

MINUTES OF THE SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Jean Schodorf at 1:35 p.m. on March 8, 2006, in Room 123-S of the Capitol.

Committee members absent:

Committee staff present: Carolyn Rampey, Kansas Legislative Research Department
Kathie Sparks, Kansas Legislative Research Department
Theresa Kiernan, Revisor of Statutes
Shirley Higgins, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee: Kathy Cook, Kansas Families United for Public Education
Senator James A. Barnett
Stuart Little, Shawnee Mission School District, USD 512
Kenneth Daniel, Advocates for Kansas Small Business

SB 584 – Relating to school finance

Kathy Cook, Kansas Families United for Public Education, emphasized that any school finance plan must be a plan which meets the needs of every student. In her opinion, **SB 584** as introduced does not meet that goal. She noted that the bill does not account for inflation and, in addition, it seems to reflect an attempt to receive credit for a boost in state funding which is provided for the most part by dollars from local school districts. She went on to say that at-risk students need all the resources due them now, that special education needs to be funded at 100 percent this year, and funding for all-day Kindergarten should be included in any school finance plan. Noting that Kansas students have been denied the resources to provide them with the opportunity to meet the outcomes required by the state, she recommended that one of the many outcome cost studies be implemented this year. (Attachment 1)

Senator Schodorf noted that, because Senator James Barnett's proposed school finance plan (**SB 501**) was one of the three school finance plans which the Committee reviewed on March 2, she had given him a copy of the comparison sheet which was distributed at that meeting. He then requested an opportunity to fully explain his plan to the Committee.

Senator Barnett distributed copies of a summary of his proposed four-year school finance plan, which addressed at-risk weighting, bilingual weighting, and base state aid per pupil (BSAPP). (Attachment 2) He also distributed copies of a computer printout prepared by the State Department of Education showing how his proposed enhancement plan would effect each school district based upon the 2005-06 FTE enrollment. (Attachment 3) In addition, he called attention to profile of the projected budget for FY 2004-FY 2011 with the inclusion of his school finance plan which was prepared by the Kansas Legislative Research Department at his request. (Attachment 4)

He explained that the profile "takes our base budget, it adds \$400 million over four years, and that's \$50 million in new money the first year, plus the \$75 million which is current law. The second year, it's another \$75 million. The third and fourth year, it's \$100 million, and that's footnoted down at the bottom. The other aspect of this flow sheet is that I have targeted some tax cuts beginning fiscal year '08. The actual cash flow for the state would be fiscal year '09. Because, if you look at how our economy is doing, we're not even keeping up with our neighbors. The only way we are going to be afford long-term paying for government is to get our economy growing again. So there are targeted tax cuts in here, and those are state income tax, increased dependent exemptions, and an investment tax credit that we talked about today in Senate Tax Committee. If you look out to fiscal year 2010, the balance is exceedingly low, and so we really have to hold our nose to make this work, although it's a lot better than \$500 million or \$800 million in the hole that I've seen on some other runs. I'm sure we'll see more runs as well."

Senator Barnett commented that he chose a 5.5 percent growth rate because he believed that, as we cut taxes, we will see our economy grow. He noted, "Of course, we're growing more rapidly than that right now with our revenues coming in. Historically, over the last 25 years, our growth rate has been over 6 percent. So I

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE Senate Education Committee at 1:35 p.m. on March 8, 2006, in Room 123-S of the Capitol.

think five and a half is very reasonable number. I also had 2.5 percent for Regents and also protected Medicaid so that the elderly were protected in this budget too.” He went on to say, “Basically, my proposal is \$481 million over four years compared to \$480 million for the Senate and \$499 million for the House. Those are over three years. I point that out. If you want to add in this local option budget shift and make it look like a higher number, you certainly could do that too with this proposal and get those numbers up much higher.”

In response to Committee questions concerning Senator Barnett’s proposed plan, Carolyn Rampey, Kansas Legislative Research Department, clarified that the funding increases were included in the first year of Senator Barnett’s plan. The increases were not built in for his second, third, and fourth years. She explained that the comparison of the three school finance plans distributed at a previous meeting was “apples to apples.” And when he quoted his four-year total of \$481 million, that amount included the LOB increase and the special education that would occur anyway under current law. It did not include KPERS because KPERS is not part of the School Finance Act.

Stuart Little, representing the Shawnee Mission School District (USD 512), testified in support of **SB 584** with six suggested amendments which he contended would give every district the tools they need to satisfy their educational needs for years to come. He expressed support for additional funding for at-risk and students from dense poverty areas. In addition, he noted that the Shawnee Mission School District supported removal of the limitation on the use of local funding options as a tool to resolve its educational needs. (Attachment 5)

Kenneth Daniel, Advocates for Kansas Small Business, commented that small businesses and K-12 education are deeply entwined and dependent upon each other for survival. Noting that he had been in business for 35 years and expects a return on an investment, he expressed his concern about the recommendations for at-risk funding in the Legislative Post Audit cost analysis study. In his opinion, free lunch is a political tool, and poverty should not be used as a funding mechanism. He noted, “If we’re going to use the word investment in conjunction with K-12, it’s hard for me to understand why we would short change Johnson County.” He suggested that at-risk money should be spent on at-risk pupils no matter where they go to school. He went on to discuss the reasons he did not believe that the recommendations of the Post Audit study would result in the predicted precise student outcomes. He contended that there was no statistical relationship between poverty and outcomes and that additional spending is not related to improved outcomes. He advocated the use of free lunch certifications only for free lunches and Title I and the use of at-risk funding only for students who are actually not performing at proficiency. (Attachment 6)

Senator Schodorf called upon Senator Vratil for a clarification of the provision in **SB 584** in which 2.5 percent of the LOB would be transferred to the general fund above the current budget limitations. Senator Vratil began his explanation by stating, “What I want to do is try to illustrate what I call the LOB recapture provisions of the Senate leadership proposal, and I do that by referring to silos.” As he drew a silo on a dry erase board, he explained, “This silo next year will be 29 feet tall because the LOB cap will be at 29 percent next year. What this proposal does is cut off the bottom of this silo at two and a half feet. The LOB recapture takes the bottom two and one half feet off this silo. Now, we’re going to take this bottom two and one half feet over here, and we’re going to put it in the State General Fund. And it will be equalized to the 100th percentile. The theory is, it takes an equal amount of effort by every school district in terms of property tax and mill levy to raise the same amount of money. And I think that’s proven true over the years. Now, what happens when we take this bottom two and one half feet off this 29 foot silo, we only have a 27 foot silo. Actually, we get a 26.5 silo. So that leads to the other part this, and that is to backfill, what I call the LOB backfill. We’re going to add back to this silo the top two and one half feet so that school districts will have the same LOB authority next year that they have under current law. And, basically that’s the scheme behind it.”

In response to committee questions, Senator Vratil explained, “The 26 foot portion of the silo is what is referred to in the bill as the mandatory student performance improvement budget. It is really analogous to the 20 mill levy that has been in the law since the beginning in that the 20 mill levy is mandated by state statute. This would be mandated by state statute. The 20 mill levy goes into the State General Fund; this goes into the State General Fund. So they are very similar in characteristics. That’s why I personally believe that the

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE Senate Education Committee at 1:35 p.m. on March 8, 2006, in Room 123-S of the Capitol.

Supreme Court is likely to approve. It can be spent on any services or programs that are mandated under state law or any services or programs designed to improve student performance. So most of your budget will be available.” Senator Schodorf added, “Based on the bill, if the districts want to go back up to 29, that is not equalized, and that’s subject to petition, but that also must be used for mandated things.” Senator Vratil commented, “That’s a good point. This LOB backfill is not equalized at all. It is subject to a protest petition and election every year, and it can only be used for services that are not mandated by state statute. In other words, it’s truly for exceptional services over and above what’s required by law. If the local district keeps this at 26.5, the mill levy will stay the same because we’re adding to spending authority.”

Staff distributed a handout prepared by the Kansas State Department of Education to be used as a reference when the Committee continued its deliberations concerning the proposed school finance plan (**SB 584**) .
(Attachment 7)

Senator Schodorf called the Committee’s attention to the minutes of the February 22, 23, 28, and March 2 meetings.

Senator Teichman moved that the minutes of the February 22, 23, 28, and March 2 meetings be approved, seconded by Senator Lee. The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

The next meeting is scheduled for March 9, 2006.

**SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE
GUEST LIST**

DATE: March 8, 2006

NAME	REPRESENTING
KEN DANIEL	K5 SMALL BIZ.COM
SCOTT FRANK	LPA
Stuart Little	Shannon Mission 512
Bob Vancrum	Blue Valley USD 229
Jin Edwards	KASB
Dodie Wellshear	KFC
Mudy Shaw	KACTE
Mark Tallman	KASB
MARK DESETTI	KNEA
Diane Heistad	Wichita Public Schools
BILL REARDON	USD 500 (KCK)
TERRY FORSYTH	KNEA
Bill Brady	SFFF
Ren Seiber	Heinrich F. von
TERRY HOPREN	KFB
Debbie Meador	KLA
Beth Jones	Hattles Government Relations
Elaine Frisbie	Div. of the Budget

KANSAS
FAMILIES
UNITED

FOR
PUBLIC
EDUCATION

15941 W. 65th St., #104
Shawnee, Kansas 66217
(913) 825-0099

Testimony to Senate Education Committee

RE: SB584

March 8, 2006

Kathy Cook, Executive Director (913) 825-0099
Kansas Families United for Public Education

Madam Chair, Members of the Committee:

I would like to thank the committee for the opportunity to address you this afternoon.

Our organization does not represent teachers, administrators, or school boards although we value their contribution to our students. Neither do we represent any one particular school district or region of the state. Our organization takes a global view and thinks only about the needs of ALL of our students.

Any school finance plan implemented has to be a plan that meets the needs of EVERY student. Unfortunately, we don't believe that SB 584 as introduced meets that goal.

The Supreme Court said that a cost analysis was essential in establishing the actual cost in providing an education that gives every child an opportunity to succeed and meet the expectations set by our state. The legislature during special session last year through SB3 asked the division of post audit to conduct a professional cost study analysis to estimate the costs of providing programs and services required by law. While SB584 is a step in the right direction, it does not succeed in providing enough funds to meet the outcomes required by the state.

By phasing in SB 584 you are denying our students their constitutional right and their opportunity for success. When we finally reach year three of the phase-in we are already behind due to inflation. We can not continue down a path that does not keep up with inflation. You must account for inflation; SB 584 does not do that.

*Senate Education Committee
3-8-06
Attachment 1*

Senate Bill 584 like the House plan seems to reflect an attempt to receive credit for school funding that is provided by local districts. We understand the new mandatory local option budget to mean that some new state money will be spent for equalization purposes, but the majority of this money is local dollars moved so that it appears as a boost in state spending. Whether it's mandatory local option budgets, in this plan or foundational funding, in the House plan it's highly unlikely that the Supreme Court will be persuaded by either. And more importantly the needs of Kansas students will not be met.

We applaud all the plans for their focus on our most vulnerable at-risk students, but again these kids have been waiting and they need ALL the resources due them NOW.

We thank the crafters for their strong position on special education, but would ask that this committee fund special education at 100% of the cost this year.

Our organization has had a position advocating for state funded all-day Kindergarten since our inception. It has been proposed by the State Board of Education, and has advocates for its inclusion in a school finance bill by both the teacher and school board associations. We would hope that the legislature would consider this valuable program in any school finance plan.

In conclusion; our students have been denied the resources to provide them with the opportunity to meet the outcomes required by the state. They can not wait any longer. We ask you to implement one of the many outcome cost studies now available to you, this year.

School finance is the best investment of our state dollars and we need to rise to the occasion and due right by our children NOW. Our children have been more than patient.

Let's put politics, party and the upcoming elections aside, and do what we know should be done. Adequacy and equity will align themselves once we fund school finance based on need.

To quote the father of education, Horace Mann, "Let us not be content to wait and see what will happen, but give us the determination to make the right things happen."

Thank you for your consideration.

BSAPP-\$4,257

\$1=\$568,000

Bilingual-.395

1%=\$575,000

At-Risk-.193

1%=\$5,770,000

Senator Barnett's
Proposed Plan
(In Millions)

	At-Risk	Bilingual	BSAPP	LOB	TOTAL	CUMULATIVE TOTAL
Year One	\$18.3	\$5.0	\$22.7	\$4.0	\$50.0	\$125.0*
Year Two	\$24.0	--	\$45.0	\$6.0	\$75.0	\$325.0
Year Three	\$23.4	--	\$68.6	\$8.0	\$100.0	\$625.0
Year Four	\$23.4	--	\$68.6	\$8.0	\$100.0	\$1,025.0

*Includes approximately \$75.0 million needed to fund current school finance plan in FY 2007, which has been added to subsequent years.

Rate Changes

	At-Risk	Bilingual	BSAPP	LOB	TOTAL
Year One	.225	.482	\$40 (\$4,297)		
Year Two	.267	--	\$79 (\$4,376)		
Year Three	.307	--	\$121 (\$4,497)		
Year Four	.347	--	\$121 (\$4,618)		



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

January 24, 2006

FROM: Dale M. Dennis, Deputy
Commissioner of Education

SUBJECT: Proposed School Finance Plan *Sen. Barnett*

Attached is a computer printout (SF6004) which provides the following increases.

- Increase base state aid per pupil (BSAPP) from \$4,257 to \$4,297 (\$40)
- Increase at-risk weighting from .193 to .225
- Increase bilingual weighting from .395 to .482

This plan is based upon the 2005-06 FTE enrollment. Therefore, if a school district has an increase/decrease in enrollment in 2006-07, it would not be reflected in this printout.

This computer printout is based upon enhancements and does not take into account funding which is required under current law.

COLUMN EXPLANATION

- Column 1 -- September 20, 2005, FTE enrollment
- 2 -- 2006-07 Estimated \$40 increase in BSAPP (\$4,257 to \$4,297)
- 3 -- 2006-07 Estimated increase in at-risk weighting from .193 to .225
- 4 -- 2006-07 Estimated increase in bilingual weighting from .395 to .482
- 5 -- Total (Column 2 + 3+ 4)

STATE COST

Increase BSAPP by \$40 (\$4,257 to \$4,297)	\$ 22,700,000
Increase at-risk weighting from .193 to .225	18,300,000
Increase bilingual weighting from .395 to .482	5,000,000
Equalize local option budget as provided in current law	4,000,000
TOTAL	\$ 50,000,000

*Senate Education Committee
3-8-06
Attachment 3*

			Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5
			FTE Enroll	Increase	Est. Increase	Est. Increase	
USD			inc4yr at risk	BSAPP	At Risk	Bilingual	Total
No.	County Name	USD Name	9/20/2005	\$40	(19.3% to 22.5%)	(39.5% to 48.2%)	(Col 2 + Col 3 + Col 4)
256	Allen	Marmaton Valley	362.0	24,620	17,454	0	42,074
257	Allen	Iola	1,428.0	70,864	76,626	0	147,490
258	Allen	Humboldt	511.2	32,292	24,691	0	56,983
365	Anderson	Garnett	1,102.3	61,152	48,530	0	109,682
479	Anderson	Crest	248.0	18,236	11,920	0	30,156
377	Atchison	Atchison County	734.3	45,228	20,859	0	66,087
409	Atchison	Atchison	1,557.8	73,960	88,120	0	162,080
254	Barber	Barber Co.	592.5	36,784	21,285	0	58,069
255	Barber	South Barber Co.	252.0	18,340	9,365	0	27,705
354	Barton	Clafin	295.0	19,540	7,663	0	27,203
355	Barton	Ellinwood	477.6	31,724	18,305	0	50,029
428	Barton	Great Bend	3,023.8	142,544	189,437	74,498	406,478
431	Barton	Hoisington	627.8	37,920	26,819	0	64,739
234	Bourbon	Ft. Scott	1,879.2	91,648	105,574	851	198,073
235	Bourbon	Uniontown	455.5	30,452	22,988	426	53,866
415	Brown	Hiawatha	897.9	52,380	38,313	0	90,693
430	Brown	Brown County	662.5	41,736	37,462	16,177	95,374
205	Butler	Leon	711.5	44,044	21,285	0	65,329
206	Butler	Remington-Whitewater	539.0	34,124	13,622	3,831	51,578
375	Butler	Circle	1,476.8	71,960	27,245	0	99,205
385	Butler	Andover	3,892.6	169,988	32,779	1,277	204,044
394	Butler	Rose Hill	1,683.5	76,992	27,671	0	104,663
396	Butler	Douglass	828.3	47,240	20,859	0	68,099
402	Butler	Augusta	2,131.2	95,416	66,835	426	162,677
490	Butler	El Dorado	2,086.0	95,716	93,228	426	189,370
492	Butler	Flinthills	313.5	21,204	8,514	0	29,718
284	Chase	Chase County	467.5	30,188	17,028	0	47,216
285	Chautauqua	Cedar Vale	157.5	13,388	8,088	0	21,476
286	Chautauqua	Chautauqua	416.0	27,584	17,454	0	45,038
404	Cherokee	Riverton	865.6	50,604	44,273	0	94,877
493	Cherokee	Columbus	1,188.5	66,100	62,152	0	128,252
499	Cherokee	Galena	737.0	44,456	54,064	0	98,520
508	Cherokee	Baxter Springs	859.0	48,300	42,996	1,277	92,573
103	Cheyenne	Cheylin	144.0	13,148	5,534	0	18,682
297	Cheyenne	St. Francis	311.0	21,140	9,791	0	30,931
219	Clark	Minneola	246.3	17,912	8,514	0	26,426
220	Clark	Ashland	204.5	16,216	9,791	0	26,007
379	Clay	Clay Center	1,327.2	68,724	40,867	426	110,017
333	Cloud	Concordia	1,054.7	58,364	50,233	0	108,597
334	Cloud	Southern Cloud	221.5	16,784	11,494	0	28,278
243	Coffey	Lebo-Waverly	577.5	34,780	21,285	0	56,065
244	Coffey	Burlington	836.0	48,116	26,819	0	74,935
245	Coffey	LeRoy-Gridley	270.5	18,724	9,791	0	28,515
300	Comanche	Commanche County	310.2	21,356	10,217	0	31,573
462	Cowley	Central	352.0	23,096	11,920	0	35,016
463	Cowley	Udall	368.7	23,396	10,217	0	33,613
465	Cowley	Winfield	2,415.0	116,216	108,128	3,831	228,175
470	Cowley	Arkansas City	2,748.6	135,204	185,180	19,582	339,966
471	Cowley	Dexter	234.5	16,840	10,217	0	27,057

			Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5
			FTE Enroll	Increase	Est. Increase	Est. Increase	
USD			inc4yr at risk	BSAPP	At Risk	Bilingual	Total
No.	County Name	USD Name	9/20/2005	\$40	(19.3% to 22.5%)	(39.5% to 48.2%)	(Col 2 + Col 3 + Col 4)
246	Crawford	Northeast	588.5	36,944	38,739	0	75,683
247	Crawford	Cherokee	784.5	47,016	36,610	0	83,626
248	Crawford	Girard	1,051.0	58,080	41,719	0	99,799
249	Crawford	Frontenac	743.0	41,900	24,691	0	66,591
250	Crawford	Pittsburg	2,542.2	122,264	169,854	20,008	312,126
294	Decatur	Oberlin	432.5	27,812	16,177	0	43,989
295	Decatur	Prairie Heights	12.5	3,040	426	0	3,466
393	Dickinson	Solomon	405.8	26,040	15,751	0	41,791
435	Dickinson	Abilene	1,468.0	70,220	45,550	0	115,770
473	Dickinson	Chapman	963.4	55,440	27,671	0	83,111
481	Dickinson	Rural Vista	394.5	27,792	14,474	0	42,266
487	Dickinson	Herington	509.7	30,924	19,582	0	50,506
406	Doniphan	Wathena	380.0	23,892	10,217	0	34,109
425	Doniphan	Highland	238.0	17,644	4,683	0	22,327
429	Doniphan	Troy	367.5	23,748	11,920	0	35,668
433	Doniphan	Midway	197.0	15,828	5,960	0	21,788
486	Doniphan	Elwood	297.4	19,752	20,859	0	40,611
348	Douglas	Baldwin City	1,347.0	65,496	15,325	426	81,247
491	Douglas	Eudora	1,288.6	63,344	28,948	426	92,717
497	Douglas	Lawrence	9,855.4	437,008	296,287	85,140	818,435
347	Edwards	Kinsely-Offerte	308.5	21,704	15,325	5,534	42,563
502	Edwards	Lewis	119.0	11,804	7,663	851	20,318
282	Elk	West Elk	412.5	29,216	25,542	0	54,758
283	Elk	Elk Valley	192.0	15,736	14,048	0	29,784
388	Ellis	Ellis	377.6	23,972	11,920	0	35,892
432	Ellis	Victoria	259.3	17,920	2,554	0	20,474
489	Ellis	Hays	2,869.5	137,408	94,080	11,068	242,556
327	Ellsworth	Ellsworth	595.8	36,980	14,900	0	51,880
328	Ellsworth	Lorraine	452.3	29,392	21,711	0	51,103
363	Finney	Holcomb	874.6	49,552	36,610	19,157	105,319
457	Finney	Garden City	6,859.4	344,308	458,905	439,322	1,242,535
381	Ford	Spearville	343.0	21,352	6,386	0	27,738
443	Ford	Dodge City	5,630.0	299,496	463,162	613,008	1,375,666
459	Ford	Bucklin	245.5	18,236	11,920	1,703	31,858
287	Franklin	West Franklin	874.7	51,544	31,928	0	83,472
288	Franklin	Central Heights	600.1	38,448	17,028	0	55,476
289	Franklin	Wellsville	787.0	45,720	13,197	0	58,917
290	Franklin	Ottawa	2,380.5	107,544	98,762	851	207,158
475	Geary	Junction City	5,909.3	274,096	286,070	56,192	616,359
291	Gove	Grinnell	112.0	10,432	2,129	0	12,561
292	Gove	Grainfield	167.0	14,488	6,386	0	20,874
293	Gove	Quinter	319.0	21,676	6,386	0	28,062
281	Graham	Hill City	390.6	25,916	9,365	0	35,281
214	Grant	Ulysses	1,659.1	79,676	83,863	51,935	215,474
102	Gray	Cimarron-Ensign	632.6	39,932	25,968	22,562	88,462
371	Gray	Montezuma	252.4	19,020	9,365	30,650	59,036
476	Gray	Copeland	127.0	11,828	7,663	19,157	38,647
477	Gray	Ingalls	245.9	17,940	8,514	6,386	32,840
200	Greeley	Greeley County	252.5	19,300	10,643	9,365	39,308

			Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5
USD			FTE Enroll inc4Yr at risk	Increase BSAPP	Est. Increase At Risk	Est. Increase Bilingual	Total
No.	County Name	USD Name	9/20/2005	\$40	(19.3% to 22.5%)	(39.5% to 48.2%)	(Col 2 + Col 3 + Col 4)
386	Greenwood	Madison-Virgil	246.0	17,744	10,217	0	27,961
389	Greenwood	Eureka	639.4	40,880	23,839	0	64,719
390	Greenwood	Hamilton	101.5	9,500	5,534	0	15,034
494	Hamilton	Syracuse	459.0	31,032	26,819	27,671	85,522
361	Harper	Anthony-Harper	854.6	52,876	41,719	2,554	97,149
511	Harper	Attica	120.0	10,636	5,108	0	15,744
369	Harvey	Burton	277.0	18,852	17,028	0	35,880
373	Harvey	Newton	3,433.7	157,596	165,597	40,867	364,061
439	Harvey	Sedgwick	528.5	31,436	11,920	0	43,356
440	Harvey	Halstead	706.9	42,628	25,542	0	68,170
460	Harvey	Hesston	763.0	43,200	13,622	2,554	59,377
374	Haskell	Sublette	495.4	32,760	31,502	38,313	102,575
507	Haskell	Satanta	377.5	27,160	21,285	48,530	96,975
227	Hodgeman	Jetmore	299.5	19,668	10,643	0	30,311
228	Hodgeman	Hanston	69.5	7,956	2,129	0	10,085
335	Jackson	North Jackson	404.0	27,556	9,791	0	37,347
336	Jackson	Holton	1,109.5	58,972	29,799	0	88,771
337	Jackson	Mayetta	926.7	53,656	34,907	0	88,563
338	Jefferson	Valley Halls	436.5	27,628	13,197	0	40,825
339	Jefferson	Jefferson County	478.2	30,692	7,237	0	37,929
340	Jefferson	Jefferson West	938.5	52,856	14,474	0	67,330
341	Jefferson	Oskaloosa	583.6	37,952	25,116	0	63,068
342	Jefferson	McLouth	541.3	34,340	13,622	0	47,962
343	Jefferson	Perry	956.5	54,616	22,988	426	78,030
104	Jewell	White Rock	98.5	10,340	3,406	0	13,746
278	Jewell	Mankato	207.0	15,736	8,088	0	23,824
279	Jewell	Jewell	143.0	14,036	6,386	0	20,422
229	Johnson	Blue Valley	18,975.2	874,824	60,875	20,008	955,707
230	Johnson	Spring Hill	1,643.0	73,252	23,414	426	97,091
231	Johnson	Gardner-Edgerton	3,647.8	165,676	71,943	851	238,471
232	Johnson	DeSoto	4,930.0	228,256	54,915	30,225	313,396
233	Johnson	Olathe	23,422.0	1,165,084	387,387	85,991	1,638,462
512	Johnson	Shawnee Mission	27,477.2	1,230,856	473,378	101,742	1,805,977
215	Kearny	Lakin	636.5	39,944	25,542	25,116	90,602
216	Kearny	Deerfield	335.3	23,544	23,414	36,610	83,568
331	Kingman	Kingman	1,064.0	59,788	39,590	0	99,378
332	Kingman	Cunningham	212.0	17,068	7,237	0	24,305
422	Kiowa	Greensburg	279.0	18,672	6,386	0	25,058
424	Kiowa	Mullinville	121.5	11,264	7,663	0	18,927
474	Kiowa	Haviland	176.0	13,624	8,088	0	21,712
503	Labette	Parsons	1,432.1	70,972	85,566	0	156,538
504	Labette	Oswego	468.5	29,948	23,414	0	53,362
505	Labette	Chetopa	560.5	34,240	36,610	0	70,850
506	Labette	Labette County	1,638.2	79,780	63,855	0	143,635
468	Lane	Healy	104.0	9,840	4,257	2,129	16,226
482	Lane	Dighton	244.2	17,228	9,791	0	27,019
207	Leavenworth	Ft. Leavenworth	1,536.0	69,900	8,088	0	77,988
449	Leavenworth	Easton	691.1	41,756	11,920	0	53,676
453	Leavenworth	Leavenworth	3,940.2	178,732	214,127	9,365	402,225

			Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5
			FTE Enroll	Increase	Est. Increase	Est. Increase	
USD			inc4yr at risk	BSAPP	At Risk	Bilingual	Total
No.	County Name	USD Name	9/20/2005	\$40	(19.3% to 22.5%)	(39.5% to 48.2%)	(Col 2 + Col 3 + Col 4)
458	Leavenworth	Basehor-Linwood	2,062.7	91,676	17,454	0	109,130
464	Leavenworth	Tonganoxie	1,640.7	72,988	27,245	0	100,233
469	Leavenworth	Lansing	2,150.5	92,632	21,285	426	114,343
298	Lincoln	Lincoln	364.1	23,936	16,177	0	40,113
299	Lincoln	Sylvan Grove	136.0	13,148	5,960	0	19,108
344	Linn	Pleasanton	409.5	26,208	22,988	0	49,196
346	Linn	Jayhawk	560.3	36,640	24,691	0	61,331
362	Linn	Prairie View	996.6	57,628	30,650	426	88,704
274	Logan	Oakley	410.0	26,612	17,454	0	44,066
275	Logan	Triplains	118.0	10,124	5,534	0	15,658
251	Lyon	North Lyon Co.	555.7	37,052	16,177	0	53,229
252	Lyon	Southern Lyon Co.	586.0	36,144	17,879	0	54,023
253	Lyon	Emporia	4,592.9	228,516	309,484	304,376	842,375
397	Marion	Centre	283.0	20,304	10,217	0	30,521
398	Marion	Peabody-Burns	390.2	26,512	17,028	0	43,540
408	Marion	Marion	635.2	38,376	21,285	0	59,661
410	Marion	Durham-Hills	668.9	39,724	16,177	0	55,901
411	Marion	Goessel	270.0	19,036	6,386	0	25,422
364	Marshall	Marysville	754.2	45,048	20,008	0	65,056
380	Marshall	Vermillion	541.7	35,308	14,474	0	49,782
488	Marshall	Axtell	316.5	20,788	7,663	0	28,451
498	Marshall	Valley Heights	379.9	25,512	14,048	0	39,560
400	McPherson	Smoky Valley	1,005.6	55,028	22,988	426	78,442
418	McPherson	McPherson	2,369.9	104,716	65,132	426	170,274
419	McPherson	Canton-Galva	400.4	26,020	11,068	0	37,088
423	McPherson	Moundridge	415.0	25,808	5,534	0	31,342
448	McPherson	Inman	422.5	27,400	6,386	0	33,786
225	Meade	Fowler	179.0	14,072	11,068	1,277	26,417
226	Meade	Meade	478.2	30,040	15,751	5,108	50,899
367	Miami	Osawatomie	1,185.0	61,760	62,578	0	124,338
368	Miami	Paola	2,004.7	91,836	45,124	0	136,960
416	Miami	Louisburg	1,472.8	70,024	17,028	0	87,052
272	Mitchell	Waconda	348.4	23,648	14,048	0	37,696
273	Mitchell	Beloit	748.7	43,604	20,434	426	64,463
436	Montgomery	Caney	817.5	48,872	29,799	851	79,522
445	Montgomery	Coffeyville	1,806.3	97,624	138,353	1,277	237,254
446	Montgomery	Independence	1,889.7	87,884	99,188	851	187,924
447	Montgomery	Cherryvale	680.6	39,704	31,502	0	71,206
417	Morris	Morris County	837.0	50,852	34,907	0	85,759
217	Morton	Rolla	198.0	16,268	11,068	8,514	35,850
218	Morton	Elkhart	667.1	41,084	25,542	40,867	107,493
441	Nemaha	Sabetha	906.5	51,232	21,711	0	72,943
442	Nemaha	Nemaha Valley	498.4	30,788	10,217	0	41,005
451	Nemaha	B & B	208.0	16,868	3,831	0	20,699
101	Neosho	Erie-St. Paul	696.5	57,116	28,522	0	85,638
413	Neosho	Chanute	1,831.4	82,724	83,437	426	166,587
106	Ness	Western Plains	191.5	15,248	8,088	2,129	25,465
303	Ness	Ness City	272.6	18,224	7,237	0	25,461
211	Norton	Norton	673.6	39,092	21,711	0	60,803

			Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5
			FTE Enroll	Increase	Est. Increase	Est. Increase	
USD			inc4yr at risk	BSAPP	At Risk	Bilingual	Total
No.	County Name	USD Name	9/20/2005	\$40	(19.3% to 22.5%)	(39.5% to 48.2%)	(Col 2 + Col 3 + Col 4)
212	Norton	Northern Valley	180.0	15,140	8,514	0	23,654
213	Norton	West Solomon	58.0	5,836	2,554	0	8,390
420	Osage	Osage City	727.5	41,584	23,414	0	64,998
421	Osage	Lyndon	447.0	27,976	12,345	0	40,321
434	Osage	Santa Fe	1,204.8	65,716	37,887	0	103,603
454	Osage	Burlingame	332.0	21,624	10,217	0	31,841
456	Osage	Marais Des Cygnes	258.7	19,212	17,028	0	36,240
392	Osborne	Osborne	352.7	24,776	15,751	0	40,527
239	Ottawa	North Ottawa Co.	550.5	33,832	17,879	0	51,711
240	Ottawa	Twin Valley	633.7	38,284	17,028	0	55,312
495	Pawnee	Ft. Larned	918.8	52,232	37,462	0	89,694
496	Pawnee	Pawnee Heights	178.5	14,504	5,960	0	20,464
324	Phillips	Eastern Heights	150.0	12,768	6,386	0	19,154
325	Phillips	Phillipsburg	632.5	37,680	20,008	0	57,688
326	Phillips	Logan	183.5	14,676	6,386	0	21,062
320	Pottawatomie	Wamego	1,280.6	64,852	28,522	0	93,374
321	Pottawatomie	Kaw Valley	1,085.0	59,136	30,650	0	89,786
322	Pottawatomie	Onaga	360.5	24,292	12,345	0	36,637
323	Pottawatomie	Westmoreland	777.0	45,988	21,285	0	67,273
382	Pratt	Pratt	1,177.8	60,932	46,401	0	107,333
438	Pratt	Skyline	352.5	26,576	11,494	426	38,496
105	Rawlins	Rawlins County	342.5	23,456	11,920	0	35,376
308	Reno	Hutchinson	4,542.1	210,448	292,456	9,365	512,269
309	Reno	Nickerson	1,131.1	62,172	61,727	6,386	130,284
310	Reno	Fairfield	373.6	25,652	19,157	0	44,809
311	Reno	Pretty Prairie	289.0	19,824	6,386	0	26,210
312	Reno	Haven	1,055.7	58,272	35,759	0	94,031
313	Reno	Buhler	2,129.5	98,480	54,490	5,108	158,078
426	Republic	Pike Valley	257.5	18,772	12,771	0	31,543
427	Republic	Belleville	439.5	28,648	14,900	0	43,548
455	Republic	Hillcrest	96.5	10,184	4,683	0	14,867
376	Rice	Sterling	501.7	31,204	20,434	0	51,638
401	Rice	Chase	163.3	13,236	10,217	0	23,453
405	Rice	Lyons	827.5	49,464	60,449	33,205	143,118
444	Rice	Little River	285.0	19,420	7,237	0	26,657
378	Riley	Riley County	628.0	39,064	11,068	0	50,132
383	Riley	Manhattan	4,913.7	225,824	153,678	34,907	414,409
384	Riley	Blue Valley	219.1	18,084	5,960	0	24,044
269	Rooks	Palco	149.0	12,692	7,237	0	19,929
270	Rooks	Plainville	391.8	24,624	13,197	0	37,821
271	Rooks	Stockton	344.0	22,724	13,622	0	36,346
395	Rush	LaCrosse	318.5	21,032	12,345	0	33,377
403	Rush	Otis-Bison	218.3	17,048	8,088	426	25,562
399	Russell	Paradise	133.5	12,204	5,534	0	17,738
407	Russell	Russell	989.5	54,544	39,590	0	94,134
305	Saline	Salina	7,066.2	319,428	344,817	40,016	704,261
306	Saline	Southeast of Saline	691.4	42,068	12,345	0	54,413
307	Saline	Ell-Saline	453.5	29,068	9,365	0	38,433
466	Scott	Scott County	900.7	53,428	38,739	42,144	134,311

			Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5
			FTE Enroll	Increase	Est. Increase	Est. Increase	
USD			inc4yr at risk	BSAPP	At Risk	Bilingual	Total
No.	County Name	USD Name	9/20/2005	\$40	(19.3% to 22.5%)	(39.5% to 48.2%)	(Col 2 + Col 3 + Col 4)
259	Sedgwick	Wichita	45,497.2	2,292,908	3,649,100	1,044,242	6,986,251
260	Sedgwick	Derby	6,334.2	285,836	203,910	16,177	505,923
261	Sedgwick	Haysville	4,434.1	201,168	157,509	14,900	373,577
262	Sedgwick	Valley Center	2,424.2	107,976	52,361	426	160,763
263	Sedgwick	Mulvane	1,858.3	83,064	37,887	426	121,377
264	Sedgwick	Clearwater	1,234.3	67,120	21,711	0	88,831
265	Sedgwick	Goddard	4,277.4	191,148	54,490	0	245,638
266	Sedgwick	Maize	5,867.3	266,248	54,064	2,980	323,292
267	Sedgwick	Renwick	1,932.5	86,628	19,582	0	106,210
268	Sedgwick	Cheney	752.0	42,940	12,345	0	55,285
480	Seward	Liberal	4,215.7	208,116	335,026	297,564	840,706
483	Seward	Kismet-Plains	685.0	47,448	45,124	75,775	168,347
345	Shawnee	Seaman	3,329.9	148,376	71,943	0	220,319
372	Shawnee	Silver Lake	727.8	41,816	9,365	0	51,181
437	Shawnee	Auburn Washburn	5,103.3	229,904	110,682	2,129	342,715
450	Shawnee	Shawnee Heights	3,370.6	154,984	70,241	2,980	228,204
501	Shawnee	Topeka	12,607.4	595,072	981,664	39,164	1,615,901
412	Sheridan	Hoxie	324.5	21,436	8,514	0	29,950
352	Sherman	Goodland	942.7	54,724	41,719	21,285	117,728
237	Smith	Smith Center	426.5	28,836	14,048	0	42,884
238	Smith	West Smith Co.	179.0	14,704	8,940	0	23,644
349	Stafford	Stafford	305.5	20,408	17,879	0	38,287
350	Stafford	St. John-Hudson	395.8	26,180	17,028	1,277	44,485
351	Stafford	Macksville	289.0	19,940	15,751	4,683	40,374
452	Stanton	Stanton County	454.4	31,136	25,542	22,988	79,666
209	Stevens	Moscow	211.2	18,276	14,048	28,096	60,420
210	Stevens	Hugoton	1,022.3	56,964	52,787	18,305	128,056
353	Sumner	Wellington	1,638.0	80,576	80,032	0	160,608
356	Sumner	Conway Springs	558.1	34,196	11,068	0	45,264
357	Sumner	Belle Plaine	758.5	45,900	31,928	0	77,828
358	Sumner	Oxford	381.7	25,380	11,920	0	37,300
359	Sumner	Argonia	204.0	15,740	5,534	0	21,274
360	Sumner	Caldwell	276.9	19,368	13,622	0	32,990
509	Sumner	South Haven	244.5	17,356	8,088	0	25,444
314	Thomas	Brewster	125.8	11,012	3,831	0	14,843
315	Thomas	Colby	987.3	56,104	34,907	426	91,437
316	Thomas	Golden Plains	188.1	15,132	11,494	1,703	28,329
208	Trego	WaKeeney	398.0	25,304	11,494	0	36,798
329	Wabaunsee	Alma	452.0	30,352	8,514	0	38,866
330	Wabaunsee	Wabaunsee East	523.0	34,680	17,454	0	52,134
241	Wallace	Wallace	204.0	16,488	8,940	0	25,428
242	Wallace	Weskan	119.0	11,004	4,683	426	16,112
221	Washington	North Central	111.5	10,208	3,831	0	14,039
222	Washington	Washington	353.5	22,476	10,643	0	33,119
223	Washington	Barnes	387.1	25,776	10,217	0	35,993
224	Washington	Clifton-Clyde	307.1	21,312	10,217	0	31,529
467	Wichita	Leoti	456.4	32,124	20,434	36,610	89,168
387	Wilson	Altoona-Midway	268.0	19,184	13,197	0	32,381
461	Wilson	Neodesha	742.0	43,316	31,076	0	74,392

			Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5
			FTE Enroll	Increase	Est. Increase	Est. Increase	
USD			inc4yr at risk	BSAPP	At Risk	Bilingual	Total
No.	County Name	USD Name	9/20/2005	\$40	(19.3% to 22.5%)	(39.5% to 48.2%)	(Col 2 + Col 3 + Col 4)
484	Wilson	Fredonia	742.5	44,676	35,333	0	80,009
366	Woodson	Woodson	437.5	31,248	21,711	0	52,959
202	Wyandotte	Turner	3,660.5	167,328	182,625	34,907	384,861
203	Wyandotte	Piper	1,408.0	67,160	10,217	0	77,377
204	Wyandotte	Bonner Springs	2,191.5	98,692	69,389	19,582	187,663
500	Wyandotte	Kansas City	18,877.5	949,992	1,716,422	711,345	3,377,759
TOTALS			442,852.3	22,757,680	18,442,175	4,928,329	46,128,184

Sen. Education Committee
3-8-06 Attachment 4

**STATE GENERAL FUND RECEIPTS, EXPENDITURES AND BALANCES
AS PROJECTED FY 2004-FY 2011
In Millions**

	Actual FY 2004	Actual FY 2005	Revised FY 2006	Projected FY 2007	Projected FY 2008	Projected FY 2009	Projected FY 2010	Projected FY 2011
Beginning Balance	\$ 125.1	\$ 327.4	\$ 481.0	\$ 537.2	\$ 481.0	\$ 313.8	\$ 42.5	\$ 2.3
KDOT Shift	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	45.0	245.0
Receipts (November 2005 Consensus)	4,518.9	4,843.7	5,206.3	5,266.7	5,331.0	5,590.9	5,898.5	6,285.7
Less Tax Reductions	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	(165.0)	(175.0)	(460.0)
Adjusted Receipts	4,518.9	4,843.7	5,206.3	5,266.7	5,331.0	5,425.9	5,768.5	6,070.7
Total Available	\$ 4,644.0	\$ 5,171.1	\$ 5,687.3	\$ 5,803.9	\$ 5,812.0	\$ 5,739.7	\$ 5,856.0	\$ 6,318.0
Less Additional Expenditures for School Finance - HB 2247	-	-	140.2	190.2	190.2	190.2	190.2	190.2
Less Additional Expend. for School Finance - House Sub. SB 3	-	-	148.4	148.4	148.4	148.4	148.4	148.4
Less Additional K-12 Funding	-	-	-	50.0	125.0	225.0	325.0	375.0
All Other Expenditures	4,316.6	4,690.1	4,861.5	4,934.3	5,034.6	5,133.7	5,190.0	5,281.8
Total Expenditures	4,316.6	4,690.1	5,150.1	5,322.9	5,498.2	5,697.3	5,853.6	5,995.4
Ending Balance	\$ 327.4	\$ 481.0	\$ 537.2	\$ 481.0	\$ 313.8	\$ 42.5	\$ 2.3	\$ 322.6
Ending Balance as a Percentage of Expenditures	7.6%	10.3%	10.4%	9.1%	5.8%	0.8%	0.0%	5.7%

1) Actual FY 2005 and FY 2006 expenditures as approved by the 2005 Legislature, including \$31.6 million in expenditures shifted forward from FY 2005 to FY 2006. FY 2006 and FY 2007 estimated expenditures also reflect the SRS, Aging and Department of Administration consensus caseload adjustments of October 28, 2005 and the latest school finance estimates of November 16, 2005.

2) FY 2006 revised receipts and FY 2007 projected receipts reflect the estimates of the Consensus Revenue Estimating Group as of November 3, 2005, plus \$48.4 million based on year-to-date collections.

3) FY 2008 base receipts assume a 5.5 percent growth; and expenditures include out-year significant obligations (i.e., SRS and Aging caseloads).

4) Additional school finance expenditures of \$125 million in FY 2007; \$75 million in FY 2008, \$100 million in FY 2009 and FY 2010; and \$50 million in FY 2011.

5) Tax reductions of \$165 million in FY 2009; \$175 million in FY 2010; \$460 million in FY 2011.

Prepared at the Request and Direction of Senator Jim Barriett
January 19, 2006

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

March 8, 2006

Senate Education Committee

Testimony on Senate Bill 584

Dear Madame Chair and Members of the Education Committee,

Thank you for the chance to appear today and testify on Senate Bill 584. I appear today on behalf of Shawnee Mission School District 512. The Shawnee Mission School District is the second largest district in Kansas, with 27,495 students, 2,066 teachers, in 55 schools. We are also a declining enrollment district, losing on average over 400 students each year, with 3,345 pupils meeting the free lunch criteria for "at risk," but over 10,000 students identified as at risk according to KSDE definitions and 1,548 bilingual students.

Senate Bill 584 will benefit children in Kansas and Shawnee Mission School District in particular, and we can support the bill with some adjustments. Additional funding for at-risk and poor students is exactly where funding should be targeted according the Supreme Court and the studies you commissioned. This Committee, the House, and the Governor, are setting the parameters for school finance in Kansas for the next ten years. The impact of your actions are the same as the legislators in 1992 who crafted the school finance formula that educated Kansas children for the following thirteen years. The Supreme Court is watching your actions and with some modifications, the Shawnee Mission School District can add its support to Senate Bill 584. Moreover, by addressing our concerns, the Supreme Court will receive an even more unified statement of Legislative support for this product.

Some of the amendments to the bill we would like the Committee to consider are:

1. Eliminate limitations on local funding options, with the approval of local citizens
2. Increase correlation weighting funding
3. New definition of at-risk. Using Senate Bill 509 as an example, uses proficiency in math and reading as the criteria for at risk or calculate at-risk funding distribution based on kids actually receiving at-risk services
4. Consider some version of the regional cost weighting recommended by Post Audit and the consultants
5. State funded all day kindergarten for all children
6. State per pupil funding should be made on an FTE basis to eliminate double funding of services for these areas already targeted for additional funding

Your consideration and action of these issues is critical for Shawnee Mission School District to obtain our support for this bill so it can truly give every district the tools they need to satisfy their needs for years to come.

Johnson County schools, chambers of commerce, and community leaders are working together in support of school finance components that give us the tools we need to resolve our educational needs. We agree that more money must be added for at-risk students and students from dense poverty areas. We could support this bill because we believe legislators from those school districts need these school finance tools to make their schools work. We seek in return removal of the limitation on the use of local funding options; that is the tool we need. If you believe Senate Bill 584 is solving the school finance problem for the next ten years and is making suitable provisions for the funding of education, show your commitment to the Supreme Court by removing the limitation on local funding contributions to schools.

Senate Bill 584 is attempting to solve most of the problems school districts have in a reasonable manner, and with the additions, it can solve our problems as well. Thank you for your time and I would stand for questions.

KSSmallBiz.com

ADVOCATES FOR KANSAS SMALL BUSINESS

P.O. BOX 1246 • TOPEKA, KS 66601-1246 • 785.232.4590. x205

www.KSSmallBiz.com

TESTIMONY TO THE SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

By Kenneth Daniel

March 8, 2006

Madame Chairwoman and Members of the Committee:

My name is Kenneth Daniel. I am a small business owner and volunteer advocate for Kansas small business. Small businesses and K-12 education are deeply entwined and dependent upon each other for survival.

Because of my limited time today, I will touch on a few of the items below and let my written testimony speak to the rest.

Since the LPA Study was released in January, I have intensely studied both the study and other works that it references.

Today I will not comment about the proposed new funding. Instead, I will concentrate on our complicated and unfair funding formula.

STARVING THE GOLDEN GOOSE

I'm sure you've all seen the studies that show that Johnson County is pretty much driving the economy of the entire state. I believe it. I opened a branch in Overland Park last year. I use Johnson County as my example, but there are many other areas in the state with similar situations.

If we are going to use the word "investment" in conjunction with new K-12 money, it is hard for me to understand why we would want to short-change the Johnson County schools. If I had kids in school in Johnson County, I'd be very, very angry about all the money going to free lunch instead of at-risk kids.

At-risk money should be spent on at-risk kids, no matter where they go to school. It is not right to completely ignore ten thousand or more kids in Johnson County and thousands more statewide who are at-risk. Free lunch is a political tool, not an honest funding tool.

To fix this, we need to throw out poverty as a funding mechanism, and provide targeted at-risk money to all districts for their at-risk kids on an equal basis.

STUDENT OUTCOMES

As an employer of more than 100 Kansans, I can tell you that small employers, from a business standpoint, don't give a hoot about pre-school, all-day kindergarten, or the testing results of fourth and eighth graders. We care about the end product of our K-12 system. The following are the measurements that are important to me:

*Senate Education Committee
3-8-06
Attachments*

- 10th and 11th Grade Math and English proficiency results
- The last tests for proficiency in other areas besides Math and English
- A.C.T. results
- High school graduation rate

ABOUT THE LPA STUDY

What LPA was asked to do may well be impossible. They were asked for specific recommendations to project outcomes that no study has ever been able to do. And, in this effort they had many "bosses":

Kansas Supreme Court
 House Education Committee
 Senate Education Committee
 House Select Committee on School Finance
 2010 Commission
 At-Risk Council
 State Board of Education

I do not believe the recommendations of the LPA Study will result in the "precise" outcomes predicted by its consultant, or even come close.

Here are the links to the executive summary and full report:

Executive Summary:

http://www.kslegislature.org/postaudit/audits_perform/05pa19.pdf

Full LPA School Cost Study:

http://www.kslegislature.org/postaudit/audits_perform/05pa19a.pdf

Duncomb and Yinger, Consultants

Falsification of free lunch applications has been well known in the education community for more than ten years. Since free lunch data was used as the very foundation of most the work Duncomb and Yinger (D&Y) did, the work is unreliable – garbage in, garbage out!

(For a full discussion, see "Full Analysis: New Kansas School Cost Study", http://www.kssmallbiz.com/articles/article_498.asp.)

Of all the consultants in the "school study" business, D&Y finds that twice as much money is "needed" than the others. (See the attached "Exhibit 1", which was furnished to me by Professor Bruce Baker of K.U.)

The following table shows the statistics for the consultants who twenty-six studies like our A&M and LPA studies.

Consultant	# Studies	Avg Base Cost /Pupil
Duncombe and Yinger	4	\$14,515
Institute for Wisconsin's Future	1	\$9,757
Augenblick & Colleagues	16	\$7,167
Picus & Associates	1	\$7,998
Ohio Legislature	2	\$6,383
Oregon Quality Education Comm.	1	\$7,086
Ruggiero	1	\$6,834

Furthermore, the "Cost Function Method" used by D&Y is little used, produces the highest "costs" of all methods, and uses breathtaking leaps of logic.

(See the "Full Analysis" article, http://www.kssmallbiz.com/articles/article_498.asp, for a much more complete explanation.)

Poverty and Outcomes: No Significant Statistical Relationship

Several school funding plans have now been proposed which ignore major recommendations of the LPA Study, especially the key proposal for the new weighting factor, "poverty density". Under the LPA proposal, that would have pumped \$122 million of new state money to four school districts next year and much, much more later.

Duncomb and Yinger, the consultants hired by LPA, are the ones who deserve the criticism. They created the new "weighting factor" out of whole cloth. Here is their only justification for it:

"Nationally, there is *some descriptive evidence suggesting* that student performance in high poverty inner city schools is significantly worse than high poverty rural schools (Olson and Jerald, 1998)ⁱ."

My comment: "Quality Counts '98"ⁱⁱⁱ, the actual name of the Olson and Jerald report, contains many statistics but doesn't contain correlation calculations, regression analyses, or scientific methods. This 8-year old report is extremely obscure and unknown. It was funded by the left-wing Pew Charitable Trust. D&Y provides no other justification for creating the new "poverty density" weighting, which is apparently not used by any state. D&Y's weasel words "some descriptive evidence suggesting" are instructive – this study is a solution in search of a problem and lots of money. It is no more than social engineering in the guise of science.

"To examine whether this appears to be the case in Kansas, we have created an additional poverty variable, which is percent free lunch students multiplied by pupil density (pupils per square mile)."

My comment: The free lunch data is fictitious and bloated, especially by the four large districts in question. The reasons given for this new weighting factor are characteristics of the students, which schools have little chance to change. The four districts get a lot more money than other districts under the present formula, and they will continue to get much more under any new one. There simply is no justification for the "bonus" density weighting. It is highly unfair to other kids and other districts.

"If there is an urban poverty effect on costs, the regression coefficient on this measure should be positive and statistically significant from zero."

My comment: A regression can prove that a correlation is meaningless, but it cannot prove it is meaningful. Statistical significance only provides a clue as which theories should be proposed and tested scientifically, even if the correlation is 100%. This is a fatal fault of the D&Y report. D&Y did not follow even the most basic rules of scientific study.

Bad Assumptions, Bad Science

I know you have seen the chart handed out by Kansas Assistant Education Commissioner Dale Dennis showing that free lunch kids have worse outcomes than reduced-price lunch kids, and reduced-price lunch kids have worse outcomes than those not qualified for subsidized lunches.

This means absolutely nothing if subjected to standard statistical methods or scientific analysis.

- An apparent correlation does not prove a correlation, not even if the two factors occur together 100% of the time.
- The range for a "low correlation" is .40 to .90 (40% to 90%). Below that, we have "no statistical significance". The correlation between poverty and outcomes is far less than .40.
- Even a high correlation does not prove a cause-and-effect relationship. What we are seeing with the D&Y and Dale Dennis "correlations" are most likely items caused by a common cause or causes. I'm sorry to have to be the one to say this, but one of these common causes is almost certainly intelligence. A key reason that some people don't make as much money is because they are not as smart. That same reason is why they don't do as well in school.
- A high correlation can eliminate a possible cause through regression analysis. It cannot prove a cause.
- If one cannot eliminate a cause by regression analysis, the next step is to postulate a causal theory and then perform scientific testing to prove or disprove it as a cause and not just a correlation. This has virtually never been done by any of these learned "education consultants".

(See the "Full Analysis" article, http://www.kssmallbiz.com/articles/article_498.asp, for a much more complete explanation.)

Funding and At-Risk Services Not Related:

From page 89 of the LPA report: "The State's basis for funding at-risk services has little relationship to the number of students who receive at-risk services. Poverty serves as the basis for funding the at-risk program, but lack of academic progress is the basis for receiving services under the program."

At-Risk Money Not Used for At-Risk Services:

We have been hearing requests from educators asking for "flexibility" with the at-risk funds.

Translation: "Let us spend this any way we want."

We have been hearing educators say they are very much in favor of accountability, but not the measures being proposed in some of the current funding bills.

Translation: "We really don't want to have to account closely for this money."

Page 89 of study: "Several of the larger districts identified all students who qualify for free lunches as being eligible for and receiving at-risk services. This resulted in a large number of students being reported as receiving at-risk services. The larger districts had a more difficult time providing us with lists of specific at-risk students who had received services, generally because they provide school-wide services—such as reducing class size—in their high-poverty schools."

Translation: They are spending the at-risk money on a lot of stuff other than at-risk kids.

I recommend a close review of the entire section that pertains to the relationship between funding and services (pages 89-94). It shows clearly that much at-risk money is used for items that are at best only peripherally related to at-risk, and much is spent for items that are not at-risk items at all. Look closely at page 90, which shows an incredible variation in district reporting and use of at-risk funds.

Page 93: "Most of our sample districts said they would spend the additional at-risk funding they received in 2005-06 to initiate or expand at-risk services."

Translation: They may spend all or part of the new at-risk money on at-risk kids.

Additional Spending Not Related to Improved Outcomes

Page 107 of study: "Educational research offers mixed opinions about whether increased spending for educational inputs is related to improved student performance."

This section (pages 107-113) proceeds to demonstrate very clearly that one hundred previous studies overwhelmingly find there is no relationship between spending and outcomes, with a few showing there is. In other words, the "mixed opinions" are heavily weighted to "there is no relationship."

D&Y assumes that poverty is overwhelmingly the most important factor in bad outcomes, and that it can predict with precision the amount of money needed to produce certain outcomes.

Why then, aren't we being shown lots of examples where more money has produced results?

Spending Not Keeping Up With Inflation

Yesterday, we heard testimony that the "Base State Aid Per Pupil" funding in this bill doesn't keep up with inflation. Don't you see where this is going? We are going to continue to hear the fable that school funding isn't keeping up with inflation, when in fact it has increased at far more than double the rate of inflation since 1992.

CONCLUSIONS

Even if the data was reliable, the "correlation" assumed by D&Y and LPA does not exist.

No statistically meaningful relationship between poverty and free lunches has ever been proven – not a high correlation, not a low correlation, and certainly not a scientifically proven causal relationship.

IN A NUTSHELL: THE DATA WAS BAD, THE CORRELATIONS "FOUND" DO NOT EXIST, NO SCIENCE WAS DONE, AND THE ASSUMPTION AND CONCLUSIONS ARE UTTERLY WRONG.

HOW TO FIX THIS:

1. Use free lunch certifications only for free lunches and Title I. The federal government knows the free lunch figures are falsified, but that is their problem to fix.
2. Provide at-risk funding for the actual students who are not performing at proficiency. Provide a strict definition. Provide monitoring and audits. Do not allow at-risk funds to be rolled into general fund budgets. We are testing every year now, so the qualifying data as fresh as the free-lunch statistics, and will be much more reliable and tamper-proof.

Thank you. I will be happy to answer any questions.

ⁱ LPA Cost Study, Consultant's Report, Page C-11.

ⁱⁱ "Quality Counts '98", <http://counts.edweek.org/sreports/qc98/qc98to.htm>.



Wednesday, March 8, 2006

Subscribe (Free)

**About
KSSmallBiz.com**

**Update
Subscription**

Organizations

**Small Business
Issues** *K-12*

Archives

Links

Contact Us

Home

Important Kansas Small Business Items	
2006 Guide to Kansas Small Business Issues -- 40 pages ✎	
Full Analysis: New Kansas School Cost Study -- By Kenneth Daniel	
Special Item for Topeka Readers	
Topeka Mayor Bill Bunten's "Business Friendly" Report -- 74 pages ✎	
Recent Articles (Newest at Top)	
Title	Date
TESTIMONY TO THE HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL FINANCE -- By Kenneth Daniel	(3/8/06)
LPA SCHOOL STUDY: NO SALE! -- By Kenneth Daniel	(3/8/06)
KANSAS CHAMBER SMALL BUSINESS DAY	(3/8/06)
THE WINTER OF OUR CONTENTMENT -- Opinion by Sharon DuBois	(3/8/06)
KSSMALLBIZ.COM REORGANIZES WEB SITE EDUCATION ISSUES	(3/8/06)
FRANK DISCUSSION: SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT AND KSSMALLBIZ.COM	(3/1/06)
AFL-CIO TO ATTACK HEALTH SAVINGS ACCOUNTS -- By Kenneth Daniel	(3/1/06)
TRACKSIDE -- by John D'Aloia Jr.	(3/1/06)
STREAMLINED SALES TAX REVISITED -- Opinion by Sharon DuBois	(3/1/06)
TESTIMONY TO THE SENATE UTILITIES COMMITTEE -- by Kenneth Daniel	(2/22/06)
WHICH KANSAS DISTRICTS CHEAT THE MOST?	(2/22/06)
AFP DAY AT THE CAPITOL	(2/22/06)
WHAT IS IT ABOUT GOVERNMENT OFFICES? -- Opinion by Sharon DuBois	(2/22/06)
SCHOOL STUDY CONSULTANT UNSCIENTIFIC -- By Kenneth Daniel	(2/15/06)
SCHOOL STUDY: MORE ON TAINTED DATA -- By Kenneth Daniel	(2/15/06)



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

March 8, 2006

FROM: Dale M. Dennis, Deputy
Commissioner of Education

SUBJECT: Proposed School Finance Plan – Senate Bill 584

Attached is a computer printout (SF6071) which provides increases in state aid within selected categorical programs. The 2.5 percent of the local option budget would be transferred to the general fund above the current budget limitations along with the difference in additional state aid the school district would receive from equalizing the 2.5 percent from 81.3 percent to 100 percent.

Listed below is a column explanation for your review as well as a table with the estimated cost of these increases.

COLUMN EXPLANATION

- | Column | |
|--------|--|
| 1 -- | September 20, 2005 FTE enrollment |
| 2 -- | 2006-07 Estimated \$50 increase in base state aid per pupil (\$4,257 to \$4,307) |
| 3 -- | 2006-07 Estimated increase in at-risk weighting from .193 to .268 |
| 4 -- | 2006-07 Estimated high risk school districts—Adds 4.5 percent to at-risk weighting (Top five school districts in free meal percentages) |
| 5 -- | 2006-07 Estimated increase in special education aid to 92 percent of excess cost |
| 6 -- | 2006-07 Estimated mandatory 2.5 percent of local option budget required to be transferred to the general fund and is in addition to current general fund limitations. In addition, the transfer from the LOB to the general fund is excluded in computing the LOB authority. |
| 7 -- | 2006-07 Estimated additional local option budget state aid generated as result of equalizing 2.5 percent of local option budget which is mandatory from 81.2 percent to 100 percent |
| 8 -- | 2006-07 Estimated additional budget increase (Column 2 + 3 + 4 + 5 + 7) |
| 9 -- | 2006-07 Estimated amount per pupil (Column 8 ÷ 1) |

NOTE: The mandatory LOB of 2.5 percent transferred to the General fund and the equalization aid from 81.2 percent to 100 percent are not included in computation of the LOB.

*Senate Education Committee
3-8-06
Attachment 7*

LOCAL OPTION BUDGET PROVISIONS OF SENATE BILL 584

	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Current Law	29%	30%	30%

PROVISIONS OF SENATE BILL 584

Regular LOB*	26.5%	25.0%	24.0%
Amount subject to protest petition (This must be spent on non-mandatory programs.)**	2.5%	5.0%	6.0%
Mandatory student performance improvement budget. This is a separate fund.***	2.5%	5.0%	6.0%

*Equalized to 81.2 percent

**This portion on the LOB is not equalized and funded through the local property tax.

***Equalized to 81.2 percent. In addition, the equalization aid from 81.2 percent to 100 percent is added to the mandatory student performance improvement budget above percentage required to be transferred. These funds are required to be transferred to and spent from the general fund.

Estimated Cost of Selected State Aid Programs - 2006-07 through 2008-09

7-3

Proposed School Finance Plan by Selected Senators

Program	Weighting Factor (current law)	2006-07	Difference	Cost	2007-08	Difference	Cost	2008-09	Difference	Cost
Base State Aid Per Pupil	\$4,257	\$4,307	\$50	\$28,400,000	\$4,357	\$50	\$28,800,000	\$4,427	\$70	\$40,550,000
Regular At-Risk	.193	.268	.075	43,500,000	.318	.050	28,850,000	.368	.050	29,000,000
High At-Risk*	0	.045	.045	10,000,000			200,000			200,000
Special Education (Excess Cost)	89.3%	92.0%	2.7	30,300,000	95.0%	3.0	36,750,000	98.0%	3.0	37,000,000
Supp. General State Aid (LOB)	27%	29%	2.0%	30,000,000	30%	1.0%	15,000,000	30%	0	15,000,000
Correlation Weighting	1,662				1,662			1,637	25	11,750,000
Additonal Equalization to LOB	81.3% to 100%	2.5%		38,200,000	5.0%	2.5%	40,400,000	6.0%	1.0%	16,500,000
TOTAL STATE AID				\$180,400,000			\$150,000,000			\$150,000,000
Mandatory LOB to General fund	0	2.5%	2.5%	70,700,000	5.0%	2.5%	72,000,000	6.0%	1.0%	37,000,000
Total Increase to General fund				\$251,100,000			\$222,000,000			\$187,000,000

* Top five school districts in free meal percentages.

3/7/2006			Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5	Col 6	Col 7	Col 8	Col 9
										Estimated	
			FTE Enroll		Est. At Risk		Est. Special		Estimated	Budget	Estimated
USD			inc4yr at risk	BSAPP	Increase	High At Risk	Education	2.5% of Estimated	State Aid	Increase	Amt Per Pupil
No.	County Name	USD Name	9/20/2005	\$50	(19.3% to 26.8%)	Districts	State Aid	General Fund	Increase	(Cols 2+3+4+5+7)	(col 8 / col 1)
256	Allen	Marmaton Valley	362.0	30,775	40,867	0	37,918	76,438	32,151	141,712	391
257	Allen	Iola	1,428.0	88,580	180,071	0	127,377	229,562	70,961	466,989	327
258	Allen	Humboldt	511.2	40,365	57,470	0	46,954	100,733	41,463	186,251	364
365	Anderson	Garnett	1,102.3	76,440	113,662	0	77,878	186,941	113,791	381,771	346
479	Anderson	Crest	248.0	22,795	27,671	0	23,843	56,550	40,090	114,398	461
377	Atchison	Atchison County	734.3	56,535	48,530	0	58,645	139,114	72,576	236,285	322
409	Atchison	Atchison	1,557.8	92,450	206,890	0	128,794	237,516	113,252	541,386	348
254	Barber	Barber Co.	592.5	45,980	49,381	0	45,398	113,286	89,366	230,126	388
255	Barber	South Barber Co.	252.0	22,925	22,136	0	20,366	55,402	43,913	109,341	434
354	Barton	Claffin	295.0	24,425	17,454	0	27,019	60,575	30,042	98,940	335
355	Barton	Ellinwood	477.6	39,655	42,570	0	38,449	97,214	38,818	159,493	334
428	Barton	Great Bend	3,023.8	178,180	444,431	0	153,880	434,129	164,812	941,303	311
431	Barton	Hoisington	627.8	47,400	62,152	0	46,727	115,568	55,433	211,712	337
234	Bourbon	Ft. Scott	1,879.2	114,560	247,332	0	91,549	276,196	98,482	551,922	294
235	Bourbon	Uniontown	455.5	38,065	53,638	0	26,728	90,091	30,603	149,035	327
415	Brown	Hiawatha	897.5	65,430	89,397	0	89,457	165,872	100,155	344,438	384
430	Brown	Brown County	662.5	52,170	88,120	0	64,566	132,246	42,661	247,517	374
205	Butler	Leon	711.5	55,055	49,381	0	52,845	133,771	51,997	209,279	294
206	Butler	Remington-Whitewater	539.0	42,655	31,502	0	42,520	103,861	66,153	182,830	339
375	Butler	Circle	1,476.8	89,950	63,429	0	97,883	219,791	180,085	431,347	292
385	Butler	Andover	3,891.6	212,435	76,626	0	196,359	519,463	244,697	730,117	188
394	Butler	Rose Hill	1,683.5	96,240	65,132	0	109,758	236,678	67,662	338,792	201
396	Butler	Douglass	828.3	59,050	48,530	0	64,578	145,094	39,976	212,134	256
402	Butler	Augusta	2,131.2	119,270	157,083	0	128,995	295,789	100,854	506,202	238
490	Butler	El Dorado	2,086.0	119,645	217,958	0	127,176	299,840	138,215	602,994	289
492	Butler	Flinthills	313.5	26,505	19,582	0	24,449	64,150	34,837	105,374	336
284	Chase	Chase County	467.5	37,735	39,590	0	31,057	90,712	75,465	183,847	393
285	Chautauqua	Cedar Vale	157.5	16,735	19,157	0	11,882	39,177	20,299	68,072	432
286	Chautauqua	Chautauqua	416.0	34,480	40,442	0	30,496	81,848	30,350	135,767	326
404	Cherokee	Riverton	864.6	63,070	103,019	0	48,730	151,098	53,218	268,037	310
493	Cherokee	Columbus	1,188.5	82,625	145,589	0	86,066	202,977	108,859	423,139	356
499	Cherokee	Galena	738.5	55,640	126,433	0	42,193	133,998	24,551	248,817	337
508	Cherokee	Baxter Springs	857.5	60,230	100,465	0	48,223	144,225	41,023	249,941	291
103	Cheyenne	Cheylin	144.5	16,430	13,197	0	10,538	39,296	29,383	69,548	481
297	Cheyenne	St. Francis	311.0	26,425	23,414	0	15,452	62,539	50,727	116,017	373
219	Clark	Minneola	244.0	22,415	21,285	0	17,755	54,015	40,391	101,846	417
220	Clark	Ashland	204.5	20,270	23,414	0	16,675	48,538	35,834	96,193	470
379	Clay	Clay Center	1,327.2	85,905	95,357	0	81,824	209,232	88,980	352,066	265
333	Cloud	Concordia	1,054.7	72,955	117,493	0	89,917	184,217	84,000	364,365	345
334	Cloud	Southern Cloud	221.5	20,980	27,245	0	19,940	52,501	39,459	107,624	486
243	Coffey	Lebo-Waverly	578.1	43,630	48,530	0	33,398	111,426	51,766	177,324	307
244	Coffey	Burlington	836.0	60,145	63,004	0	72,708	153,061	0	195,857	234
245	Coffey	LeRoy-Gridley	270.5	23,390	23,414	0	20,815	57,287	46,682	114,301	423
300	Comanche	Comanche County	307.4	26,525	22,988	0	25,271	65,799	45,845	120,628	392
462	Cowley	Central	350.0	28,760	26,819	0	24,640	68,840	28,253	108,472	310
463	Cowley	Udall	368.7	29,245	24,265	0	28,599	69,484	27,816	109,925	298
465	Cowley	Winfield	2,415.0	145,270	253,292	0	166,745	363,334	140,782	706,088	292

3/7/2006			Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5	Col 6	Col 7	Col 8	Col 9
										Estimated	
USD			FTE Enroll		Est. At Risk		Est. Special		Estimated	Budget	Estimated
No.	County Name	USD Name	inc4yr at risk 9/20/2005	BSAPP \$50	Increase (19.3% to 26.8%)	High At Risk Districts	Education State Aid	2.5% of Estimated General Fund	State Aid Increase	Increase (Cols 2+3+4+5+7)	Amt Per Pupil (col 8 / col 1)
470	Cowley	Arkansas City	2,748.6	169,005	434,214	0	196,184	424,294	120,182	919,584	335
471	Cowley	Dexter	234.5	21,050	23,414	0	14,185	50,060	14,635	73,283	313
246	Crawford	Northeast	588.5	46,180	91,100	0	35,623	111,354	29,953	202,856	345
247	Crawford	Cherokee	784.5	58,770	85,991	0	48,574	141,621	51,306	244,641	312
248	Crawford	Girard	1,052.0	72,310	93,654	0	66,590	174,891	60,910	293,464	279
249	Crawford	Frontenac	743.0	52,375	57,895	0	38,961	124,906	34,711	183,943	248
250	Crawford	Pittsburg	2,542.2	152,830	398,030	0	164,361	381,705	219,843	935,064	368
294	Decatur	Oberlin	429.0	34,680	39,590	0	25,645	83,349	58,284	158,200	369
393	Dickinson	Solomon	405.8	32,550	36,610	0	23,270	77,426	37,079	129,508	319
435	Dickinson	Abilene	1,468.0	87,775	106,425	0	71,332	211,379	90,807	356,339	243
473	Dickinson	Chapman	963.7	69,275	64,281	0	51,937	165,126	91,884	277,377	288
481	Dickinson	Rural Vista	394.5	34,740	33,630	0	23,878	82,604	40,029	132,277	335
487	Dickinson	Herington	509.2	38,515	44,699	0	26,124	91,279	29,291	138,628	272
406	Doniphan	Wathena	380.0	29,865	24,265	0	23,871	71,148	27,380	105,381	277
425	Doniphan	Highland	238.0	22,055	10,643	0	22,562	54,328	27,665	82,925	348
429	Doniphan	Troy	367.5	29,415	28,522	0	25,726	74,578	24,366	108,029	294
433	Doniphan	Midway	197.0	19,785	14,474	0	19,421	48,456	38,929	92,610	470
486	Doniphan	Elwood	297.4	24,690	48,530	0	20,704	59,658	28,768	122,692	413
348	Douglas	Baldwin City	1,344.9	81,670	35,759	0	77,392	198,074	99,686	294,507	219
491	Douglas	Eudora	1,288.6	79,180	67,261	0	65,215	188,545	77,006	288,661	224
497	Douglas	Lawrence	9,855.4	546,260	694,317	0	821,930	1,412,824	1,153,578	3,216,085	326
347	Edwards	Kinsely-Offerle	308.5	27,130	36,185	0	26,672	68,010	48,826	138,813	450
502	Edwards	Lewis	119.0	14,755	17,454	0	12,198	36,060	26,383	70,790	595
282	Elk	West Elk	412.5	36,520	59,598	0	41,856	91,122	51,186	189,161	459
283	Elk	Elk Valley	192.0	19,670	32,779	0	24,175	49,328	24,005	100,629	524
388	Ellis	Ellis	377.6	29,965	27,245	0	26,871	72,300	47,425	131,506	348
432	Ellis	Victoria	259.3	22,400	6,386	0	19,351	53,511	39,252	87,388	337
489	Ellis	Hays	2,869.5	171,760	220,938	0	221,362	433,059	299,870	913,931	318
327	Ellsworth	Ellsworth	595.8	46,225	34,907	0	31,909	109,283	55,889	168,931	284
328	Ellsworth	Lorraine	452.3	36,740	50,658	0	23,760	86,706	68,852	180,010	398
363	Finney	Holcomb	874.6	61,940	85,566	0	40,136	146,492	90,762	278,404	318
457	Finney	Garden City	6,859.4	430,385	1,074,893	0	400,226	1,054,407	492,880	2,398,383	350
381	Ford	Spearville	343.0	26,690	14,900	0	23,048	64,109	21,023	85,661	250
443	Ford	Dodge City	5,630.0	374,370	1,085,109	651,129	363,004	950,904	332,838	2,806,451	498
459	Ford	Bucklin	245.5	22,765	26,819	0	19,289	54,870	42,430	111,303	453
287	Franklin	West Franklin	874.7	64,430	74,923	0	79,493	160,798	67,626	286,472	328
288	Franklin	Central Heights	600.1	48,060	39,164	0	43,941	116,196	41,517	172,682	288
289	Franklin	Wellsville	787.0	57,150	30,650	0	60,321	140,236	67,798	215,919	274
290	Franklin	Ottawa	2,380.5	134,430	231,155	0	131,284	327,312	138,010	634,879	267
475	Geary	Junction City	5,909.3	342,620	670,052	0	453,164	873,689	174,877	1,640,712	278
291	Gove	Grinnell	112.0	13,040	4,683	0	11,620	31,235	25,570	54,913	490
292	Gove	Grainfield	167.0	18,110	14,474	0	22,717	44,772	32,207	87,508	524
293	Gove	Quinter	319.0	27,095	14,474	0	35,025	68,388	31,077	107,671	338
281	Graham	Hill City	390.6	32,395	21,285	0	33,786	94,621	71,747	159,212	408
214	Grant	Ulysses	1,655.1	98,840	194,971	0	78,085	238,271	146,097	517,992	313
102	Gray	Cimarron-Ensign	632.6	49,915	60,449	0	42,087	120,549	65,698	218,149	345
371	Gray	Montezuma	250.9	23,040	23,414	0	12,993	55,380	38,182	97,628	389

3/7/2006			Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5	Col 6	Col 7	Col 8	Col 9
			FTE Enroll	BSAPP	Est. At Risk		Est. Special		Estimated	Estimated	
USD			inc4yr at risk		Increase	High At Risk	Education	2.5% of Estimated	State Aid	Increase	Estimated
No.	County Name	USD Name	9/20/2005	\$50	(19.3% to 26.8%)	Districts	State Aid	General Fund	Increase	(Cols 2+3+4+5+7)	Amt Per Pupil (col 8 / col 1)
476	Gray	Copeland	127.0	14,660	18,731	0	7,262	34,295	28,030	68,683	541
477	Gray	Ingalls	245.9	22,425	19,582	0	17,755	53,238	38,044	97,806	398
200	Greeley	Greeley County	252.3	24,095	24,691	0	14,794	56,079	40,149	103,728	411
386	Greenwood	Madison-Virgil	246.0	22,180	23,839	0	19,294	53,568	30,008	95,321	387
389	Greenwood	Eureka	639.4	51,100	55,767	0	59,549	126,315	61,352	227,767	356
390	Greenwood	Hamilton	101.5	11,875	13,197	0	13,935	29,646	22,352	61,359	605
494	Hamilton	Syracuse	459.0	38,790	63,004	0	23,274	91,459	62,178	187,245	408
361	Harper	Anthony-Harper	854.6	66,095	97,911	0	71,196	164,028	79,606	314,807	368
511	Harper	Attica	120.0	13,295	11,494	0	10,321	31,773	24,625	59,735	498
369	Harvey	Burrton	277.0	23,565	40,016	0	15,858	56,348	31,906	111,345	402
373	Harvey	Newton	3,433.7	196,995	388,664	0	215,629	490,601	189,624	990,913	289
439	Harvey	Sedgwick	528.5	39,295	28,522	0	27,751	93,563	24,830	120,397	228
440	Harvey	Halstead	706.9	53,285	59,172	0	45,675	128,162	61,510	219,642	311
460	Harvey	Hesston	763.0	54,000	31,928	0	48,594	129,881	62,909	197,431	259
374	Haskell	Sublette	495.4	40,950	74,072	0	21,393	95,266	56,841	193,256	390
507	Haskell	Satanta	377.5	33,950	49,381	0	20,636	79,406	8,412	112,379	298
227	Hodgeman	Jetmore	299.5	24,585	24,691	0	19,612	58,809	30,297	99,184	331
228	Hodgeman	Hanston	69.5	9,945	4,683	0	8,020	24,554	17,661	40,309	580
335	Jackson	North Jackson	404.0	34,445	22,988	0	20,391	80,807	27,778	105,602	261
336	Jackson	Holton	1,112.0	73,755	69,389	0	66,711	178,559	57,686	267,541	241
337	Jackson	Mayetta	926.7	67,070	82,160	0	61,608	163,929	41,228	252,066	272
338	Jefferson	Valley Halls	436.5	34,535	30,650	0	24,031	81,762	26,882	116,099	266
339	Jefferson	Jefferson County	478.2	38,365	17,028	0	31,838	91,525	32,849	120,079	251
340	Jefferson	Jefferson West	938.5	66,070	34,056	0	53,759	157,535	55,296	209,181	223
341	Jefferson	Oskaloosa	583.6	47,440	58,747	0	48,437	118,315	47,104	201,728	346
342	Jefferson	McLouth	541.3	42,925	32,353	0	43,895	105,126	49,383	168,556	311
343	Jefferson	Perry	956.5	68,270	54,064	0	62,683	164,933	93,795	278,812	291
104	Jewell	White Rock	98.5	12,925	7,237	0	8,281	30,244	21,016	49,459	502
278	Jewell	Mankato	207.0	19,670	18,731	0	6,349	45,498	21,923	66,672	322
279	Jewell	Jewell	143.0	17,545	15,325	0	9,784	41,827	28,229	70,883	496
229	Johnson	Blue Valley	18,975.2	1,093,530	142,610	0	1,205,653	2,665,733	2,090,413	4,532,205	239
230	Johnson	Spring Hill	1,639.8	91,450	55,341	0	105,626	231,846	132,661	385,078	235
231	Johnson	Gardner-Edgerton	3,648.5	207,135	168,152	0	253,928	515,108	332,509	961,724	264
232	Johnson	DeSoto	4,928.2	283,025	128,987	0	298,366	691,962	488,483	1,198,861	243
233	Johnson	Olathe	23,422.0	1,456,355	907,592	0	1,690,337	3,593,257	2,617,922	6,672,206	285
512	Johnson	Shawnee Mission	27,477.2	1,538,570	1,108,949	0	1,802,086	3,803,038	2,970,910	7,420,514	270
215	Kearny	Lakin	636.5	49,930	60,024	0	34,282	117,066	37,000	181,235	285
216	Kearny	Deerfield	335.3	29,430	54,490	0	17,994	69,542	39,704	141,617	422
331	Kingman	Kingman	1,064.0	74,735	93,228	0	90,341	187,369	110,206	368,510	346
332	Kingman	Cunningham	212.0	21,335	16,602	0	21,692	53,118	29,836	89,465	422
422	Kiowa	Greensburg	279.0	23,340	15,325	0	21,050	57,100	45,211	104,926	376
424	Kiowa	Mullinville	121.5	14,080	17,879	0	10,291	33,931	22,590	64,840	534
474	Kiowa	Haviland	176.0	17,030	18,305	0	11,876	40,845	32,812	80,024	455
503	Labette	Parsons	1,432.1	88,715	200,079	0	101,179	221,876	76,370	466,343	326
504	Labette	Oswego	468.5	37,435	55,341	0	29,307	89,831	23,489	145,571	311
505	Labette	Chetopa	560.5	42,800	85,140	0	26,018	105,112	28,337	182,295	325
506	Labette	Labette County	1,638.2	99,725	149,846	0	107,856	244,518	69,449	426,876	261

3/7/2006			Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5	Col 6	Col 7	Col 8	Col 9
			FTE Enroll		Est. At Risk		Est. Special		Estimated	Budget	Estimated
USD			inc4yr at risk	BSAPP	Increase	High At Risk	Education	2.5% of Estimated	State Aid	Increase	Amt Per Pupil
No.	County Name	USD Name	9/20/2005	\$50	(19.3% to 26.8%)	Districts	State Aid	General Fund	Increase	(Cols 2+3+4+5+7)	(col 8 / col 1)
468	Lane	Healy	104.0	12,300	10,217	0	13,156	30,382	17,864	53,537	515
482	Lane	Dighton	244.2	21,535	22,988	0	16,616	51,335	39,145	100,284	411
207	Leavenworth	Ft. Leavenworth	1,536.0	87,375	18,731	0	84,247	209,127	1,848	192,201	125
449	Leavenworth	Easton	691.1	52,195	27,245	0	53,706	127,335	56,359	189,505	274
453	Leavenworth	Leavenworth	3,940.2	223,415	501,475	0	282,317	565,734	264,394	1,271,601	323
458	Leavenworth	Basehor-Linwood	2,062.7	114,595	40,442	0	104,616	277,652	136,034	395,687	192
464	Leavenworth	Tonganoxie	1,640.7	91,235	64,281	0	85,849	222,109	105,513	346,877	211
469	Leavenworth	Lansing	2,150.5	115,790	50,233	0	97,805	278,320	117,379	381,207	177
298	Lincoln	Lincoln	362.7	29,845	38,313	0	25,815	71,547	48,565	142,537	393
299	Lincoln	Sylvan Grove	138.5	16,415	14,048	0	3,980	37,205	30,214	64,657	467
344	Linn	Pleasanton	408.5	32,605	53,638	0	21,922	79,415	23,814	131,980	323
346	Linn	Jayhawk	560.3	45,750	57,470	0	41,480	109,149	56,011	200,711	358
362	Linn	Prairie View	998.6	72,065	72,369	0	91,508	178,807	129,431	365,373	366
274	Logan	Oakley	410.0	33,265	41,293	0	47,554	85,522	71,951	194,062	473
275	Logan	Triplains	83.6	9,625	10,217	0	6,622	22,074	12,865	39,329	470
251	Lyon	North Lyon Co.	555.7	46,315	38,313	0	41,259	111,733	57,509	183,395	330
252	Lyon	Southern Lyon Co.	586.0	45,180	42,144	0	42,267	109,260	58,017	187,608	320
253	Lyon	Emporia	4,592.9	285,645	725,819	0	246,363	707,170	262,895	1,520,721	331
397	Marion	Centre	283.0	25,380	24,265	0	25,606	62,618	48,227	123,478	436
398	Marion	Peabody-Burns	390.1	33,110	39,590	0	41,202	83,039	40,936	154,839	397
408	Marion	Marion	631.0	47,855	48,530	0	60,716	122,049	55,718	212,820	337
410	Marion	Durham-Hills	668.9	49,655	38,313	0	64,904	125,370	60,944	213,816	320
411	Marion	Goessel	270.0	23,795	14,900	0	27,415	58,899	25,922	92,032	341
364	Marshall	Marysville	754.2	56,310	46,827	0	59,095	139,311	97,094	259,326	344
380	Marshall	Vermillion	541.7	44,135	33,630	0	28,049	103,834	49,087	154,902	286
488	Marshall	Axtell	313.5	25,635	17,454	0	17,411	60,525	35,569	96,069	306
498	Marshall	Valley Heights	379.9	31,890	32,353	0	34,457	78,540	35,740	134,440	354
400	McPherson	Smoky Valley	1,006.6	68,840	53,213	0	67,142	167,464	90,079	279,274	277
418	McPherson	McPherson	2,369.9	130,895	152,401	0	164,029	327,244	227,867	675,191	285
419	McPherson	Canton-Galva	400.4	32,525	25,968	0	31,917	78,886	46,805	137,214	343
423	McPherson	Moundridge	415.0	32,260	13,197	0	29,810	77,720	62,456	137,723	332
448	McPherson	Inman	422.5	34,250	14,900	0	31,178	82,402	47,001	127,329	301
225	Meade	Fowler	179.0	17,590	25,968	0	11,625	41,693	35,084	90,267	504
226	Meade	Meade	478.2	37,550	37,036	0	30,245	89,964	62,680	167,511	350
367	Miami	Osawatomie	1,185.0	77,200	146,015	0	78,973	192,649	76,145	378,333	319
368	Miami	Paola	2,004.7	114,795	105,999	0	146,842	286,439	166,890	534,526	267
416	Miami	Louisburg	1,472.3	87,490	39,590	0	109,738	216,152	165,172	401,990	273
272	Mitchell	Waconda	348.4	29,560	33,205	0	18,842	69,929	49,948	131,554	378
273	Mitchell	Beloit	748.7	54,505	47,678	0	73,754	136,600	76,418	252,355	337
436	Montgomery	Caney	817.5	61,090	70,241	0	46,211	145,111	44,090	221,632	271
445	Montgomery	Coffeyville	1,797.3	122,285	321,829	0	138,790	307,805	147,394	730,299	406
446	Montgomery	Independence	1,890.7	109,710	231,581	0	111,630	271,075	118,930	571,851	302
447	Montgomery	Cherryvale	680.6	49,630	74,072	0	35,611	118,177	33,375	192,688	283
417	Morris	Morris County	837.0	63,565	82,160	0	75,200	157,615	90,879	311,804	373
217	Morton	Rolla	198.5	20,220	25,542	0	12,268	47,267	11,128	69,158	348
218	Morton	Elkhart	661.8	50,695	59,172	0	28,551	117,516	86,989	225,407	341
441	Nemaha	Sabetha	906.5	64,040	51,084	0	46,710	155,350	69,055	230,889	255

3/7/2006			Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5	Col 6	Col 7	Col 8	Col 9
										Estimated	
USD			FTE Enroll		Est. At Risk		Est. Special		Estimated	Budget	Estimated
No.	County Name	USD Name	inc4yr at risk 9/20/2005	BSAPP \$50	Increase (19.3% to 26.8%)	High At Risk Districts	Education State Aid	2.5% of Estimated General Fund	State Aid Increase	Increase (Cols 2+3+4+5+7)	Amt Per Pupil (col 8 / col 1)
442	Nemaha	Nemaha Valley	498.4	38,485	23,414	0	27,547	91,601	49,244	138,690	278
451	Nemaha	B & B	208.0	21,085	9,365	0	10,335	48,624	19,196	59,982	288
101	Neosho	Erie-St. Paul	696.5	71,395	66,835	0	96,241	182,102	73,708	308,179	442
413	Neosho	Chanute	1,831.4	103,405	195,822	0	154,358	268,494	85,278	538,863	294
106	Ness	Western Plains	191.5	19,060	18,305	0	14,635	50,658	36,977	88,977	465
303	Ness	Ness City	272.6	22,780	16,602	0	18,881	54,467	42,876	101,140	371
211	Norton	Norton	673.6	48,865	51,084	0	57,951	121,302	46,133	204,033	303
212	Norton	Northern Valley	180.0	18,925	19,582	0	15,374	45,758	25,817	79,699	443
213	Norton	West Solomon	58.0	7,295	5,960	0	6,607	17,450	11,463	31,325	540
420	Osage	Osage City	727.5	51,895	55,341	0	59,518	128,367	46,702	213,456	293
421	Osage	Lyndon	447.0	34,970	28,522	0	35,685	84,991	39,849	139,026	311
434	Osage	Santa Fe	1,204.8	82,145	88,546	0	101,388	206,987	70,420	342,498	284
454	Osage	Burlingame	332.0	27,030	23,839	0	28,626	66,481	23,502	102,997	310
456	Osage	Marais Des Cygnes	258.7	24,015	40,016	0	21,202	58,121	35,274	120,507	466
392	Osborne	Osborne	352.7	30,970	36,610	0	35,039	76,478	38,089	140,708	399
239	Ottawa	North Ottawa Co.	550.5	42,290	42,144	0	34,202	102,165	59,834	178,470	324
240	Ottawa	Twin Valley	633.7	47,855	40,016	0	32,639	113,556	46,953	167,463	264
495	Pawnee	Ft. Larned	918.8	65,290	88,120	0	74,692	169,363	81,308	309,409	337
496	Pawnee	Pawnee Heights	178.5	18,130	14,474	0	17,050	45,184	31,530	81,183	455
324	Phillips	Eastern Heights	150.0	15,960	15,325	0	12,412	38,107	21,600	65,297	435
325	Phillips	Phillipsburg	632.5	47,190	48,956	0	51,304	116,209	52,065	199,515	315
326	Phillips	Logan	183.5	18,345	15,325	0	16,870	44,227	29,443	79,984	436
320	Pottawatomie	Wamego	1,280.6	81,065	66,835	0	95,048	200,874	89,212	332,160	259
321	Pottawatomie	Kaw Valley	1,085.0	73,920	71,092	0	110,336	188,722	100,168	355,516	328
322	Pottawatomie	Onaga	360.5	30,365	28,522	0	20,102	71,896	35,628	114,617	318
323	Pottawatomie	Westmoreland	777.0	57,485	49,381	0	52,107	138,368	51,183	210,157	270
382	Pratt	Pratt	1,177.8	76,165	108,554	0	85,756	190,845	100,415	370,889	315
438	Pratt	Skyline	352.5	33,220	26,819	0	26,079	79,577	38,914	125,032	355
105	Rawlins	Rawlins County	341.5	29,395	30,225	0	19,149	85,656	66,343	145,111	425
308	Reno	Hutchinson	4,542.1	263,060	685,803	0	265,780	650,324	293,335	1,507,978	332
309	Reno	Nickerson	1,131.1	77,715	144,738	0	83,085	194,350	117,101	422,639	374
310	Reno	Fairfield	373.6	32,065	44,273	0	40,243	80,935	67,395	183,975	492
311	Reno	Pretty Prairie	289.0	24,780	15,325	0	20,419	59,557	32,182	92,706	321
312	Reno	Haven	1,055.7	72,840	83,863	0	80,631	179,651	93,053	330,386	313
313	Reno	Buhler	2,129.5	123,100	127,710	0	155,921	305,253	173,261	579,991	272
426	Republic	Pike Valley	257.5	23,465	29,799	0	21,813	57,484	30,491	105,568	410
427	Republic	Belleville	439.5	35,810	34,482	0	40,217	88,445	55,313	165,822	377
455	Republic	Hillcrest	96.5	12,730	11,068	0	9,959	30,270	24,165	57,922	600
376	Rice	Sterling	501.7	39,005	47,678	0	44,219	96,405	51,003	181,906	363
401	Rice	Chase	163.3	16,545	23,414	0	15,129	40,084	32,253	87,341	535
405	Rice	Lyons	827.5	61,830	141,332	0	69,567	155,015	65,568	338,297	409
444	Rice	Little River	285.0	24,275	16,602	0	26,611	59,699	48,393	115,881	407
378	Riley	Riley County	628.0	48,830	25,542	0	36,163	116,255	44,120	154,655	246
383	Riley	Manhattan	4,913.7	282,280	359,717	0	369,366	712,534	553,870	1,565,233	319
384	Riley	Blue Valley	219.1	22,605	13,622	0	18,308	54,129	30,901	85,436	390
269	Rooks	Palco	147.5	15,705	15,325	0	15,476	38,433	25,007	71,513	485
270	Rooks	Plainville	391.8	30,780	31,076	0	31,758	75,731	52,797	146,411	374

3/7/2006		Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5	Col 6	Col 7	Col 8	Col 9	
USD		FTE Enroll	BSAPP	Est. At Risk	Est. Special	Estimated	Budget	Estimated			
No.	County Name	USD Name	inc4yr at risk 9/20/2005	\$50	Increase (19.3% to 26.8%)	High At Risk Districts	Education State Aid	2.5% of Estimated General Fund	State Aid Increase	Increase (Cols 2+3+4+5+7)	Amt Per Pupil (col 8 / col 1)
271	Rooks	Stockton	344.0	28,405	31,502	0	30,100	69,798	37,526	127,532	371
395	Rush	LaCrosse	318.5	26,290	28,522	0	26,505	63,685	49,683	131,000	411
403	Rush	Otis-Bison	218.3	21,310	18,305	0	22,967	51,925	42,571	105,153	482
399	Russell	Paradise	133.5	15,255	13,197	0	12,722	36,650	24,925	66,098	495
407	Russell	Russell	989.5	68,180	92,803	0	63,673	165,988	97,480	322,136	326
305	Saline	Salina	7,066.2	399,285	808,404	0	501,728	1,018,748	571,868	2,281,285	323
306	Saline	Southeast of Saline	691.4	52,585	29,373	0	33,231	123,363	102,197	217,386	314
307	Saline	Ell-Saline	453.5	36,335	21,285	0	21,527	86,129	34,348	113,494	250
466	Scott	Scott County	900.7	66,785	91,100	0	42,443	159,005	129,043	329,370	366
259	Sedgwick	Wichita	45,497.2	2,866,135	8,552,313	5,131,452	3,409,604	7,414,058	4,089,668	24,049,172	529
260	Sedgwick	Derby	6,334.2	357,295	477,635	0	406,989	883,267	413,654	1,655,573	261
261	Sedgwick	Haysville	4,426.9	251,240	367,805	0	290,717	629,984	174,376	1,084,138	245
262	Sedgwick	Valley Center	2,424.2	134,970	122,176	0	134,333	331,935	128,661	520,140	215
263	Sedgwick	Mulvane	1,858.8	103,595	88,120	0	111,960	253,497	74,376	378,051	203
264	Sedgwick	Clearwater	1,234.3	83,900	50,233	0	69,252	201,715	102,374	305,758	248
265	Sedgwick	Goddard	4,277.4	238,935	128,136	0	204,465	578,203	244,204	815,739	191
266	Sedgwick	Maize	5,867.3	332,810	126,007	0	301,503	804,648	345,650	1,105,970	188
267	Sedgwick	Renwick	1,932.5	108,285	46,401	0	106,066	264,333	117,138	377,890	196
268	Sedgwick	Cheney	752.0	53,675	29,373	0	38,256	126,933	44,290	165,593	220
480	Seward	Liberal	4,215.7	260,145	785,417	471,250	146,886	632,411	253,336	1,917,034	455
483	Seward	Kismet-Plains	685.0	59,310	105,574	0	44,900	144,246	114,917	324,701	474
345	Shawnee	Seaman	3,329.9	185,470	169,003	0	251,913	466,859	294,402	900,788	271
372	Shawnee	Silver Lake	727.8	52,270	21,285	0	50,749	127,252	47,112	171,417	236
437	Shawnee	Auburn Washburn	5,096.0	287,085	257,123	0	349,241	712,087	577,587	1,471,036	289
450	Shawnee	Shawnee Heights	3,370.6	193,730	164,746	0	203,441	473,070	241,669	803,585	238
501	Shawnee	Topeka	12,607.4	743,840	2,300,483	1,380,417	1,021,818	1,972,730	992,363	6,438,922	511
412	Sheridan	Hoxie	324.5	26,615	19,157	0	32,432	66,055	54,385	132,589	409
352	Sherman	Goodland	944.0	68,400	98,762	0	57,363	165,197	103,118	327,644	347
237	Smith	Smith Center	426.5	36,045	33,205	0	40,707	88,953	55,785	165,741	389
238	Smith	West Smith Co.	179.0	18,380	20,859	0	16,674	44,308	22,835	78,748	440
349	Stafford	Stafford	305.5	25,510	42,144	0	22,419	62,542	32,370	122,443	401
350	Stafford	St. John-Hudson	395.8	32,725	39,590	0	29,452	79,372	45,988	147,755	373
351	Stafford	Macksville	289.0	24,925	36,610	0	20,395	61,327	47,990	129,920	450
452	Stanton	Stanton County	454.4	38,920	59,598	0	25,754	91,482	48,521	172,792	380
209	Stevens	Moscow	211.2	22,845	32,779	0	13,212	53,220	5,673	74,509	353
210	Stevens	Hugoton	1,001.4	70,120	122,602	0	46,908	165,969	70,583	310,212	310
353	Sumner	Wellington	1,638.0	100,720	187,734	0	123,628	256,325	94,685	506,767	309
356	Sumner	Conway Springs	558.1	42,745	25,968	0	32,245	101,904	32,084	133,041	238
357	Sumner	Belle Plaine	758.5	57,375	74,923	0	69,458	141,917	34,470	236,226	311
358	Sumner	Oxford	381.7	31,725	28,096	0	33,521	77,980	27,137	120,479	316
359	Sumner	Argonia	204.0	19,675	12,771	0	20,585	47,951	24,644	77,675	381
360	Sumner	Caldwell	276.1	24,175	31,502	0	25,655	58,864	30,977	112,309	407
509	Sumner	South Haven	244.5	21,645	19,157	0	20,257	52,057	24,183	85,242	349
314	Thomas	Brewster	125.8	13,765	8,514	0	16,012	32,576	26,356	64,647	514
315	Thomas	Colby	987.3	70,130	81,734	0	67,509	171,412	99,347	318,720	323
316	Thomas	Golden Plains	188.1	18,915	27,245	0	22,839	47,073	26,139	95,138	506
208	Trego	WaKeeney	398.0	31,570	26,393	0	26,515	76,737	64,046	148,525	373

3/7/2006			Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5	Col 6	Col 7	Col 8	Col 9
USD			FTE Enroll		Est. At Risk		Est. Special		Estimated	Budget	Estimated
No.	County Name	USD Name	inc4yr at risk 9/20/2005	BSAPP \$50	Increase (19.3% to 26.8%)	High At Risk Districts	Education State Aid	2.5% of Estimated General Fund	State Aid Increase	Increase (Cols 2+3+4+5+7)	Amt Per Pupil (col 8 / col 1)
329	Wabaunsee	Alma	452.0	37,940	20,434	0	38,029	91,200	65,201	161,604	358
330	Wabaunsee	Wabaunsee East	523.0	43,350	41,293	0	41,019	105,331	67,767	193,428	370
241	Wallace	Wallace	204.0	20,610	20,859	0	16,891	49,031	38,821	97,182	476
242	Wallace	Weskan	119.0	13,755	11,068	0	10,478	32,363	21,889	57,190	481
221	Washington	North Central	111.5	12,760	8,940	0	12,968	30,953	24,184	58,852	528
222	Washington	Washington	353.5	28,095	24,691	0	22,993	67,697	26,263	102,042	289
223	Washington	Barnes	387.1	32,220	23,414	0	27,279	77,613	50,205	133,117	344
224	Washington	Clifton-Clyde	304.6	26,330	24,265	0	25,291	63,985	42,013	117,898	387
467	Wichita	Leoti	456.4	40,155	47,678	0	23,415	93,636	72,652	183,901	403
387	Wilson	Altoona-Midway	267.5	23,925	29,799	0	23,083	58,091	42,271	119,078	445
461	Wilson	Neodesha	742.0	54,145	73,220	0	48,963	131,128	43,626	219,955	296
484	Wilson	Fredonia	742.5	55,845	82,160	0	52,415	135,961	67,013	257,433	347
366	Woodson	Woodson	437.5	39,060	50,658	0	45,695	97,667	50,195	185,608	424
202	Wyandotte	Turner	3,660.5	209,160	427,403	0	244,676	523,495	210,367	1,091,606	298
203	Wyandotte	Piper	1,408.0	83,950	24,265	0	81,786	203,435	138,946	328,946	234
204	Wyandotte	Bonner Springs	2,191.5	123,365	162,617	0	135,804	305,895	167,237	589,024	269
500	Wyandotte	Kansas City	18,877.5	1,187,490	4,022,865	2,413,719	1,254,751	3,034,326	1,249,704	10,128,530	537
TOTALS			442,821.4	28,430,755	43,180,028	10,047,967	30,337,957	70,630,847	38,168,293	150,165,000	339

7-10