

MINUTES OF THE HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Kathe Decker at 9:00 a.m. on February 16, 2004 in Room 313-S of the Capitol.

All members were present.

Committee staff present:

Kathie Sparks Legislative Research Department
Art Griggs, Office of the Revisor of Statues
Ann Deitcher, Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee:

Representative Bob Bethell
Representative Eric Carter
Representative Doug Patterson
Representative Clay Aurand
Terry Forsyth, KNEA
Mark Tallman, KASB
Diane Gjerstad, Wichita Public Schools
Dr. Stuart Little, Little Government Relations

HB 2699 - relating to teachers; concerning salary schedule.

The Chair recognized Representative Bethell who spoke to the Committee in support of **HB 2699**. (Attachment 1).

Following a question and answer session, Terry Forsyth spoke in opposition of **HB 2699**. (Attachment 2).

Mark Tallman appeared as an opponent to **HB 2699**. (Attachment 3).

Diane Gjerstad spoke in opposition of **HB 2699**. (Attachment 4).

The hearing on **HB 2699** was closed.

HB 2481 - relating to school districts; concerning local option budgets.

HB 2630 - relating to education; concerning local option budgets.

HB 2837 - concerning school districts with less than 100 pupils.

The Chair explained to the Committee that since these bills were similar, to save time, those who were appearing as proponents would speak on all three bills.

Appearing in support of **HB 2481** was Representative Eric Carter. (Attachments 5, 6 and 7).

Representative Doug Patterson offered testimony in support of **HB 2630**. (Attachment 8).

Stuart Little spoke to the Committee as a proponent of **HB 2630**. (Attachment 9).

Written testimony in support of **HB 2630** was distributed by Ashley Sharard of the Lenexa Chamber of Commerce. (Attachment 10).

Representative Clay Aurand spoke as a proponent to **HB 2837**. (Attachment 11).

Questions and answers followed the testimonies.

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE at 9:00 a.m. on February 16, 2004 in Room 313-S of the Capitol.

The Chair told the Committee that they would continue hearings on **HB 2481, HB 2630 and HB 2837** at the next meeting with testimony from the opponents to the bill.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:55. The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, February 17, 2004.

BOB BETHELL
 STATE REPRESENTATIVE, 113TH DISTRICT
 104 E. THIRD, P.O. BOX 186
 ALDEN, KS 67512
 (620) 534-3085
 FAX 620-534-3086
 bethell@ink.org



COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS
 CO-CHAIRMAN: LONG TERM CARE TASKFORCE
 MEMBER: APPROPRIATIONS
 HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES
 SOCIAL SERVICES BUDGET

STATE CAPITOL—ROOM 175-W
 TOPEKA, KS 66612-1504
 785-296-7616

TOPEKA

Testimony on HB 2699
 February 16, 2004

Chairperson Decker and members of the House Education Committee, I am Bob Bethell, Representative of District 113.

I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you this morning regarding HB 2699.

This bill is introduced for the purpose of recognizing the service provided to the children of Kansas by those teachers that have been awarded a Bachelor of Science or Arts degree.

The job of teaching the youth of our state is one that cannot be ignored and should be rewarded. The salaries of our teachers are in many ways lacking, while salary is not the only way to reward a good teacher it certainly is one way that should not be ignored. I have received information from some members of the administrative team indicating that the method of evaluating teachers is lacking, and honestly those same persons were not in agreement with HB 2699, however I am interested in providing an opportunity to begin discussion as to how those dedicated individuals in the grass root areas of Education can be rewarded.

No Child Left Behind requires “qualified teachers” it is my hope that we do not take the easy route and say that a qualified teacher is one with advanced degrees. If we take the position that advanced degrees make one better then we could come to the conclusion that every PhD. is the epitome of greatness as a teacher.

Again thank you for your time and effort to hear HB 2699.

Madame Chair, I will stand for questions.

House Education Committee
 Date: 2/16/04
 Attachment # 1



Terry Forsyth, Testimony
House Education Committee
February 16, 2004
House Bill 2699

Madame Chairman, members of the committee, I am Terry Forsyth and I represent the Kansas National Education Association. I thank you for the opportunity to come before you today and share our concerns with **House Bill 2699**.

I can appreciate what Representative Bethell is trying to do with this bill. He wants to make sure that teachers are rewarded financially no matter how they pursue professional development. Not everyone seeks an advanced degree and it may seem to some as if the only way to get to the top of a salary schedule is by earning such a degree. In many cases it is true that the only way to earn the maximum salary in a school district is by earning advanced degrees. But such a salary schedule is a local decision made at the bargaining table by representatives of the school district and the local teachers association. We support that process.

What this bill does exactly is a little unclear. I would submit to you a few questions that arose in a discussion of this bill over in our building.

- Does the bill prohibit a salary schedule from having an advanced degree requirement for achieving the maximum salary benefit available?
- Does the bill require the establishment of separate salary schedules for teachers with and without advanced degrees?
- Does the bill require a step for every year of service for a teacher without an advanced degree essentially making salary schedules with 30 or more steps?
- Would the bill have the unintended consequence of discouraging continued learning and professional development?
- Would the bill discourage the development of salary schedules that focus on "lifetime earnings" over annual steps?

We believe that this bill is far too unclear to merit passage. We ask that the committee let the local school board and teachers association work through the negotiations process to craft a salary schedule that meets the compensation goals of the district and allows for the recruitment and retention of the best teachers available.

House Education Committee

Date: 2/16/04
Attachment # 2

KANSAS
ASSOCIATION



OF
SCHOOL
BOARDS

1420 SW Arrowhead Road • Topeka, Kansas 66604-4024
785-273-3600

Testimony on
HB 2699 – Teacher Salary Schedules

Before the
House Committee on Education

By Mark Tallman, Assistant Executive Director/Advocacy
February 16, 2004

Madam Chair, Members of the Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on **HB 2699**, which would require boards to adopt salary schedules that have reasonable increases per step for each year of service and would prohibit putting limits on the salary schedule for teachers with only a bachelor of science degree. We oppose this bill for several reasons.

First, it would set a precedent for legislative dictation of the terms and conditions of employment. On one hand, the Legislature requires boards to negotiate with teachers. On the other, this bill would override the negotiations process by requiring boards to set salary schedules in a certain way.

Second, in a world of finite resources, there is no free lunch. If this bill be were passed to direct more salary dollars to some teachers, there will be less available for other teachers, or school boards will have to make cuts elsewhere in the budget. The current system allows those choices to be made at the local level; this bill will force choices to be made in certain ways.

Finally, one reason boards may adopt (through negotiations) a salary schedule that does not continually provide pay increases just for years of service is to encourage teachers to seek more education to improve their qualifications. Most of our members would like to add *more* criteria to determine how teachers are compensated. This bill would reduce the importance of the criteria of continuing professional development. We believe that is moving in the wrong direction.

Thank you for your consideration.

House Education Committee
Date: 2/16/04
Attachment # 3



House Education Committee Representative Decker, chair

H.B. 2699 – Teacher Compensation

*Presented by: Diane Gjerstad
Wichita Public Schools*

February 16, 2004

Madame Chair, members of the Committee:

The ideal to “get more money” into the classroom is a common goal. However I would argue increases in the base and weightings *do* result in more money in the classroom! When school districts are able to fund the salary schedule, able to fund a cost of living increase and able to fund health insurance premiums, we are “getting more money” into the classroom. H. B. 2699 would supercede the negotiated agreement that includes salary schedules. Boards of Education and teacher groups have negotiated salary agreements reflecting the needs of individual school districts. Some school districts have requirements for graduate degrees. For example in Wichita special education teachers are required to have a masters or better. Due to the complexity of students served, Wichita believes this is the best policy.

This bill would be, yet another, mandate. The result would be to increase fixed costs with no guarantee of corresponding revenue to fund the mandate. H. B. 2699 would required funding of steps each year for bachelor level teachers regardless of whether funding is available.

The Board of Education adopted a full 25% local option budget in 2001. Since then the Board has faced rising costs and reduced budgets starting with former Governor Graves \$27 allotment in August 02.

- 02/03 The Board **cut \$4.1M** to balance the budget:
 - Reduced 19 FTE
 - \$1M reduction from technology, supplies, services, administration, travel and transportation
- 03/04 The Board **cut \$8.3M** to balance the current year budget:
 - Reduced 84 FTE
 - Elimination of extended day and year school programs
 - Significant cut in summer school intervention for students not passing the Wichita Benchmarks
 - Further cuts in travel, service, administration, printing, supplies and student transportation
- Planning for next year’s school year is based on **\$9M** in anticipated cost increases:
 - All departments are cutting at least 5%
 - Principals are working with site councils and facility to find cuts
 - School based cuts will include personnel
 - High school – 5% cuts equals \$2.1M
 - Middle school – 5% cuts equals \$1.8M
 - Elementary school – 5% cuts equals \$3.8M

To settle the current year’s bargaining agreement, both classified and certified staff agreed their priority was to fund a 15% increase in health insurance premiums over steps on the salary schedule.

The needs of districts vary widely. Our student populations vary widely. The regional economies vary widely. A salary schedule is one reflection of the differences found across the state. H.B. 2699 would limit Board’s ability to respond to unique needs and will increase costs during times of uncertain revenue.

Thank you, Madame Chair, I would stand for questions.

House Education Committee

Date: 2/16/04

Attachment # 4

ERIC C. CARTER
 REPRESENTATIVE, FORTY-EIGHTH DISTRICT
 14340 MACKEY
 OVERLAND PARK, KANSAS 66223
 913.568.4754
 email: ericcarter@kc.rr.com
 STATE CAPITOL BUILDING—427-S
 TOPEKA, KANSAS 66612-1504
 785.296-7699
 carter@house.state.ks.us



TOPEKA
 HOUSE OF
 REPRESENTATIVES

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS
 MEMBER: CORRECTIONS AND JUVENILE
 JUSTICE
 SOCIAL SERVICES BUDGET
 UTILITIES
 LEGISLATIVE HOTLINE: 1.800.432.3924
 TTY: 785.296.8430

Testimony in Support of HB 2481

A. Core Principles

Thank you for providing me the opportunity to address you today regarding HB 2481. HB 2481 is designed to meet certain core principles, objectives, and concerns. Specifically:

- Achieve the benefits of the local option budget while addressing associated concerns
- Shrink the “opportunity gap” without pulling-down top-performing districts
- Focus on actual student performance, rather than money
- Force accountability in district spending decisions

B. Impact

- Which districts will be benefitted? (See attachments.)
- What is the potential impact?

C. Contemplated Amendments

- More precision regarding which districts qualify for redistribution fund.
- Protest petition
- Permit districts raising *above* the median to continue receiving allocations from the redistribution fund for, e.g., 1-2 years.

Respectfully submitted,

Rep. Eric Carter

House Education Committee
 Date: 2/16/04
 Attachment # 5

Map Scores -- Districts Below Median

USD	USD NAME	COUNT	%PROF +
435	Abilene	276	52.5
387	Altoona Midway	66	62.1
361	Anthony-Harper	203	53.2
470	Arkansas City	586	59.4
377	Atchison County	170	61.8
409	Atchison Public Schools	340	55.9
511	Attica	32	34.4
254	Barber Co North	157	52.9
458	Basehor-Linwood	383	51.7
508	Baxter Springs	191	45.5
304	Bazine	22	45.5
273	Beloit	170	59.4
384	Blue Valley	57	57.9
204	Bonner Springs	463	44.1
369	Burrton	53	54.7
360	Caldwell	63	57.1
436	Caney Valley	195	44.6
419	Canton Galva	82	62.2
462	Central	83	55.4
288	Central Heights	147	46.9
413	Chanute	400	60
401	Chase	28	42.9
286	Chautauqua County	106	55.7
247	Cherokee	189	58.2
447	Cherryvale	126	48.4
505	Chetopa	46	58.7
102	Cimarron-Ensign	136	56.6
264	Clearwater	279	51.3
445	Coffeyville	423	46.6
315	Colby	224	60.3
493	Columbus	247	57.5
356	Conway Springs	149	61.1
332	Cunningham	40	45
216	Deerfield	65	33.8
260	Derby	1438	60.3
443	Dodge City	1163	42.5
396	Douglass	183	56.3
449	Easton	153	55.6
490	El Dorado	473	47.6
283	Elk Valley	46	34.8
218	Elkhart	113	53.1
355	Ellinwood	126	61.1
486	Elwood	66	51.5
253	Emporia	1021	51.7
389	Eureka	159	56.6
310	Fairfield	88	54.5
495	Fort Larned	210	54.8
234	Fort Scott	465	59.8
484	Fredonia	191	45
249	Frontenac	133	61.7
499	Galena	145	44.1
457	Garden City	1457	54.8
365	Garnett	241	51
352	Goodland	194	51
428	Great Bend	689	51.1
200	Greeley County	70	60

House Education Committee
 Date: 2/16/04
 Attachment # 6-1

228	Hanston	34	58.8
474	Haviland	32	59.4
261	Haysville	968	52.7
487	Herington	115	59.1
415	Hiawatha	223	58.3
281	Hill City	97	55.7
431	Hoisington	143	53.8
363	Holcomb	206	52.4
210	Hugoton	216	57.9
258	Humboldt	127	62.2
308	Hutchinson Public Schools	980	53.3
446	Independence	415	47
477	Ingalls	31	58.1
257	Iola	310	57.7
346	Jayhawk	133	50.4
340	Jefferson West	229	59.4
227	Jetmore	68	55.9
279	Jewell	47	51.1
500	Kansas City	4017	29.4
347	Kinsley Offerle	58	50
483	Kismet-Plains	144	43.8
506	Labette County	397	58.4
395	LaCrosse	68	57.4
453	Leavenworth	875	43.8
205	Leon	182	48.4
245	LeRoy Gridley	63	57.1
480	Liberal	839	39.1
416	Louisburg	314	61.1
421	Lyndon	120	61.7
405	Lyons	184	59.2
386	Madison Virgil	70	50
278	Mankato	65	43.1
456	Marais des Cygnes	60	36.7
256	Marmaton Valley	104	55.8
364	Marysville	202	55.4
342	McLouth	128	53.1
417	Morris County	208	52.4
423	Moundridge	178	61.8
263	Mulvane	442	55.7
461	Neodesha	194	53.1
373	Newton	754	60.3
221	North Central	23	56.5
239	North Ottawa Co	139	58.3
420	Osage City	152	55.3
367	Osawatomie	279	48.7
341	Oskaloosa	148	61.5
504	Oswego-Service Valley	128	61.7
290	Ottawa	499	57.9
358	Oxford	84	48.8
368	Paola	452	60.8
503	Parsons	292	53.8
496	Pawnee Heights	30	60
398	Peabody Burns	104	59.6
343	Perry	232	60.3
325	Phillipsburg	140	61.4
250	Pittsburg	500	55.2
270	Plainville	96	49

Math Scores -- Districts Below Median

344 Pleasanton	80	46.3
295 Prairie Heights	17	35.3
382 Pratt	279	57.3
293 Quinter Schools	80	58.8
404 Riverton	178	40.4
394 Rose Hill	428	58.2
481 Rural Vista	114	45.6
407 Russell	232	45.3
305 Salina	1667	58.4
434 Santa Fe Trail	284	57
507 Satanta	98	58.2
302 Smoky Hill	33	33.3
393 Solomon	87	58.6
255 South Barber	72	59.7
334 Southern Cloud	44	36.4
350 St John-Hudson	80	43.8
349 Stafford	37	59.5
452 Stanton County	110	50.9
271 Stockton	73	58.9
494 Syracuse	109	30.3
464 Tonganoxie	324	50.3
501 Topeka Public Schools	2835	41.8
429 Troy	64	46.9
202 Turner	709	40.1
240 Twin Valley	159	57.2
214 Ulysses	345	47.5
262 Valley Center	510	60.4
338 Valley Falls	90	57.8
330 Wabaunsee East	122	58.2
241 Wallace County	58	58.6
406 Wathena	94	61.7
353 Wellington	364	44.5
289 Wellsville	178	53.4
287 West Franklin	180	61.7
238 West Smith County	52	55.8
292 Wheatland	49	55.1
259 Wichita	9187	45.1
465 Winfield	557	51.9
366 Yates Center	129	58.9

USD	USD NAME	COUNT
435	Abilene	277
387	Altoona Midway	65
361	Anthony-Harper	230
359	Argonia	52
470	Arkansas City	590
377	Atchison County	189
409	Atchison Public Schools	345
511	Attica	27
402	Augusta	464
488	Axtell	82
254	Barber Co North	137
458	Basehor-Linwood	394
508	Baxter Springs	175
273	Beloit	163
204	Bonner Springs	468
314	Brewster	32
454	Burlingame Public Schools	62
369	Burrton	57
360	Caldwell	58
436	Caney Valley	228
285	Cedar Vale	49
462	Central	82
288	Central Heights	156
397	Centre	56
401	Chase	48
247	Cherokee	192
447	Cherryvale	129
103	Cheylin	43
102	Cimarron-Ensign	156
264	Clearwater	275
445	Coffeyville	402
493	Columbus	245
300	Comanche County	72
356	Conway Springs	116
479	Crest	67
216	Deerfield	57
443	Dodge City	1061
324	Eastern Heights	35
449	Easton	175
490	El Dorado	437
283	Elk Valley	44
218	Elkhart	131
307	Ell-Saline	93
486	Elwood	57
253	Emporia	958
389	Eureka	148
310	Fairfield	88
495	Fort Larned	218
234	Fort Scott	437
484	Fredonia	175
249	Frontenac	157
499	Galena	159
457	Garden City	1423
365	Garnett	263
475	Geary County	1131
316	Golden Plains	48

House Education Committee

Date: 2/16/04

Attachment # 7-1

352 Goodland	225
428 Great Bend	664
228 Hanston	32
474 Haviland	42
261 Haysville	859
487 Herington	105
317 Herndon	24
415 Hiawatha	226
281 Hill City	96
336 Holton	218
412 Hoxie	81
210 Hugoton	148
258 Humboldt	102
308 Hutchinson Public Schools	965
446 Independence	458
477 Ingalls	63
257 Iola	303
346 Jayhawk	171
227 Jetmore	73
500 Kansas City	3933
347 Kinsley Offerle	58
483 Kismet-Plains	155
395 LaCrosse	79
215 Lakin	161
453 Leavenworth	814
245 LeRoy Gridley	89
502 Lewis	39
480 Liberal	791
326 Logan	54
416 Louisburg	314
405 Lyons	179
386 Madison Virgil	62
278 Mankato	61
456 Marais des Cygnes	73
256 Marmaton Valley	81
364 Marysville	225
342 McLouth	128
433 Midway	47
371 Montezuma	40
417 Morris County	260
209 Moscow	42
461 Neodesha	174
246 Northeast-Arma	114
322 Onaga	76
420 Osage City	168
367 Osawatomie	234
341 Oskaloosa	138
403 Otis Bison	60
290 Ottawa	519
358 Oxford	101
269 Palco	39
368 Paola	455
503 Parsons	363
343 Perry	234
325 Phillipsburg	166
203 Piper	293
250 Pittsburg	498

270 Plainville	59
344 Pleasanton	71
295 Prairie Heights	20
362 Prairie View	196
382 Pratt	254
404 Riverton	164
394 Rose Hill	410
337 Royal Valley	206
481 Rural Vista	88
407 Russell	223
507 Satanta	77
345 Seaman	702
393 Solomon	84
509 South Haven	49
334 Southern Cloud	29
252 Southern Lyon Co	162
297 St Francis	92
350 St John-Hudson	101
349 Stafford	52
452 Stanton County	89
271 Stockton	104
374 Sublette	44
494 Syracuse	92
501 Topeka Public Schools	2550
275 Triplains	20
429 Troy	77
202 Turner	733
240 Twin Valley	128
214 Ulysses	339
262 Valley Center	514
432 Victoria	67
330 Wabaunsee East	110
353 Wellington	398
289 Wellsville	176
287 West Franklin	236
213 West Solomon Valley Schools	5
259 Wichita	8706
465 Winfield	590
366 Yates Center	138

STATE OF KANSAS

HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES

REPRESENTATIVE, 28TH DISTRICT
JOHNSON COUNTY
12712 EL MONTE
LEAWOOD, KANSAS 66209
(913) 897-6905



DOUG PATTERSON
MAJORITY WHIP

ROOM 174-W
STATE CAPITOL
TOPEKA, KANSAS 66612-1504
(785) 291-3500

VICE-CHAIR: JUDICIARY
MEMBER: COMMERCE AND LABOR
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
JT. COMMITTEE ON STATE
INDIAN AFFAIRS
HOUSE RULES COMMITTEE

February ¹⁶ 19, 2004

Rep. Kathe Decker, Chair
and Members of the
House Education Committee

Re: Supporters of HB 2630

I appear before you today in support of HB 2630.

For the first time in many years the Legislature must address an overall review of our State School Finance Formula. Significant in these decisions will be the consideration of "weighing" local funding needs. I can think of no more meritorious local funding need than the desire of local communities to raise local funds for their local school districts.

With the federal impact considerations not problematic to your deliberation, I would respectfully urge you to consider HB 2630 favorably.

Yours,

Doug Patterson
Doug Patterson

House Education Committee
Date: 2/16/04
Attachment # 8

STUART J. LITTLE, Ph.D.
Little Government Relations

February 16, 2004

House Education Committee
Testimony on HB 2630

Thank you Madam Chair and Members of the Committee,

My name is Stuart Little and I am representing the Shawnee Mission School District, USD 512 in support of HB 2630.

The Shawnee Mission School District is the second largest district in Kansas, with over 28,000 students, 1,856 teachers, in 55 schools, and a state aid budget of \$137 million during the FY 2003-2004 school year. In addition, we receive funding from our LOB of 25 percent in the amount of \$34.5 million in the current school year. We also will receive \$4.6 million from the Johnson County sales tax which ceases after the 2006 school year. We are also a declining enrollment district, losing an estimated 450 students each year, with 2,444 pupils meeting the free lunch criteria for "at risk," and 1,274 bilingual students.

Shawnee Mission educates 6.5% of the entire student population in the state with one of the lowest expenditures per pupil in the state. Enrollment decline has placed a strain on the district because expenditures can not be reduced as fast as funding declines. As with all USDs, the lack of an adequate BSAPP adds additional strain as cost pressures, especially health insurance, have far outpaced BSAPP. Shawnee Mission is a net exporter of state dollars to other districts so all children have access to a suitable education, and our patrons and community want to be allowed to provide the programs they wish for their children.

Shawnee Mission School District supports efforts to increase the local option budget authority. For some USDs high levels of "at-risk" or bilingual students are addressed by the school finance formula through the weighting process. With limited but growing "at risk" and bilingual students and declining enrollment, our method of raising additional revenue is locally-generated LOB.

I provide this statistical data on the Shawnee Mission School District to demonstrate we are a very large school district that generates and spends a tremendous amount of state and local revenue on education. The Governor's Education First plan targets funding to "at-risk" and bilingual, and all day kindergarten. The proposal serves those needs very well as we believe it should. The plan is not as beneficial for us. An option to increase the LOB from 25 to 30 percent would generate \$6.9 million dollars in

new revenue for SMSD. This new revenue would not be for luxuries, extras and new programs, but would be used to offset three years of funding cuts and the elimination of programs, services, staff, and closing school to shift funding to other areas such as salaries, benefits, and utilities.

Thank you for your time and I would be happy to stand for questions.



The Historic Lackman-Thompson Estate

11180 Lackman Road
Lenexa, KS 66219-1236
913.888.1414
Fax 913.888.3770

TO: Representative Kathe Decker, Chair
Members, House Education Committee

FROM: Ashley Sherard, Vice President
Lenexa Chamber of Commerce

DATE: February 16, 2004

RE: **Support for HB 2630—Increase in Local Option Budget Authority**

The Lenexa Chamber of Commerce would like to express its support for the concepts embodied in House Bill (HB) 2630, which increases the maximum percentage allowable for school district local option budget authority from the current 25% up to 30% of state general aid.

Quality educational opportunities are a primary reason businesses choose to locate in a community—both as an incubator of highly-skilled workers as well as a quality of life issue for their families and the families of their employees. Accordingly, we strongly believe Kansas must continue its reputation as a place where children can attend excellent schools.

Unfortunately, in recent years state funding of K-12 public education has created financial challenges that may now seriously threaten the quality of instructional programs, and school districts' ability to respond to these challenges continues to be hampered by limited local authority. **Measures such as HB 2630 that provide needed flexibility and expand school districts' local authority to raise budgetary resources and administer their schools would significantly improve school districts' ability to manage and respond to serious financial issues, enhance long-term planning, and better meet the needs and expectations of their district patrons.**

Recognizing the importance of quality public education to the state's economic prosperity, the Lenexa Chamber of Commerce strongly urges the committee to recommend HB 2630 favorable for passage. Thank you for your time and attention to this issue.

House Education Committee
Date: 2/16/04
Attachment # 10

HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVESREPRESENTATIVE, 109TH DISTRICT
JEWELL, MITCHELL,
REPUBLIC AND SMITH COUNTIESROOM 381-W
STATE CAPITOL
TOPEKA, KANSAS 66612-1504
(785) 296-7662
FAX: (785) 368-7168CLAY AURAND
MAJORITY LEADER**House Bill 2837**

The Augenblick & Myers studies identified several potential changes to the way school finance is handled in Kansas. This bill attempts to address two identified shortcomings of our formula. Considering our current limited resources, and that most new revenue to education will probably go to at-risk and bilingual education, it is important to find other ways to fix problems in the formula without spending new revenue. These two issues do not require additional state revenue and may save some money if adopted. In addition, they will only impact a small handful of districts. Finally, Judge Bullock noted the great disparity between actual dollars spent per student and this bill will help lessen that disparity.

- Part 1) District Consolidation
- A. The bill requires school districts with fewer than 100 pupils to consolidate.
 - B. Only a handful of school districts would be affected by the bill. One of them is in the process of consolidating anyway.
 - C. Augenblick & Myers noted that students could be harmed by small districts.
- Part 2) Cost of Living Weighting
- A. Augenblick & Myers suggested that a cost of living factor should be a part of the school finance formula.
 - B. The Augenblick & Myers proposal would actually decrease state funding for low cost areas and increase state funding for high cost areas.
 - C. This bill holds low cost areas harmless and recognizes that some high cost areas can fund their cost of living factor.
 - D. This bill uses the cost of housing in a school district to measure cost of living.
 - E. When the average cost of housing in a school district exceeds 125% of the statewide average, a district with an approved LOB of 25% qualifies for the self funded weighting.
 - F. The extra money raised is required to go to teacher salaries.

House Education Committee
Date: 2/16/04
Attachment # 11-1

SCHOOL DIST. Name	DISTRICT Number	LOB %	Counties in which School Districts are located	Average Appraised	Percent Difference	Percent Weighting*	USD State Financial Aid**	Maximum Levy
Blue Valley	229	25.00	Johnson, Miami	304,123	143.2%	5.0%	\$97,140,157	\$4,857,008
DeSoto	232	25.00	Johnson	193,811	55.0%	5.0%	\$22,547,558	\$1,127,378
Olathe	233	25.00	Johnson	188,221	50.5%	5.0%	\$118,081,480	\$5,904,074
Shawnee Mission	512	25.00	Johnson	187,259	49.8%	5.0%	\$137,833,772	\$6,891,689
Andover	385	25.00	Butler, Sedgwick	178,674	42.9%	5.0%	\$16,510,848	\$825,542
Louisburg	416	25.00	Miami	171,707	37.3%	5.0%	\$8,181,061	\$409,053
Piper	203	25.00	Wyandotte	164,412	31.5%	5.0%	\$7,248,533	\$365,181
Auburn Washburn	437	25.00	Shawnee	163,882	31.1%	5.0%	\$24,770,715	\$1,231,150
Basehor-Linwood	458	25.00	Leavenworth	161,558	29.2%	4.7%	\$9,929,069	\$463,966
Spring Hill	230	25.00	Johnson, Miami	160,648	28.5%	4.6%	\$8,301,587	\$378,251
Lawrence	497	25.00	Douglas, Jefferson, Leavenworth	152,037	21.6%	3.5%	\$49,450,263	\$1,708,265
Lansing	469	25.00	Leavenworth	144,393	15.5%	2.5%	\$9,566,720	\$236,909
Maize	266	25.00	Sedgwick	140,841	12.6%	2.0%	\$28,964,388	\$585,625
Gardner-Edgerton-Antioch	231	25.00	Johnson, Miami	138,694	10.9%	1.7%	\$16,528,232	\$288,773
Paola	368	25.00	Miami	135,228	8.1%	1.3%	\$10,516,631	\$137,100
Goddard	265	25.00	Sedgwick	125,946	0.7%	0.1%	\$19,441,320	\$22,538

FORMULAS:

Threshold: (2003 average statewide residential value)*1.25 2003 Average Statewide Residential Value=\$100,032
 Percent Difference: [(average appraised)-(threshold)]/(threshold) Treshhold=\$125,040
 Percent Weighting: (Percent Difference)*0.16

NOTE: According to US Census Data, 16.07% of the average household income goes to housing.

*The Percent Weighting would be multiplied by the district's state financial aid.
 **Figures based on current law.