not disadvantaged. <i>(\$15 million)</i>	

3-H

<i>Coalition Position</i>	<i>State Board Budget Request</i>	<i>Task Force Recommendations</i>	<i>Governor's Recommendations</i>
Accountability, Incentives, Efficiency		Kansas should link K-12 funding to accountability and provide ongoing incentives for districts and schools to improve performance, pursue innovation, utilize technology, and increase efficiency as follows: (a) Provide an initial investment of \$7.5 million for "reward grants" to be awarded to schools in which student achievement is significantly increased or that reach the standard of excellence as determined by the State Board of Education; (b) Provide an initial investment of \$7.5 million for "reward grants" to be awarded to districts and schools (1) for success in innovation and the use of technology or (2) that voluntarily cooperate with other districts in the sharing of resources and services (including personnel, buildings, and equipment) in order to increase efficiency, save money, and/or enhance the availability and quality of educational opportunities; and (c) Allow districts more latitude with contingency reserve funds by amending K.S.A. 72-6426 to ease the restrictions on expenditures and to raise the maximum balance from 4% to 7.5% of a district's general fund and supplemental general fund.	