Approved: March 5, 2008
Date

MINUTES OF THE HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Clay Aurand at 9:05 A.M. on February 22, 2008 in Room 313-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except:
Owen Donohoe- excused
Marti Crow- excused

Committee staff present:
Theresa Kiernan, Office of Revisor of Statutes
Dianne Rosell, Office of Revisor of Statutes
Dale Dennis, Kansas State Department of Education
Martha Dorsey, Kansas Legislative Research Department
Sharon Wenger, Kansas Legislative Research Department
Janet Henning, Committee Assistant

HB 2778: Screening and treatment for dyslexia and related disorders

Representative Rhoades moved that the Committee prepare a Resolution regarding the screening and treatment for dyslexia and related disorders and direct this to the Kansas State Department of Education. The motion was seconded by Representative Storm. The motion carried. Chairman Aurand recommended Representative Rhoades develop a resolution dealing with issues surrounding dyslexia and bring that resolution back to the Committee.

HB 2734: School districts; consolidation, state financial aid

Theresa Kiernan, Office of the Revisor of Statutes, gave an explanation of **HB 2734** to Committee members.

Chairman Aurand moved for a technical amendment which would provide a school district desiring to consolidate with another district with fewer than 150 students, a guaranteed combined general fund budget for two years. If a district has more than 150 students but fewer than 200 students, the general fund budgets would be guaranteed for four years. For a district with more than 200 students, the combined general fund budgets would be guaranteed for five years. The motion was seconded by Representative Horst. After a discussion among Committee members, the motion carried. Representative Faber requested his vote of "no" be recorded.

Chairman Aurand moved the previous amendment would not take effect until the 2010 - 2011 school year. The motion was seconded by Representative Otto. The motion carried. Representative Faber requested his vote of "no" be recorded.

Representative Storm moved that **HB 2734** be passed favorably as amended. The motion was seconded by Representative Horst. The motion carried. Representative Faber requested his vote of "no" be recorded.

HB 2760: School districts; consolidation; low enrollment weighting

Theresa Kiernan, Office of the Revisor of Statutes, gave an explanation of **HB 2760** to Committee members.

Representative Faber moved to amend the bill to exempt districts that had more than 200 square miles and fewer than 75 students so their funding wouldn't be lowered. The motion was seconded by Representative Powers. The motion failed. Division was called and the vote was 6 - yes and 10 - no.

MINUTES OF THE House Education Committee at 9:05 A.M. on February 22, 2008 in Room 313-S of the Capitol.

Chairman Aurand made a motion that would amend the bill to not take effect until the 2010 - 2011 school year. The motion was seconded by Representative Horst. The motion carried.

Representative Huebert moved for the Legislative Post Audit to look at the Augenblick and Myers study to update and then make recommendations related to the study. The motion was seconded by Representative Colloton. After a discussion, Representative Huebert withdrew the motion.

Representative Otto moved that **HB 2760** be passed favorably as amended. The motion was seconded by Representative Horst. The motion carried.

HB 2605: School finance; high density at-risk formula; linear transition Calculation

Theresa Kiernan gave an explanation of **HB 2605** to Committee members.

A memorandum which included a computer printout that compared the current at-risk high-density at-risk for 2007 - 08 and 2008 - 09 with changes in computing the high-density at-risk was distributed to Committee members. . (Attachment 1)

Scott Frank, Legislative Post Audit, also distributed a cost study analysis to Committee members which had been prepared by their department. (Attachment 2)

Chairman Aurand moved for an amendment which would increase the high-density at-risk weighting for districts with over 55% at-risk pupils, by a factor of .01 in school year 2008 - 09 and for districts with high-density at-risk enrollments of 44% or fewer at-risk pupils, the multiplier would be '0'. This would be revenue neutral. The motion was seconded by Representative Colloton. The motion carried. The following requested their vote of "no" be recorded: Representatives Palmer, Trimmer, Horst, Otto, and Powers.

Representative Palmer requested to be on record as speaking on behalf of USD 234, which is Fort Scott, they would definitely be a loser so she would be opposed to this.

Representative Flaherty moved to add the $2 million to hold harmless as earlier testimony indicated this is what would be needed. Representative Trimmer seconded the motion. The motion failed.

Representative Storm moved that **HB 2605** be passed favorably as amended. The motion was seconded by Representative Craft. The motion carried. A division was called with 13 'yes' and 5 'no'. The following requested their vote of "no" be recorded: Representatives Trimmer, Palmer, Horst, Otto, and Powers.

Representative Horst announced the House Education Sub-committee would meet on Monday, February 25, 2008 at 9:00 am in the Old Supreme Court Room (313-S).

The meeting was adjourned at 10:28 A.M. The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, February 26, 2008.

Kansas state department of Education

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

February 8, 2008

TO: Rep. Clay Aurand

FROM: Dale M. Dennis, Deputy Commissioner of Education

SUBJECT: High-Density At-risk

Attached is a computer printout (SF8020) which compares the current at-risk and high-density at-risk for 2007-08 and 2008-09 and 2008-09 with changes in computing the high-density at-risk.

The computer printout provides a linear transition for school districts that have 44 to 55 percent free lunch students with a cap of 11 percent for those districts with over 55 percent free lunch students.

Please review the column explanation below carefully.

COLUMN EXPLANATION

Column 1 -- September 20, 2007 Estimated FTE enrollment

2 -- 2007-08 Percentage of free lunch applications

3 -- 2007-08 Estimated at-risk and high-density at-risk state aid

4 -- 2008-09 Estimated at-risk and high-density at-risk state aid under current law

5 -- 2008-09 Estimated at-risk and high-density at-risk utilizing a linear transition for school districts with 44 to 55 percent free lunch applications and a cap of 11 percent for those districts with 55 percent or higher free lunch applications.

h:leg:Aurand—SF8020—2-8-08

House Education Committee
Date 2-22-08
Attachment # 1

			Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5
USD No.	County Name	USD Name	2007-08 FTE Enrollment (includes MILT)	2007-08 Pct of Free Lunch	2007-08 Current At Risk & High Density Aid	2008-09 Est. Current At Risk & High Density Aid	2008-09 Est. At Risk & Linear High Density Aid
256	Allen	Marmaton Valley	332.0	31.56%	181,958	222,537	222,537
257	Allen	Iola	1,439.1	42.25%	1,138,115	1,390,632	1,228,828
258	Allen	Humboldt	508.5	30.48%	256,316	313,413	313,413
365	Anderson	Garnett	1,109.8	30.87%	576,931	705,290	705,290
479	Anderson	Crest	230.0	31.34%	124,222	151,609	151,609
377	Atchison	Atchison County	692.0	23.00%	267,689	327,599	327,599
409	Atchison	Atchison	1,583.1	48.58%	1,439,921	1,759,014	1,710,784
254	Barber	Barber Co.	527.0	20.50%	188,519	230,516	230,516
255	Barber	South Barber Co.	220.0	29.77%	114,161	139,640	139,640
354	Barton	Claflin	252.0	11.86%	52,925	64,722	64,722
355	Barton	Ellinwood	425.5	24.56%	183,708	224,310	224,310
428	Barton	Great Bend	2,989.1	48.04%	2,701,820	3,300,812	3,175,345
431	Barton	Hoisington	598.5	27.20%	277,749	339,568	339,568
234	Bourbon	Ft. Scott	1,909.4	40.13%	1,435,984	1,754,581	1,550,663
235	Bourbon	Uniontown	452.5	41.28%	363,042	443,743	392,321
415	Brown	Hiawatha	892.9	32.25%	476,329	582,053	582,053
430	Brown	Brown County	635.5	44.19%	537,565	656,527	582,697
205	Butler	Bluestem	633.5	20.49%	226,573	277,063	277,063
206	Butler	Remington-Whitewater	537.0	16.76%	148,716	181,753	181,753
375	Butler	Circle	1,593.2	15.69%	413,343	505,362	505,362
385	Butler	Andover	4,296.3	6.12%	434,776	531,517	531,517
394	Butler	Rose Hill	1,706.9	14.41%	406,782	497,383	497,383
396	Butler	Douglass	796.6	16.56%	224,824	274,846	274,846
402	Butler	Augusta	2,166.3	25.48%	912,854	1,115,786	1,115,786
490	Butler	El Dorado	2,074.0	34.62%	1,187,104	1,451,364	1,451,364
492	Butler	Flinthills	277.5	21.50%	112,412	137,423	137,423
284	Chase	Chase County	438.0	24.98%	181,958	222,537	222,537
285	Chautauqua	Cedar Vale	138.0	36.10%	87,480	107,279	107,279
286	Chautauqua	Chautauqua	381.0	35.45%	233,134	285,042	285,042
404	Cherokee	Riverton	814.7	36.41%	529,254	646,775	646,775
493	Cherokee	Columbus	1,158.5	37.38%	716,024	875,074	875,074
499	Cherokee	Galena	722.0	53.02%	796,068	958,858	941,958
508	Cherokee	Baxter Springs	913.7	45.17%	765,887	935,363	848,228
103	Cheyenne	Cheylin	143.0	46.21%	125,534	153,382	142,214
297	Cheyenne	St. Francis	307.5	24.48%	127,283	155,598	155,598
219	Clark	Minneola	277.0	19.13%	87,480	107,279	107,279
220	Clark	Ashland	208.5	27.93%	102,352	125,454	125,454
379	Clay	Clay Center	1,371.6	21.80%	494,262	604,218	604,218
333	Cloud	Concordia	1,053.8	36.91%	648,227	792,620	792,620
334	Cloud	Southern Cloud	242.4	44.40%	191,144	233,176	208,068
243	Coffey	Lebo-Waverly	558.5	26.24%	244,507	299,228	299,228
244	Coffey	Burlington	828.5	24.66%	340,735	416,259	416,259
245	Coffey	LeRoy-Gridley	262.0	29.72%	133,844	163,578	163,578
300	Comanche	Commanche County	319.7	26.27%	139,093	169,784	169,784
462	Cowley	Central	348.5	28.69%	165,337	202,145	202,145
463	Cowley	Udall	395.7	18.34%	120,722	147,619	147,619
465	Cowley	Winfield	2,397.1	33.81%	1,344,130	1,643,313	1,643,313
470	Cowley	Arkansas City	2,762.1	52.32%	2,958,136	3,561,472	3,453,857
471	Cowley	Dexter	188.8	23.09%	79,169	97,083	97,083
246	Crawford	Northeast	554.5	47.03%	505,634	617,517	581,968
247	Crawford	Cherokee	738.5	32.59%	433,026	529,744	529,744
248	Crawford	Girard	1,008.5	30.86%	524,005	641,012	641,012
249	Crawford	Frontenac	789.0	24.98%	328,925	402,073	402,073
250	Crawford	Pittsburg	2,567.8	52.61%	2,781,864	3,349,575	3,267,362

			Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5
			2007-08	2007-08	2007-08	2008-09 Est.	2008-09 Est.
USD			FTE Enrollment	Pct of Free	Current At Risk &	Current At Risk &	At Risk & Linear
No.	County Name	USD Name	(includes MILT)	Lunch	High Density Aid	High Density Aid	High Density Aid
294	Decatur	Oberlin	393.3	28.50%	193,331	236,722	236,722
393	Dickinson	Solomon	402.1	23.05%	158,776	194,165	194,165
435	Dickinson	Abilene	1,567.9	21.07%	540,626	660,960	660,960
473	Dickinson	Chapman	940.7	20.74%	327,175	400,300	400,300
481	Dickinson	Rural Vista	420.5	24.67%	176,710	216,330	216,330
487	Dickinson	Herington	512.3	30.26%	256,316	313,413	313,413
406	Doniphan	Wathena	408.0	20.10%	135,594	165,794	165,794
425	Doniphan	Highland	235.5	22.01%	86,168	105,062	105,062
429	Doniphan	Troy	361.5	19.76%	124,222	151,609	151,609
433	Doniphan	Midway	185.0	21.58%	67,797	82,897	82,897
486	Doniphan	Elwood	318.8	48.31%	288,247	351,980	340,621
348	Douglas	Baldwin City	1,338.8	10.58%	236,633	289,032	289,032
491	Douglas	Eudora	1,362.9	19.37%	436,525	533,733	533,733
497	Douglas	Lawrence	10,316.6	22.84%	3,895,484	4,762,372	4,762,372
347	Edwards	Kinsely-Offerle	331.5	32.88%	180,209	220,320	220,320
502	Edwards	Lewis	103.5	37.66%	74,358	90,877	90,877
282	Elk	West Elk	358.0	36.78%	228,323	278,836	278,836
283	Elk	Elk Valley	179.6	39.40%	130,783	159,588	159,588
388	Ellis	Ellis	355.7	12.91%	79,169	97,083	97,083
432	Ellis	Victoria	258.5	6.95%	29,743	36,351	36,351
489	Ellis	Hays	2,835.6	24.44%	1,145,988	1,400,828	1,400,828
327	Ellsworth	Ellsworth	579.5	19.48%	188,519	230,516	230,516
328	Ellsworth	Lorraine	483.1	27.94%	223,074	273,073	273,073
363	Finney	Holcomb	823.0	33.00%	457,958	559,888	559,888
457	Finney	Garden City	6,834.0	50.62%	7,088,942	8,535,298	8,016,418
381	Ford	Spearville	351.5	10.53%	61,236	74,918	74,918
443	Ford	Dodge City	5,485.1	60.23%	6,826,939	8,220,112	8,367,952
459	Ford	Bucklin	237.0	32.87%	132,095	161,805	161,805
287	Franklin	West Franklin	731.5	25.21%	350,357	428,671	428,671
288	Franklin	Central Heights	577.5	28.78%	267,689	327,599	327,599
289	Franklin	Wellsville	828.0	15.33%	209,952	256,671	256,671
290	Franklin	Ottawa	2,414.7	34.17%	1,364,251	1,667,695	1,667,695
475	Geary	Junction City	6,985.9	34.07%	3,934,850	4,811,135	4,811,135
291	Gove	Grinnell	91.5	5.99%	11,372	14,186	14,186
292	Gove	Grainfield	132.0	18.69%	44,615	54,526	54,526
293	Gove	Quinter	296.5	14.48%	76,108	93,093	93,093
281	Graham	Graham County	381.4	17.76%	115,911	141,413	141,413
214	Grant	Ulysses	1,622.5	43.06%	1,317,886	1,610,066	1,422,993
102	Gray	Cimarron-Ensign	653.5	28.85%	309,242	378,135	378,135
371	Gray	Montezuma	242.6	22.17%	87,480	107,279	107,279
476	Gray	Copeland	133.8	47.99%	115,911	141,856	136,420
477	Gray	Ingalls	255.0	41.18%	196,830	240,269	212,341
200	Greeley	Greeley County	236.8	28.70%	114,161	139,640	139,640
386	Greenwood	Madison-Virgil	233.1	20.99%	84,418	103,289	103,289
389	Greenwood	Eureka	607.9	35.63%	368,728	450,836	450,836
390	Greenwood	Hamilton	93.0	40.58%	78,732	96,196	85,114
494	Hamilton	Syracuse	457.0	39.39%	363,042	443,743	392,321
361	Harper	Anthony-Harper	831.8	37.64%	524,005	641,012	641,012
511	Harper	Attica	128.0	39.06%	82,669	101,072	101,072
369	Harvey	Burrton	241.0	32.70%	137,344	167,567	167,567
373	Harvey	Newton	3,462.3	37.09%	2,123,140	2,595,522	2,595,522
439	Harvey	Sedgwick	529.5	19.45%	170,149	208,351	208,351
440	Harvey	Halstead	750.1	17.16%	220,012	268,640	268,640
460	Harvey	Hesston	801.1	13.61%	180,209	220,320	220,320

USD No.	County Name	USD Name	Col 1 2007-08 FTE Enrollment (includes MILT)	Col 2 2007-08 Pct of Free Lunch	Col 3 2007-08 Current At Risk & High Density Aid	Col 4 2008-09 Est. Current At Risk & High Density Aid	Col 5 2008-09 Est. At Risk & Linear High Density Aid
374	Haskell	Sublette	497.2	39.02%	320,614	392,321	392,321
507	Haskell	Satanta	340.0	41.76%	284,747	347,547	307,207
227	Hodgeman	Jetmore	276.0	26.25%	124,222	151,609	151,609
228	Hodgeman	Hanston	72.0	24.00%	29,743	36,351	36,351
335	Jackson	North Jackson	397.0	18.89%	125,534	153,825	153,825
336	Jackson	Holton	1,089.0	18.47%	335,486	410,496	410,496
337	Jackson	Mayetta	953.5	29.49%	453,146	553,682	553,682
338	Jefferson	Valley Halls	417.0	15.11%	105,851	129,444	129,444
339	Jefferson	Jefferson County	486.5	19.66%	160,526	195,939	195,939
340	Jefferson	Jefferson West	925.1	12.63%	193,331	236,722	236,722
341	Jefferson	Oskaloosa	548.0	31.65%	302,681	369,712	369,712
342	Jefferson	McLouth	536.5	21.12%	188,519	230,516	230,516
343	Jefferson	Perry	942.6	18.38%	287,809	351,537	351,537
107	Jewell	Rock Hills	266.5	22.22%	114,161	139,640	139,640
279	Jewell	Jewell	116.0	19.50%	41,553	50,536	50,536
229	Johnson	Blue Valley	19,823.8	2.52%	824,936	1,008,508	1,008,508
230	Johnson	Spring Hill	1,795.0	10.81%	320,614	392,321	392,321
231	Johnson	Gardner-Edgerton	4,137.8	16.48%	1,127,617	1,378,663	1,378,663
232	Johnson	DeSoto	5,718.9	8.62%	815,314	996,538	996,538
233	Johnson	Olathe	24,798.7	13.23%	5,426,384	6,634,428	6,634,428
512	Johnson	Shawnee Mission	27,013.3	15.89%	7,190,419	8,791,082	8,791,082
215	Kearny	Lakin	615.5	34.23%	352,107	430,444	430,444
216	Kearny	Deerfield	290.0	50.53%	321,052	387,001	362,851
331	Kingman	Kingman	1,048.2	26.68%	469,768	574,074	574,074
332	Kingman	Cunningham	180.0	22.59%	72,608	89,103	89,103
422	Kiowa	Greensburg	196.5	57.66%	323,239	389,217	397,197
424	Kiowa	Mullinville	159.5	75.86%	247,568	298,341	303,705
474	Kiowa	Haviland	149.5	20.37%	52,925	64,722	64,722
503	Labette	Parsons	1,374.3	48.53%	1,288,143	1,573,715	1,528,793
504	Labette	Oswego	507.0	35.90%	300,931	367,939	367,939
505	Labette	Chetopa - St. Paul	533.0	40.33%	425,153	519,104	458,816
506	Labette	Labette County	1,535.0	28.01%	739,206	903,445	903,445
468	Lane	Healy	87.0	22.22%	34,555	42,557	42,557
482	Lane	Dighton	239.0	25.31%	105,851	129,444	129,444
207	Leavenworth	Ft. Leavenworth	1,701.1	3.82%	117,223	143,629	143,629
449	Leavenworth	Easton	655.8	14.08%	158,776	194,165	194,165
453	Leavenworth	Leavenworth	3,990.0	39.25%	3,205,267	3,859,813	3,929,234
458	Leavenworth	Basehor-Linwood	2,113.5	7.33%	256,316	313,413	313,413
464	Leavenworth	Tonganoxie	1,743.2	13.83%	398,471	487,187	487,187
469	Leavenworth	Lansing	2,311.6	9.13%	349,045	426,455	426,455
298	Lincoln	Lincoln	340.5	29.68%	171,898	210,124	210,124
299	Lincoln	Sylvan Grove	146.5	37.54%	95,791	117,031	117,031
344	Linn	Pleasanton	371.5	44.21%	318,427	388,774	345,141
346	Linn	Jayhawk	527.5	30.54%	275,999	337,795	337,795
362	Linn	Prairie View	961.3	26.93%	434,776	531,517	531,517
274	Logan	Oakley	409.5	30.28%	195,080	238,495	238,495
275	Logan	Triplains	87.9	40.96%	67,360	82,454	72,701
251	Lyon	North Lyon Co.	545.1	20.68%	191,581	234,506	234,506
252	Lyon	Southern Lyon Co.	553.5	24.23%	226,573	277,063	277,063
253	Lyon	Emporia	4,544.2	49.20%	4,227,034	5,164,888	5,084,722
397	Marion	Centre	249.0	27.04%	118,973	145,402	145,402
398	Marion	Peabody-Burns	343.5	31.48%	195,080	238,495	238,495
408	Marion	Marion	591.3	22.26%	229,635	281,052	281,052
410	Marion	Durham-Hills	616.6	18.68%	199,892	244,702	244,702

			Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5
			2007-08	2007-08	2007-08	2008-09 Est.	2008-09 Est.
USD			FTE Enrollment	Pct of Free	Current At Risk &	Current At Risk &	At Risk & Linear
No.	County Name	USD Name	(includes MILT)	Lunch	High Density Aid	High Density Aid	High Density Aid
411	Marion	Goessel	253.9	11.80%	51,176	62,505	62,505
364	Marshall	Marysville	726.6	24.45%	305,743	374,145	374,145
380	Marshall	Vermillon	513.8	20.52%	181,958	222,537	222,537
488	Marshall	Axtell	303.4	22.64%	114,161	139,640	139,640
498	Marshall	Valley Heights	374.5	27.06%	180,209	220,320	220,320
400	McPherson	Smoky Valley	991.0	18.11%	300,931	367,939	367,939
418	McPherson	McPherson	2,338.2	19.70%	777,260	949,992	949,992
419	McPherson	Canton-Galva	393.5	19.83%	139,093	169,784	169,784
423	McPherson	Moundridge	449.0	18.26%	135,594	165,794	165,794
448	McPherson	Inman	420.0	14.20%	99,290	121,464	121,464
225	Meade	Fowler	175.5	40.75%	142,155	174,217	153,825
226	Meade	Meade	476.5	24.13%	190,269	232,289	232,289
367	Miami	Osawatomie	1,144.5	40.76%	898,420	1,098,054	970,384
368	Miami	Paola	2,067.4	20.41%	697,653	852,909	852,909
416	Miami	Louisburg	1,627.7	9.46%	254,567	311,197	311,197
272	Mitchell	Waconda	365.1	28.40%	175,397	214,114	214,114
273	Mitchell	Beloit	714.8	18.65%	224,824	274,846	274,846
436	Montgomery	Caney	789.2	26.90%	355,606	434,434	434,434
445	Montgomery	Coffeyville	1,805.2	52.19%	1,936,370	2,331,758	2,257,669
446	Montgomery	Independence	1,865.6	41.42%	1,454,792	1,777,190	1,570,612
447	Montgomery	Cherryvale	907.1	31.89%	477,641	584,269	584,269
417	Morris	Morris County	791.5	25.80%	353,857	432,661	432,661
217	Morton	Rolla	201.0	37.75%	127,283	155,598	155,598
218	Morton	Elkhart	664.5	28.93%	320,614	392,321	392,321
441	Nemaha	Sabetha	927.0	20.37%	312,304	382,125	382,125
442	Nemaha	Nemaha Valley	466.9	11.44%	94,041	115,258	115,258
451	Nemaha	B & B	200.0	12.83%	44,615	54,526	54,526
101	Neosho	Erie	574.5	29.51%	349,045	426,455	426,455
413	Neosho	Chanute	1,799.7	35.26%	1,066,381	1,303,745	1,303,745
106	Ness	Western Plains	171.0	34.62%	104,101	127,227	127,227
303	Ness	Ness City	268.6	14.09%	64,298	78,907	78,907
211	Norton	Norton	663.5	25.73%	282,560	345,774	345,774
212	Norton	Northern Valley	202.5	40.00%	151,778	185,299	163,578
213	Norton	West Solomon	45.5	35.86%	29,743	36,351	36,351
420	Osage	Osage City	677.1	25.44%	294,370	359,960	359,960
421	Osage	Lyndon	452.5	16.88%	129,033	157,815	157,815
434	Osage	Santa Fe	1,129.9	23.62%	454,896	555,898	555,898
454	Osage	Burlingame	324.5	24.51%	133,844	163,578	163,578
456	Osage	Marais Des Cygnes	289.0	46.02%	249,318	304,104	280,550
392	Osborne	Osborne	329.9	29.93%	168,836	206,135	206,135
239	Ottawa	North Ottawa Co.	590.2	23.21%	226,573	277,063	277,063
240	Ottawa	Twin Valley	631.5	19.95%	208,202	254,898	254,898
495	Pawnee	Ft. Larned	865.5	30.47%	453,146	553,682	553,682
496	Pawnee	Pawnee Heights	143.5	12.32%	33,242	40,340	40,340
324	Phillips	Eastern Heights	115.5	27.09%	57,737	70,928	70,928
325	Phillips	Phillipsburg	630.0	26.06%	274,250	335,578	335,578
326	Phillips	Logan	178.0	22.53%	67,797	82,897	82,897
320	Pottawatomie	Wamego	1,306.0	16.63%	360,418	440,640	440,640
321	Pottawatomie	Kaw Valley	1,106.0	24.91%	461,457	563,878	563,878
322	Pottawatomie	Onaga	347.5	29.12%	170,149	208,351	208,351
323	Pottawatomie	Westmoreland	821.0	17.66%	239,695	293,021	293,021
382	Pratt	Pratt	1,105.1	24.20%	469,768	574,074	574,074
438	Pratt	Skyline	368.0	23.22%	142,155	173,774	173,774
105	Rawlins	Rawlins County	309.0	27.91%	150,466	183,970	183,970

USD No.	County Name	USD Name	Col 1 2007-08 FTE Enrollment (includes MILT)	Col 2 2007-08 Pct of Free Lunch	Col 3 2007-08 Current At Risk & High Density Aid	Col 4 2008-09 Est. Current At Risk & High Density Aid	Col 5 2008-09 Est. At Risk & Linear High Density Aid
308	Reno	Hutchinson	4,520.7	49.40%	4,571,267	5,503,570	5,602,559
309	Reno	Nickerson	1,164.2	42.25%	923,351	1,127,755	996,538
310	Reno	Fairfield	323.5	38.05%	223,074	273,073	273,073
311	Reno	Pretty Prairie	286.2	19.88%	94,041	115,258	115,258
312	Reno	Haven	998.6	21.21%	373,540	457,042	457,042
313	Reno	Buhler	2,204.5	21.25%	777,260	949,992	949,992
109	Republic	Republic County	503.0	25.93%	221,762	270,856	270,856
426	Republic	Pike Valley	243.0	31.47%	130,783	159,588	159,588
376	Rice	Sterling	549.1	31.32%	284,310	347,547	347,547
401	Rice	Chase	129.0	37.25%	94,041	115,258	115,258
405	Rice	Lyons	785.2	55.44%	916,790	1,104,260	1,124,120
444	Rice	Little River	305.2	21.95%	110,662	135,650	135,650
378	Riley	Riley County	657.0	14.76%	160,526	195,939	195,939
383	Riley	Manhattan	5,634.8	19.86%	1,850,202	2,262,160	2,262,160
384	Riley	Blue Valley	203.5	18.71%	64,298	78,907	78,907
269	Rooks	Palco	156.5	31.95%	82,669	101,072	101,072
270	Rooks	Plainville	364.0	18.68%	120,722	147,619	147,619
271	Rooks	Stockton	312.0	22.73%	124,222	151,609	151,609
395	Rush	LaCrosse	304.0	36.94%	186,770	228,300	228,300
403	Rush	Otis-Bison	185.0	24.22%	82,669	101,072	101,072
399	Russell	Paradise	146.5	20.32%	52,925	64,722	64,722
407	Russell	Russell	942.5	28.72%	468,018	571,857	571,857
305	Saline	Salina	7,041.2	37.92%	4,460,605	5,453,920	5,453,920
306	Saline	Southeast of Saline	689.2	9.81%	114,161	139,640	139,640
307	Saline	Ell-Saline	457.9	15.06%	114,161	139,640	139,640
466	Scott	Scott County	851.7	32.27%	466,268	570,084	570,084
259	Sedgwick	Wichita	45,413.9	58.92%	54,772,103	65,949,298	67,135,436
260	Sedgwick	Derby	6,248.7	23.48%	2,503,240	3,060,543	3,060,543
261	Sedgwick	Haysville	4,561.2	28.19%	2,126,201	2,599,511	2,599,511
262	Sedgwick	Valley Center	2,541.2	19.72%	828,436	1,012,941	1,012,941
263	Sedgwick	Mulvane	1,829.0	15.17%	462,769	566,094	566,094
264	Sedgwick	Clearwater	1,279.6	11.64%	246,256	301,001	301,001
265	Sedgwick	Goddard	4,717.8	10.81%	843,307	1,031,116	1,031,116
266	Sedgwick	Maize	6,201.0	7.53%	772,011	944,229	944,229
267	Sedgwick	Renwick	1,961.8	6.42%	208,202	254,898	254,898
268	Sedgwick	Cheney	774.3	9.94%	127,283	155,598	155,598
480	Seward	Liberal	4,300.4	55.74%	4,933,435	5,940,220	6,047,055
483	Seward	Kismet-Plains	704.0	56.07%	798,255	961,074	980,801
345	Shawnee	Seaman	3,427.2	17.30%	980,651	1,198,683	1,198,683
372	Shawnee	Silver Lake	703.3	12.33%	145,654	177,763	177,763
437	Shawnee	Auburn Washburn	5,306.4	16.32%	1,431,610	1,750,592	1,750,592
450	Shawnee	Shawnee Heights	3,437.7	18.68%	1,061,570	1,297,982	1,297,982
501	Shawnee	Topeka	12,698.9	57.67%	14,992,760	18,051,619	18,376,292
412	Sheridan	Hoxie	291.5	14.55%	72,608	89,103	89,103
352	Sherman	Goodland	939.3	32.90%	510,883	624,610	624,610
237	Smith	Smith Center	473.0	28.33%	221,762	270,856	270,856
238	Smith	West Smith Co.	162.5	35.82%	101,039	123,237	123,237
349	Stafford	Stafford	275.2	42.17%	228,323	278,836	246,475
350	Stafford	St. John-Hudson	379.8	31.34%	205,141	250,465	250,465
351	Stafford	Macksville	304.7	34.85%	176,710	216,330	216,330
452	Stanton	Stanton County	440.0	41.32%	344,671	420,692	371,929
209	Stevens	Moscow	209.3	49.69%	194,643	237,609	236,357
210	Stevens	Hugoton	985.4	37.85%	616,734	754,053	754,053
353	Sumner	Wellington	1,641.5	34.79%	943,909	1,154,353	1,154,353

			Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5
			2007-08	2007-08	2007-08	2008-09 Est.	2008-09 Est.
USD			FTE Enrollment	Pct of Free	Current At Risk &	Current At Risk &	At Risk & Linear
No.	County Name	USD Name	(includes MILT)	Lunch	High Density Aid	High Density Aid	High Density Aid
356	Sumner	Conway Springs	559.9	18.18%	170,149	208,351	208,351
357	Sumner	Belle Plaine	727.5	30.30%	372,227	454,826	454,826
358	Sumner	Oxford	367.5	24.12%	153,965	187,959	187,959
359	Sumner	Argonia	190.5	23.12%	76,108	93,093	93,093
360	Sumner	Caldwell	232.4	30.56%	127,283	155,598	155,598
509	Sumner	South Haven	236.5	24.93%	99,290	121,464	121,464
314	Thomas	Brewster	96.5	19.93%	36,304	44,330	44,330
315	Thomas	Colby	957.8	22.46%	360,418	440,640	440,640
316	Thomas	Golden Plains	180.5	37.08%	114,161	139,640	139,640
208	Trego	WaKeeney	401.0	21.20%	140,405	172,000	172,000
329	Wabaunsee	Alma	490.2	19.79%	160,526	195,939	195,939
330	Wabaunsee	Wabaunsee East	492.0	20.74%	175,397	214,114	214,114
241	Wallace	Wallace	212.5	32.94%	115,911	141,413	141,413
242	Wallace	Weskan	112.0	19.83%	39,803	48,320	48,320
108	Washington	Washington Co. Schools	414.5	22.96%	165,337	202,145	202,145
223	Washington	Barnes	354.5	20.02%	120,722	147,619	147,619
224	Washington	Clifton-Clyde	306.5	17.67%	90,979	111,268	111,268
467	Wichita	Leoti	426.5	34.65%	262,877	321,393	321,393
387	Wilson	Altoona-Midway	205.5	27.11%	114,161	139,640	139,640
461	Wilson	Neodesha	763.0	32.39%	413,343	505,362	505,362
484	Wilson	Fredonia	750.0	33.99%	428,215	523,537	523,537
366	Woodson	Woodson	427.2	36.45%	259,378	317,403	317,403
202	Wyandotte	Turner	3,797.2	49.35%	3,836,435	4,618,743	4,701,818
203	Wyandotte	Piper	1,529.0	5.43%	137,344	167,567	167,567
204	Wyandotte	Bonner Springs	2,370.4	27.25%	1,068,131	1,305,962	1,305,962
500	Wyandotte	Kansas City	18,455.4	70.67%	26,867,732	32,349,818	32,931,649
TOTALS			447,954.1		262,094,017	317,856,296	317,673,635

COST STUDY ANALYSIS

Elementary and Secondary Education in Kansas: Estimating the Costs of K-12 Education Using Two Approaches

A Report to the Legislative Post Audit Committee
By the Legislative Division of Post Audit
State of Kansas

05PA19

formula for smaller districts. The cost function estimates that districts with 100 or fewer students should receive an additional weighting of .773—meaning it would cost about 77% more than the base-level cost for students in these districts to have the opportunity to meet the desired education outcomes. This is significantly less than the weighting of 1.014 in the current formula.

For districts with an enrollment level above 1,700, the cost function enrollment weight (.008) is one-third as much as the correlation weight in the current formula (.021).

3. ESTIMATED POVERTY AND BILINGUAL WEIGHTS

The estimated poverty weight is .484 per free-lunch student in most school districts, and .726 per free-lunch student in high-poverty, inner-city school districts. The estimated bilingual weight is .100 per bilingual student. Student poverty and limited English proficiency are two factors that negatively affect student performance. These two factors and their effect on education costs are recognized through the at-risk and bilingual weights in the current funding formula.

The consultants used the cost function to estimate districts' additional costs (above base-level costs) of having poverty and bilingual students reach the same performance levels that other students were achieving (whether or not the other students were meeting standards), and to develop poverty and bilingual weights in each district. We had to take two additional steps to turn their estimated district-level poverty and bilingual weights into estimated Statewide weights:

- **Estimate a separate poverty weight for high-poverty, inner-city school districts.** Urban poverty is associated with a variety of more serious social problems, including drugs and violent crime. Because our consultants cited evidence suggesting inner-city poverty has more of an effect on costs than rural poverty, we included an additional measure of inner-city poverty in our cost model—the percent of students qualifying for free lunch multiplied by the student density of a district. To estimate a Statewide inner-city poverty weight, we averaged the district-level weights estimated by the consultants for large and mid-sized cities (as defined by the U.S. Census) with above-average poverty. There were four of these districts—Kansas City, Kansas City-Turner, Topeka, and Wichita.

- **Remove federal sources of funding.** As was the case with base-level costs, the poverty and bilingual weights estimated by the consultants also included costs that could be paid for with those federal funds. Therefore, we had to reduce these weights to better reflect the costs the State might fund.

Figure 1.2-6 shows our estimated poverty and bilingual weights and the weights in the current funding formula.

Figure 1.2-6
Comparison of Poverty and Bilingual Weights
COST FUNCTION ESTIMATES vs. CURRENT FUNDING FORMULA

Weight	Weight ESTIMATED WITH COST FUNCTION		Weight CURRENT FUNDING FORMULA	Difference
	Original Estimated Weight	Adjusted by LPA to Remove Federal Funds		
Poverty				
Regular	0.703	0.484	0.193	(0.291)
High-Poverty, Inner City	1.054	0.726	---	(0.726)
Bilingual	0.139	0.100	0.395	---(a)

(a) Whereas the bilingual weight in the current formula uses bilingual FTE (which is based on contact hours), the weight from the cost function is based on bilingual headcount, making these weights uncomparable.

Source: LPA analysis of Duncombe and Yinger cost estimates.

As the figure shows, the estimated poverty weight for most districts is .484. That weight implies that it would cost almost 50% more than the estimated base-level costs for students in poverty to achieve the same performance levels that other students are achieving. This is significantly higher than the at-risk weight in the current formula (.193).

In the four inner-city districts with high poverty (Kansas City, Kansas City-Turner, Topeka, and Wichita), the estimated poverty weight is .726, which recognizes that the cost of educating students in these types of districts is even greater. There is no separate urban-poverty weight in the current funding formula.

***Figure I.2-6* also shows that the estimated bilingual weight is .100.** This is significantly lower than the current bilingual weight of .395, but it's important to note that these two weights aren't really comparable for the following reasons:

- The bilingual weight estimated by the **cost function** is based on bilingual headcount (the number students in a district who have limited English proficiency)
- The bilingual weight used in the **current funding formula** is based on bilingual student FTE, which is calculated on the number of contact hours bilingual students spend with bilingual-endorsed teachers (see Section 2.2 of this report for additional information).

Bilingual FTE, as it is calculated in the current funding formula, is a very poor measure of the number of bilingual students in a district. That's because many bilingual services are being provided to bilingual students in settings or districts where there are no "bilingual-endorsed" teachers (the only contact hours that are counted for funding purposes). In Wichita, for example, only 2,923.5 bilingual FTE students were counted for funding purposes in 2004-05, but Wichita reported serving 5,342 bilingual students that year on a headcount basis.

The bilingual weight estimated by the cost function may be low for a number of reasons. Among them:

- there's a strong correlation between bilingual and free-lunch students, so the cost function analysis may have assigned part of the additional costs for bilingual students to at-risk students. (In 2003-04, Department data show that 73% of the students who took the Statewide assessment tests were reported as being both bilingual and eligible for free lunches.) Department guidelines for 2006-07 have clarified that students who are bilingual can be served with at-risk moneys.

- the headcount of bilingual students that districts report may not be completely accurate. As explained in Section 2.2, some districts may not be reporting all their bilingual students, and others may not be reporting them uniformly.

Nonetheless, using bilingual headcount data provides the best available measure to use in computing a bilingual weight. If funding were based on bilingual headcounts, those data would be audited and likely would be reported more accurately over time.

4. VARIATIONS IN COSTS

District size, student characteristics, teacher salaries, and district efficiency appear to explain a lot of the variation in district spending per student. On average, school districts spent $6,887 per student in 2003-04. However, there was a tremendous amount of variation. Spending ranged from $4,915 to $12,684. The cost function analysis found that the following contributed to increased per-student spending:

- smaller districts spent more than larger districts
- districts with more students in poverty or more bilingual students spent more
- districts that paid higher teacher salaries spent more

When we controlled for size, student characteristics, salary levels, and student performance in the cost model, there still were large variations in spending. We used the cost model to predict what all districts would have spent per student in 2003-04 to achieve the same outcomes they actually achieved if they all operated at an average level of efficiency. When we compared these estimates to what districts actually spent per student, we found 20 districts that spent at least 20% more than the cost model predicted (controlling for the factors noted above), and another nine districts that spent at least 20% less than predicted.

To get a better understanding of why actual spending in these 29 districts was so different from what the cost model predicted, we examined information on district staffing from the Department of Education. ***Figure 1.2-7*** summarizes what we found.