

MINUTES OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL FINANCE

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Kathe Decker at 9:00 on January 26, 2005 in Room 313-S of the Capitol.

All members were present.

Committee staff present:

Kathie Sparks, Kansas Legislative Research  
Theresa Kiernan, Revisor of Statutes Office  
Art Griggs, Revisor of Statutes Office  
Ann Deitcher, Committee Secretary

Theresa Kiernan spoke to the Committee in explanation of at-risk weighting. (Attachment 1).

A copy of a chart was distributed to the Committee and the Chair explained how it showed the requirements for free or reduced price meals. (Attachment 2).

Representative O'Neal addressed the Committee in regard to the State Dept. Of Ed table that provides information related to the number of at-risk students served in the 2002-03 school year. (Attachment 3).

The Chair spoke of the information regarding At-Risk funding in Kansas and other states that was compiled by the Research Department. (Attachment 4).

The discussion on At-Risk was closed.

Kathie Sparks explained the formation of an oversight committee on School District Finance and Quality Performance during the 1992 Session. (Attachment 5).

A discussion was held in regard to the formation of a sub-committee to work with Theresa Kiernan in coming up with language following the language that's on the Judicial Council statute on setting up guidelines for establishing this type of committee.

Representatives DeCastro, Gordon and Crow were named as members of this sub-committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:45. The next meeting of the select committee is scheduled for Thursday, January 27, 2005.

## **At-Risk Weighting**

**K.S.A. 72-6414.** (a) The at-risk pupil weighting of each district shall be determined by the state board by multiplying the number of at-risk pupils included in enrollment of the district by .10. The product is the at-risk pupil weighting of the district.

(b) Except as provided in subsection (d), of the amount a district receives from the at-risk pupil weighting, an amount produced by a pupil weighting of .01 shall be used by the district for achieving mastery of basic reading skills by completion of the third grade in accordance with standards and outcomes of mastery identified by the state board under K.S.A. 72-7534, and amendments thereto.

(c) A district shall include such information in its at-risk pupil assistance plan as the state board may require regarding the district's remediation strategies and the results thereof in achieving the third grade reading standards and outcomes of mastery identified by the state board. The reporting requirements shall include information documenting remediation strategies and improvement made by pupils who performed below the expected standard on the second grade diagnostic reading test prescribed by the state board.

(d) A district whose pupils substantially achieve the state board standards and outcomes of mastery of reading skills upon completion of third grade may be released, upon request, by the state board from the requirements of subsection (b).

**Select Comm. on School Finance**

Date 1-26-05

Attachment # 1

**From:** Vicki Hoffman  
**Sent:** Monday, December 20, 2004 9:36 AM  
**To:** Diane Gjerstad  
**Subject:** RE: f/r requirements  
 Diane, I'll list guidelines for several different family sizes.

Household size	FREE MEALS		REDUCED PRICE MEALS	
	Annual Income	Monthly Income	Annual Income	Monthly Income
1	\$0 to \$12,103	\$1,009	\$12,104 to \$17,224	\$1,436
2	\$0 to \$16,237	\$1,354	\$16,238 to \$23,107	\$1,926
4	\$0 to \$24,505	\$2,043	\$24,506 to \$34,873	\$2,907
6	\$0 to \$32,773	\$2,732	\$32,774 to \$46,639	\$3,887

Please let me know if you need additional information!  
Vicki

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Diane Gjerstad  
**Sent:** Monday, December 20, 2004 9:16 AM  
**To:** Vicki Hoffman  
**Subject:** f/r requirements

My annual question --

What are a couple of examples of the guidelines for free lunch, like a family of 4.

Thanks

Diane Gjerstad  
 Government Relations

Wichita Public Schools  
 201 N. Water Street  
 Wichita, KS 67202

Office: 316-973-4639  
 Cell phone: 316-371-4687

Select Comm. on School Finance  
 Date 1-26-05  
 Attachment # 2



# Division of Fiscal and Administrative Services

785-296-3871  
785-296-0459 (fax)

120 SE 10th Avenue • Topeka, KS 66612-1182 • (785) 296-6338 (TTY) • www.ksde.org

November 8, 2004

TO: Select Joint Committee on School Finance

FROM: Dale M. Dennis, Deputy  
Commissioner of Education

SUBJECT: At-Risk – K-12

Listed below is a table which provides information related to the number of at-risk students served in the 2002-03 school year. Kansas statutes define at-risk as the number of students eligible for free lunches. The 2003-04 information is in the process of being updated.

At-risk enrollment (students eligible for free lunches)	121,928	
At-risk pupils served	135,895	13,967 More ed.
At-risk weighting at .10	12,192.8	
At-risk weighting state aid	\$ 47,100,786	347.00 per student

Even though the students eligible for free lunch determines the amount of money eligible for at-risk students, all students who meet the definition of at-risk (see Q2. attached) would be eligible to receive benefits.

The table below provides the number of at-risk students receiving benefits and the number of students eligible for free lunch

School Year	At-Risk Students Being Served	No. of Free Lunch Applications
1998-99	105,512	108,732
1999-00	122,006	107,248
2000-01	128,587	109,650
2001-02	125,692	113,881
2002-03	135,895	121,928

Attached is additional information on at-risk for your review.

h:leg:SJCSF—At-Risk Students Served

Select Comm. on School Finance  
Date 1-26-05  
Attachment # 3-1

## AT-RISK WEIGHT

Near the end of the discussion on weightings in 1992, several members of the Legislature became concerned that there was no weight provide for at-risk children. They realized that additional revenues were necessary to insure at-risk children were successful, but the data in this area was limited. Members also realized there was a wide variation among school districts in the terms of the number and percent of at-risk children in their enrollments. In the end, the Legislature chose .05 as the weight factor. This weight has been increased since that time to .10. Details of the weight factor are provided below.

Each school district must submit an at-risk plan which shows how it is going to spend the state aid. The program is audited annually to insure the money is spent in accordance with the requirements of the law and State Board of Education regulations.

School year	At-Risk Pupil Weight (Percent)
1992-93	5.0
1993-94	5.0
1994-95	5.0
1995-96	5.0
1996-97	5.0
1997-98	6.5
1998-99	8.0
1999-00	9.0
2000-01	9.0
2001-02	10.0
2002-03	10.0
2003-04	10.0

## NEW FACILITIES WEIGHT

This weight is assigned to enrollment of districts for costs associated with beginning operation of new facilities. In connection with operation of a new facility, the weight is available for two school years—the year in which the facility operation is commenced and the following year. The enrollment adjustment factor is 0.25 for each pupil who is enrolled in the district and is attending the new school facility. This weight is available only if a district has utilized the full amount of the local option budget authority authorized for the school year.

The new facilities weight was not a part of the original school finance plan proposal, but was added as a result of testimony and hearings before the Legislature from districts that had rapidly increasing enrollments and were opening new facilities on an annual basis. Data were submitted to the Legislature via testimony from school districts and legislators determined that a .25 weight for two years was appropriate, if the school district was using the full amount of the 25 percent local option budget authority available to it.

beginning in the 1997-98 school year. The correlation weight factor was modified by both the 1998 and 1999 Legislatures. A 1998 amendment applied the correlation weight factor to all school districts with 1,750 and over enrollment, beginning in the 1998-99 school year and the 1999 amendment applied the correlation weight factor to all school districts with 1,725 and over enrollment, beginning in 1999-2000.

School Year	Correlation Low Enrollment Weight Threshold	BSAPP	Correlation Weight	Est. State Aid	Increase
1992-93	1,900	\$ 3,600	NA	NA	NA
1993-94	1,900	3,600	NA	NA	NA
1994-95	1,900	3,600	NA	NA	NA
1995-96	1,875	3,626	2,592.4	\$ 9,400,042	\$ 9,400,000
1996-97	1,850	3,648	5,236.5	10,102,752	9,702,710
1997-98	1,800	3,670	10,707.2	39,295,424	20,192,672
1998-99	1,750	3,720	16,527.0	61,480,440	22,185,016
1999-00	1,725	3,770	19,481.4	73,444,878	11,964,438
2000-01	1,725	3,820	19,548.4	74,674,888	1,230,010
2001-02	1,725	3,870	19,519.0	75,538,530	863,642
2002-03	1,725	3,863	19,672.0	75,992,936	454,406
2003-04	1,725	3,863	19,529.5	75,442,459	(550,477)

### AT-RISK PUPIL WEIGHT

A 1997 amendment increased the at-risk pupil weight from 0.05 to 0.065, commencing with the 1997-98 school year. A 1998 amendment increased this weight to 0.08, commencing with the 1998-99 school year, a 1999 amendment increased the weight to 0.09 commencing with the 1999-2000 school year, and a 2001 amendment increased the weight to 0.10 in 2001-02 and thereafter. The 2001 amendment also directed that an amount equal to 0.01 be used by the district for achieving mastery of basic reading skills by completion of the third grade in accordance with standards established by the State Board of Education. A school district must include information in its at-risk pupil assistance plan as the State board of Education requires regarding the district's remediation strategies and its results in achieving the State Board's third grade reading mastery standards. A school district's report must include information documenting remediation strategies and improvement made by pupils who performed below the expected standard on the State Board's second grade diagnostic reading test. A school district whose third grade pupils substantially meet the State Board standards for mastery of third grade reading skills, upon request, may be released by the Board from the requirement to dedicate a specific portion of the at-risk weight to this reading initiative.

School Year	At-Risk Pupil Weight Percent	BSAPP	At-Risk Weight	Est. State Aid	Increase
1992-93	5.0	\$ 3,600	3,632.3	\$ 13,076,280	
1993-94	5.0	3,600	5,044.8	18,161,280	\$ 5,085,000
1994-95	5.0	3,600	5,274.7	18,988,920	827,640
1995-96	5.0	3,626	5,371.7	19,477,784	488,864
1996-97	5.0	3,648	5,408.6	19,730,573	252,789
1997-98	6.5	3,670	7,242.6	26,580,342	6,849,769
1998-99	8.0	3,720	8,697.5	32,354,700	5,774,358
1999-00	9.0	3,770	9,654.0	36,395,580	4,040,880
2000-01	9.0	3,820	9,870.5	37,705,310	1,309,730
2001-02	10.0*	3,870	11,388.1	44,071,947	6,366,637
2002-03	10.0*	3,863	12,192.8	47,100,786	3,028,839
2003-04	10.0*	3,863	12,988.5	50,174,576	3,073,790

\*1.0 percent is targeted at mastery of third grade reading skills

### GENERAL FUND PROPERTY TAX RATE

A 1994 amendment set the school district general fund property tax rate applicable for the 1994-95 and 1995-96 school years at 35 mills. The 35 mill tax rate in 1994-95 and 1995-96 was not a change in policy from the previous law, except that under the previous law, the 35 mill rate would have continued from year to year until changed by the Legislature. Rather, the amendment responded to the opinion of the Shawnee County District Court in the school finance litigation in which the judge interpreted the former property tax levying provision to constitute a "state" property tax levy. As such, the tax could not be imposed for a period in excess of two years. This finding was not contested before the Kansas Supreme Court in the school finance litigation that on December 2, 1994, upheld the constitutionality of 1992 and 1993 school finance legislation.

A 1996 amendment set the school district general fund property tax rate at 35 mills for the 1996-97 school year and 33 mills for the 1997-98 school year. The legislation further specified that this rate could not exceed 31 mills for the 1998-99 school year.

A 1997 amendment modified the 1996 legislation by setting the school district general fund property tax rate for the 1997-98 and 1998-99 school years at 27 mills in each year. This legislation also provided for exemption of \$20,000 of the appraised valuation of residential property from application of that levy.

A 1998 amendment set the school district general fund property tax rate for the 1998-99 and 1999-2000 school years at 20 mills in each year. Also exempted from application of this levy for the two-year period was \$20,000 of the appraised valuation of residential property. A 1999 amendment extended the 20 mill uniform tax rate and the \$20,000 residential property tax

# KANSAS LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH DEPARTMENT

Rm. 545N-Statehouse, 300 SW 10th Ave.  
Topeka, Kansas 66612-1504  
(785) 296-3181 ♦ FAX (785) 296-3824

[kslegres@klrd.state.ks.us](mailto:kslegres@klrd.state.ks.us)

<http://www.kslegislature.org/klrd>

September 9, 2004

**To:** Select Joint Committee on School Finance  
**From:** Kathie Sparks, Principal Analyst  
**Re:** At-Risk and Bilingual Weighting Costs

Assumptions: BSAPP \$3,863

At-Risk: Current .10 130,000 receive free meals X .1 X \$3,863 = \$50.219 million

Change: .01 = \$5.0 million (approximately)

Bilingual: Current .20 71,633 / 6 hrs. = 11,939 X .2 X \$3,863 = \$9.2 million

Change: .01 = \$500,000 (approximately)



# KANSAS LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH DEPARTMENT

Rm. 545N-Statehouse, 300 SW 10th Ave.

Topeka, Kansas 66612-1504

(785) 296-3181 ♦ FAX (785) 296-3824

kslegres@klrd.state.ks.us

<http://www.kslegislature.org/klrd>

June 9, 2004

**To:** Select Joint Committee on School Finance  
**From:** Kathie Sparks, Principal Analyst  
**Re:** At-Risk Assistance Program

Per your request, the following information regarding At-Risk funding in Kansas and other states is as follows:

- **The purpose of the Kansas At-Risk Assistance Program**

The purpose of the Kansas At-Risk Pupil Assistance Program is to provide at-risk students with additional educational opportunities and instructional services to increase their academic achievement. These opportunities or instructional services must be in addition to the services currently offered to the general population. Some examples of an at-risk program include the following:

- Extended year;
- Extended day;
- Alternative schools;
- Drop-Out Prevention;
- Tutorial Assistance.

- **Which students are identified as at-risk**

An at-risk student is defined as a student who meets one or more of the following:

- A student who is not meeting the requirements necessary for promotion to the next grade level or graduation from high school;
- A student whose educational attainment is below other students of their age or grade level;
- A student who is a potential drop-out;
- A student who is failing two or more courses of study;
- A student who has been retained;
- A student who is not reading on grade level.

This definition does not include a student who has been identified for special education services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

**Select Comm. on School Finance**

**Date** 1-26-05

**Attachment #** 4-1

- **Who selects the criteria for identifying students who are At-Risk**

Districts will determine the criteria that will be used to identify at-risk students who are eligible to participate in the program. Districts must document the criteria used to select at-risk students and maintain this information.

Criteria that could be used include, but are not limited to, the following:

- State Assessment scores;
- Local assessments;
- Performance-based assessments;
- Norm reference tests;
- Records of academic performance;
- Second grade diagnostic.

- **Determination of At-Risk funding**

Only those students eligible for free lunch as associated with the National School Lunch Act generate funding to support the At-Risk programs. The following formula provides the basis of how the Local Education Agency (LEA) determines its at-risk funding:

Number of Free Lunch Students X .1 (Weighting factor) = weighted FTE

Weighted FTE X General State Aid Amount = Funding for At-Risk Program

Example: 500 students X .1 = 50 Weighted FTE

50 X \$3,863 = \$193,150

For school year 2002-2003, 130,265 children were eligible for free lunches or 27.9 percent of the population, while 28.9 percent received services.

- **Uses for At-Risk funds**

The district must be able to verify that the funds accessed through the At-Risk program are actually spent on students identified as being at-risk. A line item budget is included in the Local Consolidated Plan (LCP).

- At-Risk funds must be expended by June 30 of each year;
- No carryover of at-risk funds is allowed;
- Equipment purchases cannot exceed 25 percent of the total At-Risk allocation; and

- Administrative salaries cannot be funded with At-Risk funds unless it is provided beyond their regular contract duties. (If an At-Risk Saturday program is started; the principal could be compensated for their work in the program. Documentation of time and effort must be maintained to support the expenditure.)

- **The K-3 literacy instruction**

10 percent of At-Risk funding is to be used to support early literacy instruction. Funds must be used to assist K-3 students in achieving mastery of basic reading skills by the completion of the third grade. Funds may be used for the following:

- Hiring of instructional staff to support reading in the primary grades;
- Professional development to support reading in the primary grades;
- Supplies and materials to support reading in the primary grades.

However, the local education agency may receive a waiver from this requirement if at least 85 percent of the third graders are reading on grade level. The local education agency makes application through the Local Consolidated Plan to waiver out of this requirement.

- **Augenblick & Myers' Approach to At-Risk Weighting**

The 2002 report "Calculation of the Cost of a Suitable Education In Kansas in 2000-2001 Using Two Different Analytic Approaches" found the following:

<u>At-Risk</u>	<u>Elementary School</u>	<u>Middle School</u>	<u>High School</u>	<u>Combined</u>
Base cost	\$ 1,388	\$ 1,378	\$ 1,469	\$ 1,411
Pre-K	945	0	0	488
After School	451	451	166	362
Summer	22	22	15	20

Note: Costs are shown per pupil in the program.

Which translates to the following weights for at-risk students based on size of the school district:

Very small	.22
Small	.30
Moderate	.51
Large	.44

The reports goes on to say that "this weight would be multiplied by the number of students participating in the federal free lunch program (as is done now), which serves as a proxy measure of low-income families, which in turn is a reasonable predictor of being at risk of failure in school, times the base cost figure, to determine the needs of school districts. While other states have examined the use of other proxy measures, such census-based indicators of family socio-economic status, many states use free (or free and reduced price) lunch to avoid providing

an incentive for low performance in order to increase revenue, and because the data are beyond the control of school districts and are updated annually. The magnitude of the weights used in other states is typically lower than .5 although the use of concentration factors or of approaches other than weights may provide well over an amount that corresponds to a .5 weight when applied against a state's foundation level."

● **How Other Selected States Fund At-Risk Students in State Foundation Formulas**

State	At-Risk Funding in Foundation	Id for Foundation Formulas	Distribution for Base Funding
Georgia	Yes	Students in remedial programs	extra .29 weight
Illinois	Yes	Percent of students in poverty	\$800 to \$2,050 per student
Indiana	Yes	Below poverty level; single parent families; and adults who are high school dropouts	\$3,522 per student
Massachusetts	Yes	Free and reduced lunch	\$2,228 elementary \$1,794 high school
Missouri	Yes	Free and reduced lunch and percent of students below minimum competency on 3 <sup>rd</sup> and 6 <sup>th</sup> grade tests	\$655 per identified student. Identified students are provided with an extra .25 weight
Oregon	Yes	Pregnant and parenting, poverty, neglected, delinquent, students in foster homes	Pregnant and parenting 1.0; poverty .25; neglected and delinquent .25; foster homes .25; max. weight is 2.0
Pennsylvania	Yes	AFDC	\$50 per AFDC student

Note: California, Florida, Michigan, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, and Washington have foundation formulas, but do not provide for at-risk students in the formula.

The above information is provided by the Education Commission of the States as compiled in 2002.

January 21, 2005

**To:** Representative Kathe Decker  
**From:** Kathie Sparks, Principal Analyst  
**Re:** Committee on School District Finance and Quality Performance (SDFQP)

The following memo will examine the formation of, responsibilities of, and the only report of the Committee on School District Finance and Quality Performance.

## Formation of the Committee on School District Finance and Quality Performance

The 1992 Session, in Senate Substitute for Senate Substitute for House Bill No. 2892 (Chapter 280 of the *1992 Session Laws*), created the 16-member Committee on School District Finance and Quality Performance as part of the School District Finance and Quality Performance Act. Twelve of the members included the following persons or their designees: chairperson and ranking minority member of the House Committees on Education, Taxation, and Appropriations and the Senate Committees on Education, Assessment and Taxation, and Ways and Means. The remaining four members were representatives of the general public, two of whom were appointed each by the Governor and the State Board of Education. These members served at the pleasure of the appointing authority.

The Committee was to function until June 30, 1994, when it was to be abolished. The Committee could meet at any time upon the call of the chairperson. Professional staff services were provided to the Committee pursuant to Legislative Coordinating Council direction. Committee members received compensation, subsistence, and mileage in accord with KSA 75-3223, as amended.

## Responsibilities of the Committee

The responsibilities assigned to the Committee included:

- Monitor implementation and operation of the School District Finance and Quality Performance Act and the Quality Performance Accreditation system;
- Evaluate the School District Finance and Quality Performance Act and determine if there is a fair and equitable relationship between the costs of weighted components and the assigned weightings;
- Determine if additional school district operations should be weighted;
- Evaluate the reform and restructuring components of the law and assess their impact;

Select Comm. on School Finance

Date 1-26-05

Attachment # 5-1

- Evaluate the system of financial support, reform, and restructuring of public education in Kansas and in other states to ensure that the Kansas system is the most efficient and effective;
- Review the amount of the Base State Aid Per Pupil and determine if the amount of State Financial Assistance is sufficient to provide quality educational opportunities for Kansas children;
- Explore ways of decreasing Local Option Budget spending authority in conjunction with increases in the amount of the Base State Aid Per Pupil, by adjusting any weighted component of the Act, or by weighting any additional school district operation;
- Explore alternative funding sources; and
- Evaluate the state policy regarding qualification of educational programs for categorical state aid and whether entitlement formulas are equitable.

Finally, the Committee was required to continue to be familiar with the activities of the Kansas Commission on Education Restructuring and Accountability and consult with the Commission and consider its reports and recommendations.

The Committee was to make an annual report, including proposed legislation, concerning school finance and restructuring to the Legislature, the Governor, and the Kansas State Board of Education.

### **Recommendations from the Report of the Kansas Committee on School District Finance and Quality Performance, December 1992**

The Committee met on four occasions during 1992 – on June 29, November 5 and 6, November 18, and December 1. The following is a list of the specific recommendations proposed by the Committee in its Report:

- The school finance law should be amended to discontinue earmarking of the enhanced sales and income taxes enacted by the 1992 Legislature for school district general state aid.
- The school finance law should be modified as it pertains to local option budget (LOB) protest petition election procedures to exempt from such procedures, cumulatively, the LOB percentage utilized by school districts in 1992-93 and up to 3 percentage points of LOB authority accessed by a school district in any subsequent year. This policy should be effective beginning in the 1993-94 school year. The LOB cap, currently 25 percent, should be retained.
- The school finance law should be amended to include a declining enrollment provision designed to provide temporary assistance to school districts as they adapt to the impact of lower enrollments.

5-2

- The school finance law should be amended to define the term "new school facilities," a pupil weighting enrollment adjustment factor in the school finance law, as "buildings acquired or constructed due to additional enrollment."
- The school finance law should be amended to require that tuition charged to a nonresident pupil be deposited in the school district fund appropriate to the educational services provided to the pupil. Tuition that must be deposited in the school district general fund would be a component of the district's local effort.
- The school finance law should be amended to permit a school district which has experienced an enrollment decline to maintain a contingency reserve fund amount in excess of 1 percent of the general fund budget, if the "excess" amount was legally budgeted in a year prior to an enrollment decline.
- The school finance law should be amended to eliminate the school district technology education fund.
- The school district capital improvements state aid program law should be amended to specify that entitlements under the law apply only to bond and interest payments due in connection with general obligation bonds issued pursuant to voter approval by election.
- Legislation should be enacted to delegate to school district boards of education authority to operate child day care centers and to charge fees for these services.

The report goes on the state that "it is clear, however, that the main features of the law will require continuing attention in order to ensure that the school finance law serves effectively as a vehicle for carrying out public policy. This oversight, as well as attention to implementation of the school restructuring initiatives contained in the law, will provide an agenda for the future work of the Committee." The Committee did not meet again after the Kansas Committee on School District Finance and Quality Performance Report was submitted to the Legislature, the Governor, and the Kansas State Board of Education in December 1992.

amount of time equal to not less than two school days, and in the 1993-94 school year an amount of time equal to not less than three school days, for the purpose of engaging professional employees of the district in professional development programs related to implementation and effectuation of the provisions of this section. The amount of time scheduled by a district under the provisions of this subsection shall be considered an additional part of the school term.

(h) The provisions of this section shall take effect and be in force from and after July 1, 1992.

New Sec. 36. (a) If any clause, paragraph, subsection or section of the school district finance and quality performance act shall be held invalid or unconstitutional, it shall be conclusively presumed that the legislature would have enacted the remainder of the act without such invalid or unconstitutional clause, paragraph, subsection or section.

(b) The provisions of this section shall take effect and be in force from and after July 1, 1992.

New Sec. 37. (a) There is hereby established the Kansas committee on school district finance and quality performance. The committee shall be composed of 16 members.

(b) The following members of the committee shall serve ex officio or shall designate a person to represent them on the committee: The chairperson and ranking minority member of the committee on education of the house of representatives, the chairperson and ranking minority member of the committee on education of the senate, the chairperson and ranking minority member of the committee on taxation of the house of representatives, the chairperson and ranking minority member of the committee on assessment and taxation of the senate, the chairperson and ranking minority member of the committee on appropriations of the house of representatives, the chairperson and ranking minority member of the committee on ways and means of the senate. The remainder of the members of the committee shall be representative of the general public and shall be appointed as follows: Two members shall be appointed by the governor and shall serve at the pleasure of the governor, and two members shall be appointed by the state board of education and shall serve at the pleasure of the state board.

(c) The committee shall organize annually and elect a chairperson and vice-chairperson from among the members of the committee. The vice-chairperson shall exercise all of the powers of the chairperson in the absence of the chairperson. If a vacancy occurs in the office of chairperson or vice-chairperson, another member of the committee shall be elected by the members of the committee to fill

such vacancy. Within 30 days after the effective date of this act, the committee shall organize and elect a chairperson and a vice-chairperson in accordance with the provisions of this subsection.

(d) A quorum of the committee on school district finance and quality performance shall be nine. All actions of the committee shall be taken by a majority of all of the members of the committee.

(e) The committee on school district finance and quality performance may meet at any time on the call of the chairperson.

(f) In accordance with K.S.A. 46-1204, and amendments thereto, the legislative coordinating council may provide for such professional services as may be requested by the committee on school district finance and quality performance.

(g) Members of the committee on school district finance and quality performance attending meetings of the committee or subcommittee meetings authorized by the committee shall receive compensation, subsistence allowances and mileage provided for in K.S.A. 75-3223, and amendments thereto.

(h) The staff of the legislative research department, the office of the revisor of statutes and the division of legislative administrative services shall provide such assistance as may be requested by the committee on school district finance and quality performance and authorized by the legislative coordinating council.

(i) The provisions of this section shall expire on June 30, 1994.

New Sec. 38. (a) The committee on school district finance and quality performance shall:

(1) Monitor implementation and operation of the school district finance and quality performance act and the quality performance accreditation system;

(2) evaluate the components of the act and determine whether there is a fair and equitable relationship between the costs of weighted components and the weightings assigned to such components;

(3) determine whether additional school district operations should be weighted;

(4) evaluate the effect of the act and the system on local control

(5) determine whether operation of the act fosters or impedes successful accomplishment of the mission for Kansas education;

(6) evaluate the reform and restructuring components of the act and assess the impact of such components on the educational system of school districts and on the educational system of the state as a whole;

(7) review and evaluate systems of financial support, reform and restructuring of public education in other states in an effort to ensure that the Kansas system is the most efficient and effective;



(8) review the amount of base state aid per pupil and, in conjunction therewith, determine whether the amount of state financial aid provided for school districts is sufficient to provide quality educational opportunities for Kansas children;

(9) if the committee determines that the amount of state financial aid should be increased by increasing the amount of base state aid per pupil, by adjusting any weighted component of the act, or by weighting any additional school district operation, examine ways to provide for a corresponding decrease in the amount authorized to be budgeted in local option budgets;

(10) explore alternative funding sources;

(11) evaluate the state's policy regarding qualification of educational programs for categorical state aid and whether entitlement formulas therefor are equitable;

(12) make an annual report, together with any recommendations for legislation relating to school finance or restructuring deemed necessary, to the legislature, the governor, and the state board of education.

(b) The committee on school district finance and quality performance shall familiarize itself with the activities of the Kansas commission on education restructuring and accountability and shall consult with and consider reports and recommendations formulated by the commission. The committee and commission shall coordinate the performance of their duties and cooperate with each other to the greatest possible extent.

(c) The provisions of this section shall expire on June 30, 1994.

Sec. 39. On July 1, 1992, K.S.A. 1991 Supp. 72-978 is hereby amended to read as follows: 72-978. (a) (1) In each school year, in accordance with appropriations for special education services provided under this act, each school district which has provided special education services in compliance with the requirements of the state plan and the provisions of this act shall be entitled to receive:

(A) Reimbursement for actual travel allowances paid to special teachers at not to exceed the rate specified under K.S.A. 75-3203, and amendments thereto, for each mile actually traveled during the school year in connection with duties in providing special education services for exceptional children; such reimbursement shall be computed by the state board by ascertaining the actual travel allowances paid to special teachers by the school district for the school year and shall be in an amount equal to 80% of such actual travel allowances;

(B) reimbursement in an amount equal to 80% of the actual travel expenses incurred for providing transportation for exceptional chil-

dren to special education services; such reimbursement shall not be paid if such child has been counted in ~~calculating~~ *determining* the state transportation aid received by *weighting* of the district under the provisions of ~~K.S.A. 72-7047, and amendments thereto~~ *the school district finance and quality performance act*;

(C) reimbursement in an amount equal to 80% of the actual expenses incurred for the maintenance of an exceptional child at some place other than the residence of such child for the purpose of providing special education services; such reimbursement shall not exceed \$600 per exceptional child per school year; and

(D) after subtracting the amounts of reimbursement under (A), (B) and (C) from the total amount appropriated for special education services under this act, an amount which bears the same proportion to the remaining amount appropriated as the number of full-time equivalent special teachers employed by the school district for approved special education services bears to the total number of full-time equivalent special teachers employed by all school districts for approved special education services.

(2) Each special teacher who is a paraprofessional shall be counted as  $\frac{2}{5}$  full-time equivalent special teacher.

(b) (1) No special teacher in excess of the number of special teachers necessary to comply with the ratio of special teacher to exceptional children prescribed by the state board for the school district shall be counted in making computations under this section.

(2) No time spent by a special teacher in connection with duties performed under a contract entered into by the youth center at Atchison, the youth center at Beloit or the youth center at Topeka and a school district for the provision of special education services by such state institution shall be counted in making computations under this section.

Sec. 40. On July 1, 1992, K.S.A. 1991 Supp. 72-1106 is hereby amended to read as follows: 72-1106. (a) Subject to the other provisions of this section, a school term during which public school shall be maintained *in the 1992-93 school year* by each school district organized under the laws of this state shall consist of: (1) For pupils attending kindergarten, not less than ~~180~~ 181 school days and each such school day shall consist of not less than  $2\frac{1}{2}$  hours; and (2) for pupils attending any of the grades one through 11, not less than ~~180~~ 181 school days and each such school day shall consist of not less than six hours; and (3) for pupils attending grade 12, not less than ~~175~~ 176 school days and each such school day shall consist of not less than six hours. *The minimum number of school days in a school term shall be increased by two school days in the 1993-94 school year. The school term in school years commencing after June*