Adam C. Proffitt, Director



Phone: (785) 296-2436 adam.c.proffitt@ks.gov http://budget.kansas.gov

Laura Kelly, Governor

January 29, 2025

The Honorable Renee Erickson, Chairperson Senate Committee on Education 300 SW 10th Avenue, Room 144-S Topeka, Kansas 66612

Dear Senator Erickson:

SUBJECT: Fiscal Note for SB 48 by Senate Committee on Education

In accordance with KSA 75-3715a, the following fiscal note concerning SB 48 is respectfully submitted to your committee.

Current law, requires the State Board of Education, for the mission of Kansas education, is required to design and adopt a school district accreditation system based upon improvement in performance that equals or exceeds the educational goals set in KSA 72-3218(c), also known as the "Rose Capacities." SB 48 would require an accreditation system that requires conclusive, measurable evidence of improved student academic performance and equals or exceeds the "Rose Capacities."

Beginning July 1, 2026, and each subsequent school year, to achieve or maintain accreditation, school districts would be required to demonstrate material improvement in student academic performance from the preceding school year. This evidence would be a significant reduction in the number of students who scored at "level 1" on state assessments and a significant increase in the number of students who scored above "level 2" on state assessments. The State Board of Education would be required to set required academic performance improvement targets and ensure all districts have programs and initiatives in place.

The bill would specify that the school district accreditation system would require districts to be in compliance with all applicable federal and state statutes, as well as all rules and regulations. Districts found to be out of compliance would be notified by the State Board of Education for each noncompliance. The notification would identify the nature and extent of the noncompliance and provide a deadline to be corrected, not to extend beyond June 30 of the succeeding school year. Failure of a district to correct the noncompliance would result in the loss of accreditation.

The Honorable Renee Erickson, Chairperson Page 2—SB 48

If a district is conditionally accredited, accredited with conditions, or not fully accredited, the State Board would require a corrective action plan which would be approved by the State Board of Education. If a school district is not fully accredited for failure to demonstrate conclusive, measurable evidence of improvement in academic performance, the superintendent or designee would be required to appear before the House Committee on Education and the Senate Committee on Education. The district would have to provide a report to these committees on the challenges and obstacles that are preventing accreditation and what actions are being taken or will be taken to correct the unaccredited status.

The bill would require the State Board of Education to not substantially revise or update the English language arts or mathematics curriculum standards that are in effect on July 1, 2014, that would necessitate the development of new statewide assessments until 75.0 percent of all students perform in "level 3" and "level 4" combined in the statewide assessments by the year 2023. This policy would not be construed to impinge on a school district's authority to determine its own curriculum if a district's curriculum reflects high academic standards.

According to the Department of Education, the State Board of Education implemented a new accreditation model, KESA 2.0, beginning in school year 2024-2025. SB 48 would change the approved and implemented accreditation model and would require the State Board of Education to return to a model that reviews and accredits schools, rather than school systems.

Currently, school districts are required to be in compliance with federal and state laws, and rules and regulations set by the State Board of Education to obtain and maintain their accreditation status. This bill would require the State Board of Education to establish a due process procedure in which any individual could challenge a determination made on school district or school compliance. This requirement would permit individuals to make challenges to the State Board of Education and Department's determination based on findings after extensive review of school district materials and would require a new due process investigation to be completed.

While the Department is not able to estimate the number of challenges that would be made; however, based on current staffing levels and current staff workloads committed to the accreditation process, the Department is unable to fit these new duties into the current agency structure. The agency would require additional staff in the Accreditation and Design Program to facilitate challenges to school district and school building compliance. This would also require additional travel to follow up and investigate compliance challenges.

The Department estimates that an additional 5.00 FTE positions and additional expenditures totaling \$471,922, all from the State General Fund, would be needed to implement requirements of this bill in FY 2026. This estimate includes salaries and wages totaling \$427,172 for 1.00 Assistant Director, 1.00 Investigator, 2.00 Public Service Executives, and 1.00 Administrative Specialist. The total estimated expenditures include \$28,000 for travel and subsistence costs, \$6,750 for fuel and office supplies, and \$10,000 for computer equipment. These new positions would be ongoing and expenditures in future years would increase by the rate of

The Honorable Renee Erickson, Chairperson Page 3—SB 48

inflation along with any statewide salary increases for state employees that would be authorized. Any fiscal effect associated with SB 48 is not reflected in *The FY 2026 Governor's Budget Report*.

The Kansas Association of School Boards reports that the enactment of the bill could have school districts redesign curriculum and add additional test preparation into its procedures. These additional actions would require additional administrative costs for these districts. In addition, the bill would increase the potential for districts to lose accreditation in any given year. However, a fiscal effect cannot be estimated.

Sincerely,

A- C. - +

Adam C. Proffitt Director of the Budget

cc: Gabrielle Hull, Department of Education Angie Stallbaumer, Kansas Association of School Boards