

MINUTES OF THE HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Clay Aurand at 9:00 a.m. on February 17, 2009, in Room 711 of the Docking State Office Building.

All members were present.

Committee staff present:

Sharon Wenger, Kansas Legislative Research Department
Reagan Cussimano, Kansas Legislative Research Department
Theresa Kiernan, Office of the Revisor of Statutes
Dale Dennis, Deputy Commissioner, Kansas State Department of Education
Janet Henning, Committee Assistant

Conferees appearing before the committee:

Sharon Karr, Governmental Relations, Kansas Association of School Psychologists
Regina Kimbrel, School Psychologist, Marion County Special Education Cooperative #617
Dr. Jim Persinger, Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Emporia State University
Ricardo Vieyra, Director of Special Education, Geary County Schools USD #475
Mark Tallman, Kansas Association of School Boards
Terry Forsythe, Kansas National Education Association
Jim Means, Executive Director of Career & Technical Education, Wichita Public Schools
Cheryl Semmel, United Schools Administrators of Kansas (written testimony)
Steve Kearny, Kansas Association for Career and Technical Educators (written testimony)

Representative Loganbill requested a point of personal privilege and stated the Wichita Eagle newspaper had recently published a special report entitled "*Grading Our Schools*". Representative Loganbill told Committee members the article included test scores taken in spring 2008 as well as scores from spring 2006 and spring 2007 for comparison and were for public school districts in Sedgwick, Butler, and Harvey counties as well as private and parochial schools. Included in the report was the percentage of a school's students considered low-income. Representative Loganbill stated Allen Elementary school listed 79.4% students in poverty, however, their test scores had increased dramatically. As a side note, Representative Loganbill told Committee members this is the school where she teaches. (On file - Wichita Eagle, 2.15.09)

HB 2153 - Schools; national school psychologist certification incentive program.

Theresa Kiernan gave an overview of **HB 2153** to Committee members.

Sharon Karr, Governmental Relations, Kansas Association of School Psychologists, spoke to Committee members as a proponent of **HB 2153**. Ms. Karr told Committee members that **HB 2153** is similar to Kansas Statute 72-1398 which provides a financial incentive bonus of \$1,000 each year to each teacher who has national board certification. This bill is to provide a similar financial incentive bonus of \$1,000 each year to each nationally certified school psychologist. (Attachment 1)

Regina Kimbrel, School Psychologist, Marion County Special Education Cooperative #617, spoke to Committee members as a proponent of **HB 2153**. Ms. Kimbrel advised there are approximately 89 school psychologists in Kansas who have the title of Nationally Certified School Psychologist. Ms. Kimbrel told Committee members that to have the Nationally Certified School Psychologist credential demonstrates that the person is a lifelong learner and has attained a level of training and professional competence that demonstrates knowledge in the diverse areas that impact children and their learning today. (Attachment 2)

Dr. Jim Persinger, Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Emporia State University, spoke to Committee members as a proponent of **HB 2153**. Dr. Persinger told Committee members that in past decades, the majority of the school psychologist's time had been spent in assessment of children for special education. Now, school psychologists work with all students, regardless of ability or disability, primarily working proactively to prevent academic and mental health problems. Dr. Persinger stated that for well over ten years, there have been warnings about increasing shortages of school psychologists in the United States. The two most ready remedies for personnel shortages are to recruit more students into training programs and to enact policies which help retain existing personnel. (Attachment 3)

Ricardo Vieyra, Director of Special Education, Geary County Schools USD #475, spoke to Committee members as a proponent of **HB 2153**. Mr. Vieyra told Committee members the bill's effect

CONTINUATION SHEET

Minutes of the House Education Committee at 9:00 a.m. on February 17, 2009, in Room 711 of the Docking State Office Building.

would assist in the recruitment and retention of highly qualified and trained staff. Mr. Vieyra told Committee members that due to the growing military population of diverse learners and mobile population, their district has seen rapid growth in school population over the past three years. He stated the military regarding the Junction City school district as one of three districts nationally to send families with children who have special needs. Mr. Vieyra stated that by having well-trained staff in the school psychology area adds to the knowledge base as their districts serves these diverse learners. He also stated that having flexible staff to implement, train, and assist with the Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) is a vital role for the school psychologist. The better trained their staff is in this framework, the fewer students they will have in special education thus reducing the costs of special education to taxpayers. (Attachment 4)

A question and answer session followed the presentations.

Mark Tallman, Kansas Association of School Boards, spoke to Committee members in opposition of **HB 2153**. Mr. Tallman told Committee members the bill states that school districts are entitled to reimbursement by the state for the costs. However, as this year has already demonstrated, a statutory entitlement is no guarantee of actual funding. If Legislative appropriations were inadequate to fund the entitlement, school districts would still be responsible for paying the bonus. Therefore, the bill represents another potential unfunded mandate. (Attachment 5)

Terry Forsyth, Kansas National Education Association (KNEA), spoke to Committee members in opposition of **HB 2153**. Mr. Forsyth told Committee members that KNEA supports paying educational professionals for their efforts to successfully complete the requirements to become nationally certified in their area of expertise. However, all national certification processes are not equal in terms of the rigor, the time and effort required to successfully become nationally certified. KNEA suggests that the incentive be based on the rigor of the process rather than only on the attainment of the national certificate. (Attachment 6)

A question and answer session followed the presentations.

Chairman Aurand closed the hearing on **HB 2153**.

HB 2237 - Schools; vocational education courses.

Theresa Kiernan, Office of the Revisor of Statutes, reviewed a technical amendment for **HB 2237** with Committee members. (Attachment 7)

Scott Frank, Legislative Post Audit, gave a background of the Performance Audit Report - School District Audit "*K-12 Education: Reviewing the Cost of Vocational Education Programs*". Mr. Frank told Committee members that Vocational Education programs are designed to teach high school students about current or emerging occupations that don't require an advanced degree. In Kansas, school districts aren't required to offer Vocational Education programs, but if they do, the State has adopted a funding formula to help pay for approved programs.

Mr. Frank told Committee members this school district performance audit answers the following question:

- What types of Vocational Education programs do school districts offer, and how much do they cost?

The audit determined that Vocational Education programs traditionally have served as an alternative for students who might not be college-bound, training them for a variety of technical careers in such areas as agriculture, business, industry, and technology. The majority of the State's \$34 million in Vocational Education funding goes for classes that prepare students for specific occupations, but about \$5 million is paid to districts for classes that help students develop general employability and life skills, as well as for generic seminar classes.

Mr. Frank also told Committee members that changes at the federal level are radically changing the focus of Vocational Education, from a more-limited notion of technical careers that don't require a four year degree to an expanded notion that includes almost all professional career paths. (On file - Legislative

CONTINUATION SHEET

Minutes of the House Education Committee at 9:00 a.m. on February 17, 2009, in Room 711 of the Docking State Office Building.

Division of Post Audit)

A question and answer session followed the presentation.

Cheryl Semmel, United School Administrators of Kansas, gave written testimony in support of **HB 2237**. (Attachment 8)

Jim Means, Wichita Public Schools, spoke to Committee members in opposition of **HB 2237**. Mr. Means told Committee members that the bill provides for the continued .5 weighted funding of vocational education programs, which are so critical. However, it eliminates that funding for seminar periods and courses that teach important employment and living skills. Seminar periods are an import tool to reinforce and supplement instruction in all courses, including vocational education programs; and vocational education courses provide the best setting in which to develop and reinforce the employment and life skills so often requested by the business community. (Attachment 9)

Mark Tallman, Kansas Association of School Boards (KASB), spoke to Committee members in opposition of **HB 2237**. Mr. Tallman advised KASB opposes this bill because the school districts will be facing significant changes in the structure of vocational education under federal law over the next few years, including changing the name to career and technical education, the implementation of career pathways and other new approaches.

Mr. Tallman advised rather than passing this bill, KASB would suggest the committee should ask the Kansas State Department of Education to do a complete study of how all the career and technical education changes will affect school district costs, and make recommendations to the Legislature on an equitable, cost-based system for funding. (Attachment 10)

Steve Kearny, Kansas Association for Career and Technical Educators, gave written testimony as a neutral of **HB 2237**. (Attachment 11)

A question and answer session followed the presentation.

Chairman Aurand closed the hearing on **HB 2237**.

HB 2104 - Schools; low enrollment weighting, limitation relating to high and medium density at-risk pupil weightings.

Theresa Kiernan, Office of Revisor of Statutes, gave an explanation of the balloon amendment for **HB 2104**. (Attachment 12 & 13)

Representative Huebert moved to adopt the balloon amendment for HB 2104. The motion was seconded by Representative Horst.

After discussion by Committee members, Chairman Aurand made a motion for a substitute amendment which would delay action for one year. The motion was seconded by Representative Horst. The motion carried.

Representative Huebert moved to pass out HB 2104 as amended favorably for passage. Representative Brookens seconded the motion. The motion failed by show of hands.

Chairman Aurand requested updated information regarding the sub-committees appointed for **HB 2008** and **HB 2199**. Representative Horst reported that she would request the Speaker of the House to “bless” **HB 2008** to continue working the bill. Representative Spalding reported that she would also request the Speaker of the House to “bless” **HB 2199** to continue working the bill. Representative Spalding advised members of the sub-committee would include Representatives Trimmer, Loganbill, Brookens and herself. She also advised they would be meeting March 2nd at 9:00 am in Room 711-D.

Chairman Aurand announced there would not be an Education meeting on Wednesday, February 18th.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 a.m. No future meeting is scheduled at this time.

Testimony
House Education Committee
February 17, 2009
House Bill 2153
by
Sharon Karr, Governmental Relations
Kansas Association of School Psychologists

Chairman and Members of the Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on HB 2153. The Kansas Association of School Psychologists supports this bill.

HB 2153 is similar to Kansas Statute 72-1398 which provides a financial incentive bonus of \$1,000 each year to each teacher who has national board certification. This bill is to provide a similar financial incentive bonus of \$1,000 each year to each nationally certified school psychologist. There are two specific differences between the statute and the bill:

1. The Kansas State Board of Education will not be required to give a special school psychologist license for nationally certified school psychologists. According to Kansas Statute 72-1398a, each nationally board certified teacher is issued a master teacher's license by the state board of education. This license is valid for 10 years.
2. The expense of the initial certification and renewal of the national certification will be the responsibility of each nationally certified school psychologist. In contrast, KS 72-1398e provides each teacher a scholarship of \$1,100 for initial national board certification and \$500 to each teacher who renews the national board certification.

The rationale for the current bill is to:

- Provide nationally certified school psychologists in Kansas equality with Kansas nationally board certified teachers who currently receive a yearly incentive bonus of \$1,000
- Make Kansas competitive with states which pay incentives to the nationally certified school psychologists. Oklahoma provides a yearly incentive of \$5,000 to nationally certified school psychologists. At least four additional states provide a financial incentive to nationally certified school psychologists.
- Attract more highly qualified school psychologists to Kansas.
- Demonstrate that Kansas values hiring school psychologists who meet nationally recognized standards for training and supervision. Nationally Certified School Psychologists must complete 75 contact hours of continuing professional development every 3 years, including 3 hours in ethics or professional practices. Twenty-five hours of the professional development activities must be approved by the National Association of School Psychologists or the American Psychological Association. (See the attached table for additional requirements for a Nationally Certified School Psychologist.)
- Promote higher levels of knowledge and competency. Nationally certified school psychologists must participate in ongoing, meaningful continuing professional development to maintain national certification.

House Education Committee
Date 2-17-09
Attachment # 1

Nationally Certified School Psychologists (NCSP)

	Nationally Certified School Psychologists (NCSP)
Awarded By	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National School Psychology Certification System of the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP), an independent, non-for-profit professional organization
Purpose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To credential school psychologists who meet rigorous, nationally recognized standards of training & continuing professional development
Pre-Requisite Requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum of 60 semester hours of graduate study in “School Psychology,” culminating in a MA, Ed.S., or Ph.D. degree • Supervised practica and a culminating 1,200 clock-hour supervised internship
Requirements for Certification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrated competency in 11 domains of professional practice • Completion of a NCSP Case Study demonstrating professional skills necessary to deliver effective services, resulting in positive, measurable outcomes for clients • Passing score on the National School Psychology Examination, administered by the Educational Testing Service (Praxis II: NTE Test #10400). This score is <u>higher</u> than the minimum score established by the Kansas State Department of Education
Renewal Requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renewed every three years • 75 contact hours of continuing professional development (CPD) activities, designed to maintain, expand, and extend professional training and skills every three years. These professional development activities must include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 3 hours in ethics or professional practices ○ 25 hours by providers approved by the National Association of School Psychologists or by the American Psychological Association.

Testimony
House Education Committee
February 17, 2009
House Bill 2153
By Regina Kimbrel, EdS, NCSP
School Psychologist employed by Marion County Special Education Cooperative #617

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on HB 2153. As a school psychologist who serves the elementary, middle and high school of Marion-Florence USD 408 and the OASIS Day School, I support this bill.

There are approximately 38,000 school psychologists employed in the United States in either a school, mental health, hospital or private practice setting. Of those 38,000, 10,000 have the title of Nationally Certified School Psychologist. In Kansas, approximately 89 school psychologists have the title Nationally Certified School Psychologist. School psychologists are licensed by individual states but may also be nationally certified.

To me the recognition of Nationally Certified School Psychologists is about recruiting and retaining highly qualified professionals so that the mental health needs of students and families can be better addressed. It is about ensuring that the highest quality of services can be provided to students and families to make sure that the learning environment is the most conducive to individual success.

What do school psychologists do besides evaluate students for special needs services? I was trained in both psychology and education. I have taken graduate level coursework in mental health, child development, school organization, learning styles and processes, behavior, motivation and effective teaching so that I can focus on improving academics, social and emotional functioning, family-school partnerships, classroom instruction, and school-based mental health services for all learners.

What I do as part of my job in a rural setting in Kansas:

Consultation

- Collaborate with teachers, parents, and administrators to find solutions to individual learning and behavior problems
- Help teachers and parents understand child development and how it affects learning and behavior
- Strengthen working relationships between teachers, parents and service providers in the community i.e. SRS, mental health, child care, health care,

Evaluation

- Evaluate for eligibility for special services
- Assess current academic skills and aptitude for learning through assessment or progress monitoring

House Education Committee
Date 2-17-09
Attachment # 2

- Determine social-emotional development and mental health status through questionnaires
- Observe in classrooms to evaluate learning environments

Intervention

- Provide counseling to help with interpersonal or family problems that interfere with school performance-divorce, death, alcoholism, etc.
- Work directly with children and their families to help resolve problems in adjustment and learning
- Provide training in social skills and anger management
- Help families and schools manage crisis in the death of a student or school personnel

Prevention

- Work with children at risk of failure in school
- Lead problem solving groups of students to teach tolerance, understanding and appreciation of diversity within the school community
- Work with individual students or groups of students to make school safer and a better learning environment
- Collaborate with school staff and community mental health to provide services to individual students-attend wraparound meetings
- Provide in-service training for parents and educators on mental health and academic issues such as ADHD and how to address it in the classroom

Research and Planning

- Continually evaluate the effectiveness of academic and behavior management at OASIS day school by looking at individual student data
- Help implement programs like Multi Tier Systems of Support to improve learning for all students
- I read the Communique and School Psychology Review to learn about evidence-based research to recommend effective interventions for academic or behavior issues.

Some student issues I have dealt with:

- Students feeling afraid to go to school or afraid that something will happen to a parent while they are at school
- Students having difficulty organizing their time or materials efficiently to complete school work
- Students lacking effective study skills
- Students falling behind in school work because they can't do the work or won't do the work
- Students who are lacking self discipline
- Students worrying about family matters such as divorce, death, economic hardships, parents in the military, etc.
- Students feeling depressed, lonely, rejected, anxious or stressed
- Students experimenting with drugs and alcohol
- Students thinking about suicide or hurting others
- Students who worry about their sexuality

- Students facing difficult life decisions-applying to college, vo-tech, getting a job or quitting school
- Students who question their aptitudes and abilities
- Students who in spite of good teaching have a reading problem
- Students who will not attend school regularly and have truancy problems
- Students who have poor social skills and need to learn better ones to function in the community
- Students who have been bullied
- Students who worry about peer pressure, friends or the lack of friends
- Students who have a disability or mental health condition who want to understand the condition or disability better and find out if medication can help
- Students who bring weapons to school for attention, protection or to be removed from the school setting
- Students who physically or verbally “blow up” when they are given correction by a teacher
- Students who hit, kick, spit on and call adults every vulgar name you can think of because they have learned this behavior through abuse from the adults in their life or from the media or from peers
- Increasing numbers of students diagnosed with conditions such as Bipolar Disorder, Autism Spectrum, Depression, ADHD-Neither teachers or parents know how to deal with the special learning issues these children face

I try to make a connection between mental health and learning and behavior. I believe that good mental health leads to high academic achievement, positive social skills and behavior, tolerance and respect for others, and safe and supportive learning environments

I think that my Nationally Certified School Psychologist credential demonstrates that I am a lifelong learner and that I have attained a level of training and professional competence that demonstrates knowledge in the diverse areas that impact children and their learning today!

Respectfully Submitted,

Regina Kimbrel, EdS, NCSP
Regina Kimbrel, EdS, NCSP

Dr. Jim Persinger, Associate Professor
Department of Psychology, Box 4031 Visser Hall
Emporia State University
Emporia, KS. 66801
620-341-5428
jpersing@emporia.edu

2/16/09

Chairman and Members of the Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on HB 2153. I am an Associate Professor in the Teachers College at Emporia State University, and direct the School Psychology Program. I served last year as President of the Kansas Association of School Psychologists, which supports this bill.

I would first like to offer some brief facts about the changing role of school psychologists. In past decades, the majority of school psychologist time had been spent in assessment of children for special education. Now, school psychologists work with all students, regardless of ability or disability, primarily working proactively to prevent academic and mental health problems.

- The Bureau of Labor Statistics (2009) currently estimate employment of psychologists in all fields to grow 15 percent from 2006 to 2016, much faster than average for other occupations. They identify the increased demand for psychological services in schools as a key cause for this growth. They state that "Growing awareness of how students' mental health and behavioral problems...affect learning will increase demand for school psychologists to offer student counseling and mental health services."
- Today's school psychologists are recognized as mental health professionals in the healthcare system. This is particularly so with research well demonstrating the profound impact of mental health and social/emotional development on a learner's ability to benefit from educational services.
- The U.S. Surgeon General's *Mental Health: A Report of the Surgeon General* (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1999) and the report from the President's New Freedom Commission on Mental Health (2003) are two recent federal documents that focused attention on the critical importance of school-based mental health services in improving the emotional well being of children.
 - According to these reports, more than 80% of youth with mental disorders receive no specialty intervention for their emotional and behavioral problems at all.
 - Of the 20% who do, about 70% see a mental health professional in the schools.
 - For nearly half of those children, the schools are the sole provider.
- This highlights that there are 1) tremendous unmet mental health needs among children in the United States, and that 2) schools are currently the primary providers of mental health services for children.

This relates to other facts I would like to share with you, which regards the extent of training needed to become a licensed school psychologist.

- In 1969, 93% of practicing school psychologists had Master's (M.S.) degrees.

House Education Committee
Date 2-17-09
Attachment # 3

- By 1990, the Education Specialist (Ed.S.) became the minimal degree needed to enter the profession.
- By 2000, 41% hold an M.S., 28% an Ed.S., and 30% a Ph.D (doctorate).
 - To put the preparation via the Ed.S. degree in context, it can help to compare it to building administrator credentialing.
 - To earn an Ed.D. in Educational Leadership requires 60 credit hours at the University of Kansas and virtually all other universities.
 - To earn an Ed.S. degree in my program at Emporia State University requires 73 credit hours, a full-time three-year commitment.
 - Those who pursue a doctorate in school psychology require 136 credit hours (cf. University of Kansas), a commitment that averages 4-5 years of full-time study and well exceeds by double the graduate training needed to earn a doctorate in educational administration.

For well over ten years, there have been warnings about increasing shortages of school psychologists in the United States, which primarily have to do with three factors. In part it has to do with increasing needs for school-based mental health services, in part on the increasing training requirements for school psychologists, and finally has to do with graying of the profession. I would like to briefly review some of those facts.

- The Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Act, reports on all school psychologists employed in public schools. That most recent report (2002) indicates that there are 26,266 school psychology positions in public schools. As of January 2009, 9,800 of those school psychologists have attained board certification.
- Studies (Curtis et al, 2004) have projected personnel needs based on estimates of new school psychologists entering the field from training programs, as well as those exiting through retirement and attrition. Personnel attrition due to retirement rates continues to exceed the supply of new university graduates eligible for employment (NASP, 2006).
 - (Curtis, 2004) In 1980, the mean age of school psychologists was 38, and but that mean now approaches 50.
 - More than 50% of currently practicing school psychologists are predicted to retire by 2015, and 2 out to 3 by 2020 (Curtis, Grier, and Hunley, 2004).
 - Based on a state by state analysis, 27 states will experience a retirement rate of higher than 50% by 2012.
 - On average, approximately 1750 new school psychologists enter the field each year (Curtis, 2004).
 - In accounting for school populations nationwide compared to school psychology personnel, there has been an 11% decrease in the number of school psychologists available per pupil between 1999-2005 (Charvat, 2005). By 2015, the excess retirement rate will be an additional 2.9 percent per year.
 - At present, there is a nation-wide shortage of almost 9,000 school psychologists, and expected to be 15,000 by 2020.

The two most ready remedies for personnel shortages are to recruit more students into training programs, and to enact policies which help retain existing personnel. NCSP parity addresses both. Here is what it will accomplish:

- Promote the employment of highly qualified personnel. Salary stipends demonstrate that a state recognizes and acknowledges the importance of hiring school psychologists who meet contemporary, nationally recognized standards for training and supervision.
- Ensure that the highest quality of services can be provided to students and families to make sure that the learning environment is the most conducive to individual success
- Salary stipends promote higher levels of knowledge and competency as NCSP school psychologists must engage in ongoing and meaningful continuing professional development to maintain their certification.
- Salary stipends for board-certified school psychologists help in recruitment and retention of more highly qualified personnel at a time when a national shortage of school psychologists is being experienced and great competition exists for qualified personnel across states. Most recent data (Curtis et al, 2007) shows mean salaries of school psychologists nationally to be \$62,513. Our census region reports an average salary of \$50,920, which ranks Kansas toward the bottom (7th out of 9th).
- It will allow the state of Kansas to act proactively to hold our ratio of school psychologists to pupils at an acceptable level.
 - In neighboring states of Missouri (161 school psychologists, ratio 5735:1) and Oklahoma (192 school psychologists, 3249:1), students have little access to school psychology services. Finally addressing the problem, Oklahoma passed an NCSP parity bill last year, paying \$5000 stipends to school psychologists in order to address their shortages.
 - Other states to do so in recent years are Louisiana, Nevada, and Delaware.
 - An NCSP parity bill for \$2,000 stipends is currently being heard by the Indiana legislature.

I appreciate the opportunity to be heard today. The attached reference list provides sources for the above statements.

Jim Persinger

References

- Bureau of Labor Statistics (2009). Occupational Outlook Handbook. Retrieved 2/16/09 at <http://www.bls.gov/oco/ocos056.htm#outlook>
- Center for Mental Health Services (2004). Mental Health, United States, 2002. Center for Mental Health Services, Rockville, MD. Retrieved on 2/16/09 at <http://mentalhealth.samhsa.gov/publications/allpubs/SMA04-3938/default.asp>.
- Charvat, J. (2005). NASP study: How many school psychologists are there? Communiqué, 33 (6).
- Curtis, M. J. (2002, November). The changing face of school psychology: Past, present, and future. Keynote address to The Future of School Psychology 2002 Invitational Conference, Indianapolis, IN.
- Curtis, M. J., Grier, J. E. C., Abshier, D. W., Sutton, N. T., & Hunley, S. A. (2002). School psychology: Turning the corner into the twenty-first century. Communiqué, 30(8), 1-5.
- Curtis, M., Grier, J., & Hunley, S. (2004). The changing face of school psychology: Trends in data and projections for the future. School Psychology Review, 33(1), 49-66.
- Curtis, M. J., Lopez, A. D., Batsche, G. M., Minch, D., & Abshier, D. (2007, March). Status report on school psychology: A national perspective. Paper presented at the annual convention of the National Association of School Psychologists, New York City.
- National Association of School Psychologists (2006) Supporting student success: Remediating the shortage of school psychologists. Retrieved on 2/16/09 at <http://www.nasponline.org/advocacy/personnelshortages.pdf>
- McKevitt, B., Schroeder, J., Williams, K., Mitchell, A., & Kaufman, J. (2008, Feb). Making the jump to academia: Perspectives from early career academics. Paper presented at the annual convention of the National Association of School Psychologists, New Orleans.
- President's New Freedom Commission on Mental Health (2003). Final Report to the President. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Washington, DC. Retrieved 2/16/09 at <http://www.mentalhealthcommission.gov/reports/reports.htm>.
- United States Department of Health and Human Services (1999). Mental health: A report of the Surgeon General. United States Department of Health and Human Services, Washington, DC. Retrieved 2/16/09 at <http://www.surgeongeneral.gov/library/mentalhealth/home.html>



Geary County Unified School District No. 475

PO Box 370 - 123 N. Eisenhower - Junction City, KS 66441-0370
(785) 717-4000 Fax (785) 717-4003 www.usd475.org

Testimony

House Education Committee

February 17, 2009

House Bill 2153

By Ricardo Vieyra, Director of Special Education
Geary County Schools USD 475
Kansas Association of Special Education Administrators
Past President

Chairman Aurand and Members of the Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to testify in support of House Bill 2153 which is being considered as enacting the national school psychologist certification incentive program. I support the bill for the following reasons:

- If a school psychologist could be paid and recognized for this certification it would also contribute to equality with teachers who attain National Board Certification.
- The bill's effect would assist us in the recruitment & retention of highly qualified and trained staff. Of the last 12 years that I have been in my position we have had to rely on hiring clinical psychologists and/or to begin the year understaffed for five of those years due to shortages of suitable candidates in the school psychology field.
- The growing population of diverse learners and mobile population due to the military. Our area is seeing rapid growth in school population over the past three years. The military regards our school district as one of three districts nationally to send families with children who have special needs.
- Having well-trained staff in the school psychology area adds to the knowledge base as we serve these diverse learners. For example, our students with autism increased from 47 to 64 students in one year's time.
- Role of the School Psychologist in the Kansas version of Response to Intervention which is known as Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS). Having flexible staff to implement, train, and assist with MTSS is a vital role for the school psychologist. The better trained our staff are in this framework the fewer students we will have in special education thus reducing the costs of special education to the taxpayers.

House Education Committee

Date 2-17-09

Attachment # 4

KANSAS
ASSOCIATION



OF
SCHOOL
BOARDS



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

Testimony before the
House Education Committee
by

Mark Tallman, Assistant Executive Director/Advocacy
Kansas Association of School Boards

February 17, 2009

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on **HB 2153**. This bill provides that school psychologists who receive certification from the National Association of School Psychologists shall be entitled to a \$1,000 annual bonus, presumably paid by the employing school district.

The bill states that school districts are entitled to reimbursement by the state for these costs. However, as this year has already demonstrated, a statutory entitlement, (for example, funding 92 percent of special education excess cost), is no guarantee of actual funding. If Legislative appropriations were inadequate to fund the entitlement, school districts would still be responsible for paying the bonus. Therefore, the bill represents another potential unfunded mandate.

If the committee wishes to consider this concept, it should either provide direct bonus payments by the state, or limit school district obligations to the amount of actual reimbursement. However, we question whether any new requirement should be imposed at a time when so many current programs are at risk due to funding reductions.

Thank you for your consideration.

House Education Committee
Date 2-17-09
Attachment # 5



Making public schools great for every child

KANSAS NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION / 715 SW 10TH AVENUE / TOPEKA, KANSAS 66612-1686

**Terry Forsyth, Testimony
House Education Committee
February 17, 2009**

House Bill 2153

Mister Chairman, members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to come before you today to discuss House Bill 2153. My name is Terry Forsyth and I am representing the Kansas NEA.

Some concerns we have about the current form of this bill follows. We support paying educational professionals for their efforts to successfully complete the requirements to become nationally certified in their area of expertise. But all national certification processes are not equal in terms of the rigor, the time and effort required to successfully become nationally certified. Our concern centers on fairness and equity.

Currently the state of Kansas pays an incentive of \$1,000 each school year to the teachers who have successfully completed the process to become a Nationally Board Certified Teacher. The process involves approximately 300 hours of work and testing over a one to three year period.

The work to become a Nationally Board Certified Teacher consists of Portfolio Entries and an Assessment lasting up to three hours. Applicants to the process are required to submit four portfolio entries. Three are classroom based, where video recordings and examples of student work serve as supporting documentation. A fourth entry relates to their accomplishments outside of the classroom – with families, the community or colleagues – and how they impact student learning.

There is also a written assessment which requires the teacher to demonstrate content knowledge in response to six exercises developed for their chosen certificate area. Each teacher applicant has up to 30 minutes to complete each exercise. Assessments are administered at a computer-based testing center.

It is our understanding that the requirements for National Certification as a School Psychologist includes those same criteria that it takes to be licensed in the state of Kansas as a School Psychologist which include completing an organized program of study, an internship and a two hour examination. The difference between a licensed School Psychologist in Kansas and a Nationally Board Certified Psychologist is the cut score on the examination which is significantly higher than the cut score required for licensing.

Our objection to the bill in its current form is in its fairness and equity as regards the rigor of the two sets of processes and the amount of the incentive to be paid to successful candidates. We would suggest that the incentive be based on the rigor of the process rather than only on the attainment of the national certificate.

House Education Committee
Date 2-18-09
Attachment # 6

HOUSE BILL No. 2237

By Committee on Education

2-3

9 AN ACT concerning school districts; relating to school finance; amend-
10 ing K.S.A. 2008 Supp. 72-6413 and repealing the existing section.
11

12 *Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Kansas:*

13 Section 1. K.S.A. 2008 Supp. 72-6413 is hereby amended to read as
14 follows: 72-6413. (a) The program weighting of each district shall be de-
15 termined by the state board as follows:

16 (1) Compute full time equivalent enrollment in ~~programs of bilingual~~
17 ~~education occupation-specific vocational education courses~~ and multiply
18 the computed enrollment by .395;

programs of bilingual education

19 (2) compute full time equivalent enrollment in ~~approved vocational~~
20 ~~education programs~~ and multiply the computed enrollment by 0.5;

occupation-specific vocational education courses

21 (3) add the products obtained under (1) and (2). The sum is the pro-
22 gram weighting of the district.

23 (b) A school district may expend amounts received from the bilingual
24 weighting to pay the cost of providing at-risk and preschool-aged at-risk
25 education programs and services.

26 (c) *As used in this section:*

27 (1) "Approved vocational education program" means a vocational ed-
28 ucation program approved by the state board which offers a sequence of
29 courses which are directly related to the preparation of individuals in
30 paid employment in current or emerging occupations requiring other than
31 a baccalaureate or advanced degree.

32 (2) ~~(A)~~ "Occupation-specific vocational education course" means a
33 course within an approved vocational education program.

34 (3) "Occupation-specific vocational education course" shall not mean:
35 (A) Seminars or study halls; or (B) courses which teach basic employment
36 or independent living skills that are not related to specific occupations.

37 Sec. 2. K.S.A. 2008 Supp. 72-6413 is hereby repealed.

38 Sec. 3. This act shall take effect and be in force from and after its
39 publication in the statute book.

House Education Committee
Date 2-18-09
Attachment # 7

Testimony on

HB 2237

House Education Committee

Prepared by: Cheryl L. Semmel, Executive Director

February 17, 2009

The mission of United School Administrators of Kansas (USA|Kansas*), through collaboration of member associations, is to serve, support, and develop educational leaders and to establish USA|Kansas as a significant force to improve education.

Education administrators remain committed to ensuring that each and every child in Kansas receives a quality education that will help them reach their potential and become successful, productive adults. There are 465,000 students in our public schools that we strive to impact positively every single day.

USA|Kansas supports HB 2237, a bill relating to school finance and vocational education. Economies here and abroad are changing into knowledge-based economies, reinforcing the need for strong, vocational education programs. Each year, students throughout Kansas enroll in vocational education programs as a means of preparing themselves to compete in the workforce and diversify their educational experience.

In many communities throughout Kansas, it is strong vocational education programs that strengthen the partnership between education and private industry. These partnerships enhance the local economy and help develop a skilled workforce. Administrators encourage continued investment in and expansion of resources available for vocational education programs.

In closing, on behalf of education administrators, I would like to thank you for your continued support of education and for realizing the importance of investing in education. Preparing our children requires a shared commitment, collaboration, and open dialogue among all stakeholders. Thank you for being partners in education.

*USA|Kansas represents more than 2,000 individual members and ten member associations:

Kansas Association of Elementary School Principals
Kansas Association of Middle School Administrators
Kansas Association of School Administrators
Kansas Association of School Business Officials
Kansas Association of School Personnel Administrators
Kansas Assoc for Supervision and Curriculum Development
Kansas Association of Special Education Administrators
Kansas Association of Secondary School Principals
Kansas Council of Career and Technical Education Administrators
Kansas School Public Relations Association

House Education Committee

Date 2-17-09

Attachment # 8



**House Education
Representative Aurand, Chair**

H.B. 2237 – Vocational Education Program Funding

*Presented by: Jim Means
Wichita Public Schools*

February 17, 2009

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee:

HB 2237 presents changes for weighted funding for both bilingual and vocational education programs. I wish to speak in opposition to the proposed funding changes in vocational education only.

Under HB 2237, the .5 weighted funding for vocational education programs continues but the consideration of non-occupational specific vocational education courses for this funding is eliminated. Specifically, this bill prohibits seminars or study halls; or courses that teach basic employment or independent living skills that are not related to specific occupations, from receiving the weighted funding.

I understand the intent of eliminating weighted funding for study halls, which often do not encourage or allow for instructional exchanges between teachers and students. However, seminar periods are created to do just that - to provide additional time for students and teachers to work on course content and activities. I know first hand that career and technical education (CTE) students, who are typically very connected with their CTE teachers, take advantage of this additional instructional time.

The weighted funding that is currently allowed for seminars is carefully calculated to reflect that a CTE classroom may be just one destination choice for students during seminar. If a student is taking seven courses and only one is a CTE course, only 1/7 of the weekly seminar minutes are counted for weighted funding. If a student is taking two CTE courses, 2/7 of the seminar minutes are counted for weighted funding. This formula allows equitable prorating for weighted funding.

I would also like to share with the committee something that I have heard from nearly every employer I have spoken to in regard to workforce development. Employers are seeking employees with a well-developed work ethic along with technical skills. Productivity and efficiency are diminished if employees are unable to effectively communicate, work independently and in teams, and/or exhibit prompt and regular attendance.

Mr. Chairman, this bill provides for the continued .5 weighted funding of vocational education programs, which is so critical. However, it eliminates that funding for seminar periods and courses that teach important employment and living skills. Seminar periods are an important tool to reinforce and supplement instruction in all courses, including vocational education programs; and vocational education courses provide the best setting in which to develop and reinforce the employment and life skills so often requested by our business community. For these reasons, I am opposed to the restrictions contained within HB 2237.

House Education Committee
Date 2-17-09
Attachment # 9

KANSAS
ASSOCIATION



OF
SCHOOL
BOARDS

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

Testimony before the
House Education Committee
by

Mark Tallman, Assistant Executive Director/Advocacy
Kansas Association of School Boards
Also Representing
Kansas City USD 500

February 17, 2009

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on **HB 2237**. As we understand the intent of this bill, it would limit state vocational education funding provided through the school finance vocational weighting to occupational-specific vocational courses.

KASB appears as an opponent of this bill primarily because we believe school districts will be facing significant changes in the structure of vocation education under federal law over the next few years, including changing the name to career and technical education, the implementation of career pathways and other new approaches.

Rather than pass this bill, which would address just one aspect of the issue, we suggest the committee should ask the Kansas State Department of Education to do a complete study of how all of the career and technical education changes will affect school district costs, and make recommendations to the Legislature on an equitable, cost-based system for funding.

We would also note that districts might be better able to deal with implications of this bill in a year in which they were not facing severe reductions in overall funding. Although this bill reflects issues raised by the Legislative Post Audit cost study, the LPA study also determined that the base budget per pupil should be far higher than it was even before the current year budget cuts in order to meet student outcomes.

Thank you for your consideration.

House Education Committee
Date 2-17-09
Attachment # 10

HB 2237 TESTIMONY FOR KACTE

TO: HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE
FROM: STEVE KEARNEY ON BEHALF OF KACTE
SUBJECT: HB 2237
DATE: 2/17/2009

Chairman Aurand and members of the Committee thank you for considering the remarks of the Kansas Association for Career and Technical Educators this morning on House Bill 2237. The KACTE is a non profit association of approximately 700 teachers in the secondary setting engaged in delivering technical education across the state.

House Bill 2237 appears to be an attempt to address the continuing concern of some lawmakers that any weighted funding for technical education gets spent on technical education programs. We certainly concur that such items as "study hall" would not typically fit into that category contemplated by the weighted funding and should not be compensated in that fashion.

While the intent of the bill appears to be well meaning it is confusing at best and raises several questions for our members. A few of those are as follows:

- Does the change in language in lines 16 and 17 indicate that there will no longer be a need for a bilingual component of technical education programs or does it mean that it will simply no longer be an additional weighted component?
- With those changes does the bill still contemplate adding both the weighting in (a) (1) and (a) (2) together for a total sum?
- The new definitions beginning on line 16 are using language that is not in line with current practices such as " approved vocational programs" when technical education has long since changed that terminology and is employing currently career clusters and other methods for determination of programs.
- The definitions of "occupation specific vocational education course" on line beginning on line 34, while getting at study hall as something that should not be weighted, would impinge the authority of the State Board to determine what the components of a technical education program should be based on national standards and local experiences.

Thank you for considering these remarks. Please let me know if there are any questions.

House Education Committee
Date 2-17-09
Attachment # 11

HOUSE BILL No. 2104

By Committee on Education

1-27

9 AN ACT concerning school districts; relating to school finance; amend-
10 ing K.S.A. 2008 Supp. 72-6412, 72-6455 and 72-6459 and repealing
11 the existing sections.

12
13 *Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Kansas:*

14 New Section 1. (a) A school district shall be eligible either for the
15 low enrollment weighting or the high density at-risk pupil weighting,
16 whichever is higher, but shall not be eligible for both weightings.

17 (b) A school district shall be eligible either for the low enrollment
18 weighting or the medium density at-risk pupil weighting, whichever is
19 higher, but shall not be eligible for both weightings.

20 (c) The provisions of this section shall be part of and supplemental
21 to the school district finance and quality performance act.

22 Sec. 2. K.S.A. 2008 Supp. 72-6412 is hereby amended to read as
23 follows: 72-6412. (a) The low enrollment weighting shall be determined
24 by the state board as provided by this section.

25 (b) For districts with enrollment of 1,637 or more in school year
26 2006-2007, and 1,622 or more in school year 2007-2008 and each school
27 year thereafter, the low enrollment weighting shall be 0.

28 (c) For districts with enrollment of less than 100, the low enrollment
29 weighting shall be equal to the low enrollment weighting of a district with
30 enrollment of 100.

31 (d) For districts with enrollment of less than 1,637 in school year
32 2006-2007 and less than 1,622 in school year 2007-2008 and each school
33 year thereafter and more than 99, the low enrollment weighting shall be
34 determined by the state board as follows:

35 (1) Determine the low enrollment weighting for such districts for
36 school year 2004-2005;

37 (2) multiply the low enrollment weighting of each district determined
38 under paragraph (1) by 3,863;

39 (3) add 3,863 to the product obtained under paragraph (2);

40 (4) divide the product obtained under paragraph (3) by 4,107; and

41 (5) subtract 1 from the product obtained under paragraph (4). The
42 difference shall be the low enrollment weighting of the district.

43 (e) *The provisions of this section shall be subject to section 1, and*

In school year 2011-2012 and in each school year thereafter, a

1 *amendments thereto.*

2 Sec. 3. K.S.A. 2008 Supp. 72-6455 is hereby amended to read as
3 follows: 72-6455. (a) As used in this section, school district means any
4 district having: (1) An enrollment of at least 50% at-risk pupils; or (2) an
5 enrollment of at least 35.1% at-risk pupils and an enrollment density of
6 at least 212.1 pupils per square mile.

7 (b) The high density at-risk pupil weighting of each school district
8 shall be determined by the state board by multiplying the number of at-
9 risk pupils by .10. The product is the high density at-risk pupil weighting
10 of the district.

11 (c) If a school district becomes ineligible for high density at-risk pupil
12 weighting because enrollment of at-risk pupils in the district falls below
13 the requirements of subsection (a), the high density at-risk pupil weight-
14 ing of the district shall be the greater of: (1) The high density at-risk pupil
15 weighting in the current school year; (2) the high density at-risk pupil
16 weighting in the prior school year; or (3) the average of the high density
17 at-risk pupil weighting in the current school year and the preceding two
18 school years.

19 (d) *The provisions of this section shall be subject to section 1, and*
20 *amendments thereto.*

21 (e) The provisions of this subsection shall expire on June 30, 2011.

22 Sec. 4. K.S.A. 2008 Supp. 72-6459 is hereby amended to read as
23 follows: 72-6459. (a) As used in this section, "school district" means any
24 district having an enrollment of at least 40% but less than 50% at-risk
25 pupils.

26 (b) ~~The medium density at-risk pupil weighting of each school district~~
27 ~~shall be determined by the state board by multiplying the number of at-~~
28 ~~risk pupils by .06. The product is the medium density at-risk pupil weight-~~
29 ~~ing of the district.~~

30 (c) If a school district becomes ineligible for medium density at-risk
31 pupil weighting because enrollment of at-risk pupils in the district falls
32 below the requirement of subsection (a), the medium density at-risk pupil
33 weighting of the district shall be the greater of: (1) The medium density
34 at-risk pupil weighting in the current school year; (2) the medium density
35 at-risk pupil weighting in the prior school year; or (3) the average of the
36 medium density at-risk pupil weighting in the current school year and the
37 preceding two school years.

38 (d) *The provisions of this section shall be subject to section 1, and*
39 *amendments thereto.*

40 (e) The provisions of this subsection shall expire on June 30, 2011.

41 Sec. 5. K.S.A. 2008 Supp. 72-6412, 72-6455 and 72-6459 are hereby
42 repealed.

43

(1) Except as provided by paragraph(2), the

(2) In school year 2010-2011, the medium density at-risk pupil weighting of a school district which also is eligible for low enrollment weighting shall be determined by the state board by multiplying the number of at-risk pupils by .03. The product is the medium density at-risk pupil weighting of the district.

			Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5
USD	County	District	Low	Current Law	Original Proposed	New Proposed	Funding Loss
			Enrollment	High At Risk Funding	High At Risk	High At Risk	Difference
			WTD FTE	at \$4,433	Funding Loss	Funding Loss	(Col 3 - Col 4)
256	Allen	Marmaton Valley	158.6	0	0	0	0
257	Allen	Iola	140.1	179,980	-179,980	0	-179,980
258	Allen	Humboldt	209.8	0	0	0	0
365	Anderson	Garnett	231.0	0	0	0	0
479	Anderson	Crest	154.1	0	0	0	0
377	Atchison	Atchison County	242.9	0	0	0	0
409	Atchison	Atchison	77.2	209,681	-209,681	0	-209,681
254	Barber	Barber Co.	214.5	0	0	0	0
255	Barber	South Barber Co.	153.3	0	0	0	0
354	Barton	Clafflin	154.0	0	0	0	0
355	Barton	Ellinwood	189.5	0	0	0	0
428	Barton	Great Bend	0.0	678,249	0	0	0
431	Barton	Hoisington	230.7	0	0	0	0
234	Bourbon	Ft. Scott	0.0	246,918	0	0	0
235	Bourbon	Uniontown	195.6	48,763	-48,763	0	-48,763
415	Brown	Hiawatha	252.5	0	0	0	0
430	Brown	Brown County	236.0	144,073	-144,073	-57,629	-86,444
205	Butler	Bluestem	234.7	0	0	0	0
206	Butler	Remington-Whitewater	217.4	0	0	0	0
375	Butler	Circle	77.3	0	0	0	0
385	Butler	Andover	0.0	0	0	0	0
394	Butler	Rose Hill	0.0	0	0	0	0
396	Butler	Douglass	251.4	0	0	0	0
402	Butler	Augusta	0.0	0	0	0	0
490	Butler	El Dorado	0.0	0	0	0	0
492	Butler	Flinthills	145.9	0	0	0	0
284	Chase	Chase County	191.5	0	0	0	0
285	Chautauqua	Cedar Vale	127.6	0	0	0	0
286	Chautauqua	Chautauqua	174.3	0	0	0	0
404	Cherokee	Riverton	252.6	0	0	0	0
493	Cherokee	Columbus	223.2	127,227	-127,227	0	-127,227
499	Cherokee	Galena	247.0	172,887	-172,887	-69,953	-102,934
508	Cherokee	Baxter Springs	251.5	118,361	-118,361	0	-118,361
103	Cheyenne	Cheylin	128.8	14,629	-14,629	0	-14,629
297	Cheyenne	St. Francis	148.1	0	0	0	0
219	Clark	Minneola	151.0	0	0	0	0
220	Clark	Ashland	152.7	0	0	0	0
379	Clay	Clay Center	170.8	0	0	0	0
333	Cloud	Concordia	239.3	117,918	-117,918	0	-117,918
334	Cloud	Southern Cloud	154.4	27,485	-27,485	0	-27,485
243	Coffey	Lebo-Waverly	221.2	0	0	0	0
244	Coffey	Burlington	252.4	0	0	0	0
245	Coffey	LeRoy-Gridley	152.9	0	0	0	0
300	Comanche	Comanche County	152.7	0	0	0	0
462	Cowley	Central	162.8	0	0	0	0
463	Cowley	Udall	178.4	0	0	0	0

			Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5
JSD	County	District	Low Enrollment WTD FTE	Current Law High At Risk Funding at \$4,433	Original Proposed High At Risk Funding Loss	New Proposed High At Risk Funding Loss	Funding Loss Difference (Co 3 - Col 4)
465	Cowley	Winfield	0.0	0	0	0	0
470	Cowley	Arkansas City	0.0	647,218	0	0	0
471	Cowley	Dexter	141.6	0	0	0	0
246	Crawford	Northeast	220.5	123,681	-123,681	-49,472	-74,208
247	Crawford	Cherokee	248.5	0	0	0	0
248	Crawford	Girard	245.4	0	0	0	0
249	Crawford	Frontenac	252.4	0	0	0	0
250	Crawford	Pittsburg	0.0	647,661	0	0	0
294	Decatur	Oberlin	178.0	0	0	0	0
393	Dickinson	Solomon	180.8	0	0	0	0
435	Dickinson	Abilene	83.8	0	0	0	0
473	Dickinson	Chapman	248.8	0	0	0	0
481	Dickinson	Rural Vista	188.8	0	0	0	0
487	Dickinson	Herington	215.3	0	0	0	0
406	Doniphan	Wathena	181.6	0	0	0	0
425	Doniphan	Highland	154.3	0	0	0	0
429	Doniphan	Troy	167.5	0	0	0	0
433	Doniphan	Midway	145.5	0	0	0	0
486	Doniphan	Elwood	149.2	78,021	-78,021	-31,208	-46,812
348	Douglas	Baldwin City	168.9	0	0	0	0
491	Douglas	Eudora	156.0	0	0	0	0
497	Douglas	Lawrence	0.0	0	0	0	0
347	Edwards	Kinsely-Offerte	157.8	0	0	0	0
502	Edwards	Lewis	106.9	0	0	0	0
282	Elk	West Elk	166.9	40,340	-40,340	0	-40,340
283	Elk	Elk Valley	147.2	42,557	-42,557	-17,023	-25,534
388	Ellis	Ellis	169.7	0	0	0	0
432	Ellis	Victoria	153.6	0	0	0	0
489	Ellis	Hays	0.0	0	0	0	0
327	Ellsworth	Ellsworth	229.8	0	0	0	0
328	Ellsworth	Lorraine	195.4	0	0	0	0
363	Finney	Holcomb	252.8	0	0	0	0
457	Finney	Garden City	0.0	1,618,932	0	0	0
381	Ford	Spearville	164.4	0	0	0	0
443	Ford	Dodge City	0.0	1,632,674	0	0	0
459	Ford	Bucklin	154.1	0	0	0	0
287	Franklin	West Franklin	249.0	0	0	0	0
288	Franklin	Central Heights	226.1	0	0	0	0
289	Franklin	Wellsville	252.6	0	0	0	0
290	Franklin	Ottawa	0.0	258,444	0	0	0
475	Geary	Junction City	0.0	0	0	0	0
291	Gove	Grinnell	97.7	0	0	0	0
292	Gove	Wheatland	123.6	0	0	0	0
293	Gove	Quinter	147.2	0	0	0	0
281	Graham	Graham County	174.2	0	0	0	0
214	Grant	Ulysses	63.6	183,970	-183,970	0	-183,970

			Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5
USD	County	District	Low Enrollment WTD FTE	Current Law High At Risk Funding at \$4,433	Original Proposed High At Risk Funding Loss	New Proposed High At Risk Funding Loss	Funding Loss Difference (Col 3 - Col 4)
102	Gray	Cimarron-Ensign	238.3	0	0	0	0
371	Gray	Montezuma	154.4	0	0	0	0
476	Gray	Copeland	123.7	14,186	-14,186	0	-14,186
477	Gray	Ingalls	153.8	24,382	-24,382	0	-24,382
200	Greeley	Greeley County	154.2	0	0	0	0
386	Greenwood	Madison-Virgil	154.3	0	0	0	0
389	Greenwood	Eureka	231.2	69,598	-69,598	0	-69,598
390	Greenwood	Hamilton	100.9	27,041	-27,041	-10,817	-16,225
494	Hamilton	Syracuse	200.3	60,289	-60,289	0	-60,289
361	Harper	Anthony-Harper	252.4	89,990	-89,990	0	-89,990
511	Harper	Attica	128.0	0	0	0	0
369	Harvey	Burton	154.4	0	0	0	0
373	Harvey	Newton	0.0	0	0	0	0
439	Harvey	Sedgwick	215.9	0	0	0	0
440	Harvey	Halstead	251.1	0	0	0	0
460	Harvey	Hesston	252.2	0	0	0	0
374	Haskell	Sublette	202.1	49,650	-49,650	0	-49,650
507	Haskell	Satanta	163.1	44,330	-44,330	0	-44,330
227	Hodgeman	Jetmore	151.2	0	0	0	0
228	Hodgeman	Hanston	74.2	0	0	0	0
335	Jackson	North Jackson	178.9	0	0	0	0
336	Jackson	Holton	236.0	0	0	0	0
337	Jackson	Mayetta	250.0	0	0	0	0
338	Jefferson	Valley Halls	185.6	0	0	0	0
339	Jefferson	Jefferson County	206.4	0	0	0	0
340	Jefferson	Jefferson West	251.5	0	0	0	0
341	Jefferson	Oskaloosa	219.4	0	0	0	0
342	Jefferson	McLouth	216.7	0	0	0	0
343	Jefferson	Perry	250.7	0	0	0	0
107	Jewell	Rock Hills	149.8	0	0	0	0
279	Jewell	Jewell	112.7	0	0	0	0
229	Johnson	Blue Valley	0.0	0	0	0	0
230	Johnson	Spring Hill	0.0	0	0	0	0
231	Johnson	Gardner-Edgerton	0.0	0	0	0	0
232	Johnson	DeSoto	0.0	0	0	0	0
233	Johnson	Olathe	0.0	0	0	0	0
512	Johnson	Shawnee Mission	0.0	0	0	0	0
215	Kearny	Lakin	235.5	74,474	-74,474	0	-74,474
216	Kearny	Deerfield	147.2	73,588	-73,588	-29,435	-44,153
331	Kingman	Kingman	241.0	0	0	0	0
332	Kingman	Cunningham	145.6	0	0	0	0
422	Kiowa	Greensburg	153.9	31,474	-31,474	-12,590	-18,885
424	Kiowa	Mullinville	60.1	0	0	0	0
474	Kiowa	Haviland	132.3	0	0	0	0
503	Labette	Parsons	163.0	310,753	-310,753	-124,301	-186,452
504	Labette	Oswego	210.2	0	0	0	0

		Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5	
JSD	County	District	Low Enrollment WTD FTE	Current Law High At Risk Funding at \$4,433	Original Proposed High At Risk Funding Loss	New Proposed High At Risk Funding Loss	Funding Loss Difference (Col 3 - Col 4)
							-65,808
505	Labette	Chetopa - St. Paul	214.7	65,608	-65,608	0	0
506	Labette	Labette County	77.3	0	0	0	0
468	Lane	Healy	88.2	0	0	0	0
482	Lane	Dighton	154.0	0	0	0	0
207	Leavenworth	Ft. Leavenworth	0.0	0	0	0	0
449	Leavenworth	Easton	240.5	0	0	0	0
453	Leavenworth	Leavenworth	0.0	780,651	0	0	0
458	Leavenworth	Basehor-Linwood	0.0	0	0	0	0
464	Leavenworth	Tonganoxie	0.0	0	0	0	0
469	Leavenworth	Lansing	0.0	0	0	0	0
298	Lincoln	Lincoln	160.5	0	0	0	-11,526
299	Lincoln	Sylvan Grove	120.5	11,526	-11,526	0	-43,000
344	Linn	Pleasanton	171.0	43,000	-43,000	0	0
346	Linn	Jayhawk	216.3	0	0	0	0
362	Linn	Prairie View	250.0	0	0	0	0
274	Logan	Oakley	184.0	0	0	0	0
275	Logan	Triplains	88.7	9,753	-9,753	0	-9,753
251	Lyon	North Lyon Co.	218.5	0	0	0	0
252	Lyon	Southern Lyon Co.	219.4	0	0	0	0
253	Lyon	Emporia	0.0	1,056,827	0	0	0
397	Marion	Centre	154.2	0	0	0	0
398	Marion	Peabody-Burns	164.8	0	0	0	0
408	Marion	Marion	230.1	0	0	0	0
410	Marion	Durham-Hills	232.5	0	0	0	0
411	Marion	Goessel	154.0	0	0	0	0
364	Marshall	Marysville	247.2	0	0	0	0
380	Marshall	Vermillion	214.2	0	0	0	0
488	Marshall	Axtell	146.1	0	0	0	0
498	Marshall	Valley Heights	172.4	0	0	0	0
400	McPherson	Smoky Valley	250.1	0	0	0	0
418	McPherson	McPherson	0.0	0	0	0	0
419	McPherson	Canton-Galva	177.8	0	0	0	0
423	McPherson	Moundridge	194.7	0	0	0	0
448	McPherson	Inman	192.9	0	0	0	0
225	Meade	Fowler	142.7	17,732	-17,732	0	-17,732
226	Meade	Meade	202.5	0	0	0	0
367	Miami	Osawatomie	225.0	131,217	-131,217	0	-131,217
368	Miami	Paola	0.0	0	0	0	0
416	Miami	Louisburg	0.0	0	0	0	0
272	Mitchell	Waconda	173.8	0	0	0	0
273	Mitchell	Beloit	245.6	0	0	0	0
436	Montgomery	Caney	251.3	0	0	0	0
445	Montgomery	Coffeyville	0.0	438,424	0	0	0
446	Montgomery	Independence	0.0	214,557	0	0	0
447	Montgomery	Cherryvale	250.1	87,330	-87,330	0	-87,330
417	Morris	Morris County	251.2	0	0	0	0

			Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5
JSD	County	District	Low Enrollment WTD FTE	Current Law High At Risk Funding at \$4,433	Original Proposed High At Risk Funding Loss	New Proposed High At Risk Funding Loss	Funding Loss Difference (Col 3 - Col 4)
			150.2	0	0	0	0
217	Morton	Rolla	219.7	0	0	0	0
218	Morton	Elkhart	251.0	0	0	0	0
441	Nemaha	Sabetha	201.2	0	0	0	0
442	Nemaha	Nemaha Valley	150.1	0	0	0	0
451	Nemaha	B & B	231.5	0	0	0	0
101	Neosho	Erie	0.0	195,495	0	0	0
413	Neosho	Chanute	141.3	0	0	0	0
106	Ness	Western Plains	151.5	0	0	0	0
303	Ness	Ness City	241.9	0	0	0	0
211	Norton	Norton	151.2	24,825	-24,825	0	-24,825
212	Norton	Northern Valley	47.2	0	0	0	0
213	Norton	West Solomon	241.2	0	0	0	0
420	Osage	Osage City	195.6	0	0	0	0
421	Osage	Lyndon	227.5	0	0	0	0
434	Osage	Santa Fe	158.4	0	0	0	0
454	Osage	Burlingame	148.5	35,021	-35,021	0	-35,021
456	Osage	Marals Des Cygnes	158.3	38,124	-38,124	0	-38,124
392	Osborne	Osborne	229.9	0	0	0	0
239	Ottawa	North Ottawa Co.	234.6	0	0	0	0
240	Ottawa	Twin Valley	252.7	0	0	0	0
495	Pawnee	Ft. Lamed	126.3	0	0	0	0
496	Pawnee	Pawnee Heights	150.8	0	0	0	0
110	Phillips	Thunder Ridge	238.2	0	0	0	0
325	Phillips	Phillipsburg	143.7	0	0	0	0
326	Phillips	Logan	186.2	0	0	0	0
320	Pottawatomie	Wamego	229.7	0	0	0	0
321	Pottawatomie	Kaw Valley	162.8	0	0	0	0
322	Pottawatomie	Onaga	252.1	0	0	0	0
323	Pottawatomie	Westmoreland	229.7	0	0	0	0
382	Pratt	Pratt	169.8	0	0	0	0
438	Pratt	Skyline	151.8	0	0	0	0
105	Rawlins	Rawlins County	0.0	1,038,209	0	0	0
308	Reno	Hutchinson	221.6	134,763	-134,763	0	-134,763
309	Reno	Nickerson	154.7	37,681	-37,681	0	-37,681
310	Reno	Fairfield	149.3	0	0	0	0
311	Reno	Pretty Prairie	244.1	0	0	0	0
312	Reno	Haven	0.0	0	0	0	0
313	Reno	Buhler	209.9	0	0	0	0
109	Republic	Republic County	154.0	0	0	0	0
426	Republic	Pike Valley	219.0	0	0	0	0
376	Rice	Sterling	128.1	17,732	-17,732	0	-17,732
401	Rice	Chase	251.0	205,691	-205,691	-82,276	-123,415
405	Rice	Lyons	148.6	0	0	0	0
444	Rice	Little River	238.4	0	0	0	0
378	Riley	Riley County	0.0	0	0	0	0
383	Riley	Manhattan					

13-5

			Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5
JSD	County	District	Low Enrollment WTD FTE	Current Law High At Risk Funding at \$4,433	Original Proposed High At Risk Funding Loss	New Proposed High At Risk Funding Loss	Funding Loss Difference (Col 3 - Col 4)
			250.3	0	0	0	0
315	Thomas	Colby					
316	Thomas	Golden Plains	147.2	20,835	-20,835	0	-20,835
208	Trego	WaKeeney	193.1	0	0	0	0
329	Wabaunsee	Alma	204.7	0	0	0	0
330	Wabaunsee	Wabaunsee East	206.1	0	0	0	0
241	Wallace	Wallace	152.2	0	0	0	0
242	Wallace	Weskan	110.7	0	0	0	0
108	Washington	Washington Co. Schools	184.6	0	0	0	0
223	Washington	Barnes	165.6	0	0	0	0
224	Washington	Clifton-Clyde	149.2	0	0	0	0
467	Wichita	Leoti	191.6	0	0	0	0
387	Wilson	Altoona-Midway	152.3	0	0	0	0
461	Wilson	Neodesha	249.8	0	0	0	0
484	Wilson	Fredonia	248.5	0	0	0	0
366	Woodson	Woodson	187.6	0	0	0	0
202	Wyandotte	Turner	0.0	918,518	0	0	0
203	Wyandotte	Piper	77.2	0	0	0	0
204	Wyandotte	Bonner Springs	0.0	0	0	0	0
500	Wyandotte	Kansas City	0.0	8,440,706	0	0	0
Total			44,420.6	38,108,511	-3,667,421	-559,001	-3,108,420

13-7