



**KANSAS ASSOCIATION
OF SCHOOL BOARDS**

Serving Educational Leaders, Inspiring Student Success

www.kasb.org

Testimony before the
Senate Education Committee
on
SB 312 - Extending the school district efficiency audit sunset and exemption time frame
by

Mark Tallman, Associate Executive Director for Advocacy

January 21, 2016

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on **SB 312**. KASB appears as a proponent of **SB 312** which extends the period of time the Legislative Post Audit is required to conduct efficiency audits on three school districts per year until 2020. Under current law, LPA first seeks volunteer districts to audit. If there are not enough volunteers, districts are selected at random. However, districts may be exempted from this selection if they have had a similar audit in recent years, and the bill extends the exemptions “window” from five to ten years.

KASB supports this bill because it extends a program we have previously supported as a way to help individual school districts look for efficiencies in their operations, and to develop ideas that can help other districts. KASB has consistently worked with LPA to promote awareness of these audits and their findings. We have a high regard for the quality of LPA’s work and the professionalism of its staff.

However, I want to make clear that we support this program because the audit recommendations are just that: recommendations. KASB’s priority resolution for 2016 includes the following statement:

Local Accountability. We support allowing locally elected boards to determine the most efficient way to spend resources to meet their specific student and community needs.

The LPA efficiency audit process recognizes that most of the significant potential savings also have a significant potential impact on students, staff and community. LPA has identified a number of ways selected school districts could reduce expenditures. They have also recognized that these are usually not painless, hidden, backroom changes that no one will notice.

Asking school boards to accept everything in an LPA report would be like asking the Legislature to adopt everything in the recent state efficiency study without hearings, debate or amendment. No one runs for the school board on a platform of operating inefficiently. Local boards must evaluate not only savings but the broader impact of changes designed to save money on their constituents - just as you do.

Finally, we urge the committee and Legislature to consider how efficient Kansas school districts already are for the money they spend. To determine the quality of state educational systems, this summer and fall KASB identified 14 different indicators of student achievement, including National Assessment of Educational Progress reading and math results, graduation rates and preparation for college. We found just seven states (New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Nebraska, New Jersey, Vermont, Indiana and Iowa) ranked higher than Kansas on at least 8 of these 14 outcomes. We call these aspiration states because they are getting the results we aspire to reach. Every one of these states provided more total resources per pupil from all sources than Kansas. To repeat: no higher achieving state spent less per pupil than Kansas.

However, we wanted to look ever more broadly at state education outcomes. Our KASB research department identified state rankings on 76 different education outcomes, including all of the factors we previously used, plus more detailed NAEP results and more indicators of postsecondary attainment (listed on page 3). When all of these ranks are averaged, Kansas ends up 10th in the nation, behind Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Jersey, Iowa, Wisconsin and Connecticut. Every higher achieving state provides more total funding per pupil than Kansas. (Page 4)

Of course, because Kansas ranks below the national average in funding per pupil, many other states spend *more* than Kansas and have *lower* overall results. In addition, every state that ranks higher than Kansas also has at least as high a percentage of students in poverty than Kansas. In other words, no state has better overall results without spending more and having the same or fewer students in poverty.

This does not mean Kansas is getting the student results we want and need, but it means we are closer than most other states. It doesn't mean we are doing *everything* right, but it means we doing *some things* right. We suggest that our strong tradition of local control, giving local school boards the constitutional responsibility to maintain, develop and operate local public schools, is not a hinderance to be overcome, but an advantage to be maintained and strengthened.

Maybe local voters really do know what they are doing when they elect local school boards to make decisions. They are, after all, the same voters who elect the Legislature.

Thank you for your consideration.

Category	Outcome Measure	Year	Kansas Rank	Higher Ranking States that Spend Less	
				#	%
Graduation / Dropouts / HS Completion	Percentage of high school dropouts 16 to 24 years old	2013	9	0	0%
	4 Yr Rate	2013	13	3	25%
	Cohort Rate - All Students	2013	13	3	25%
	Cohort Rate - Economically Disadvantaged Students	2013	13	6	50%
	Cohort Rate - Limited English Proficiency Students	2013	5	1	25%
	Cohort Rate - Students with Disabilities	2013	3	2	100%
	Freshman Graduation Rate	2013	10	1	11%
	Percent 18-24 Less than high school graduate	2014	18	1	6%
	Percent 18-24 High school graduate (includes equivalency)	2014	6	0	0%
	Percent 25 years and over - Less than 9th grade	2014	15	3	21%
	Percent 25 years and over - 9th to 12th grade, no diploma	2014	16	5	33%
	Percent 25 years and over - High school graduate (includes equivalency)	2014	16	9	60%
	Percent 25 and over high school graduate or higher	2014	17	5	31%
Postsecondary Enrollment / Completion	Percent 18-24 Some college or associate's degree	2014	5	1	25%
	Percent 18-24 Bachelor's degree or higher	2014	23	0	0%
	Percent 25 years and over - Some college, no degree	2014	10	7	78%
	Percent 25 years and over - Associate's degree	2014	29	12	43%
	Percent 25 years and over - Bachelor's degree	2014	13	3	25%
	Percent 25 years and over - Graduate or professional degree	2014	19	5	28%
	Percent 25 and over bachelor's degree or higher	2014	15	3	21%
ACT	Composite Score	2015	10	1	11%
	English Score	2015	11	2	20%
	Math Score	2015	12	1	9%
	Reading Score	2015	10	1	11%
	Science Score	2015	13	3	25%
	Meeting All 4 Benchmarks	2015	12	2	18%
	Meeting English Benchmark	2015	9	1	13%
	Meeting Mathematics Benchmark	2015	11	2	20%
	Meeting Reading Benchmark	2015	8	1	14%
	Meeting Science Benchmark	2015	14	2	15%
SAT	Combined Score	2015	16	3	20%
	Mathematics Score	2014	15	2	14%
	Reading Score	2014	16	3	20%
	Writing Score	2014	22	5	24%
NAEP	All Basic or Above	2015	20	5	26%
	All Proficient or Above	2015	22	7	33%
	All Score	2015	23	7	32%
	NSLP Eligible Basic or Above	2015	17	8	50%
	NSLP Eligible Proficient or Above	2015	18	7	41%
	NSLP Eligible Score	2015	12	5	45%
	NSLP Not Eligible Basic or Above	2015	10	2	22%
	NSLP Not Eligible Proficient or Above	2015	20	5	26%
	NSLP Not Eligible Score	2015	17	4	25%
	4 Math All Basic or Above	2015	21	7	35%
	4 Math All Proficient or Above	2015	21	6	30%
	4 Math All Score	2015	23	7	32%
	4 Math NSLP Eligible Basic or Above	2015	18	6	35%
	4 Math NSLP Eligible Proficient or Above	2015	12	6	55%
	4 Math NSLP Not Eligible Basic or Above	2015	14	5	38%
	4 Math NSLP Not Eligible Proficient or Above	2015	17	6	38%
	4 Read All Basic or Above	2015	29	10	36%
	4 Read All Proficient or Above	2015	30	9	31%
	4 Read All Score	2015	34	11	33%
	4 Read NSLP Eligible Basic or Above	2015	34	14	42%
	4 Read NSLP Eligible Proficient or Above	2015	34	15	45%
	4 Read NSLP Eligible Score	2015	20	5	26%
	4 Read NSLP Not Eligible Basic or Above	2015	19	6	33%
	4 Read NSLP Not Eligible Proficient or Above	2015	14	5	38%
	4 Read NSLP Not Eligible Score	2015	14	5	42%
	8 Math All Basic or Above	2015	13	2	17%
	8 Math All Proficient or Above	2015	25	7	29%
	8 Math NSLP Eligible Basic or Above	2015	9	2	25%
	8 Math NSLP Eligible Proficient or Above	2015	22	7	33%
	8 Math NSLP Eligible Score	2015	10	3	33%
	8 Math NSLP Not Eligible Basic or Above	2015	11	1	10%
	8 Math NSLP Not Eligible Proficient or Above	2015	25	7	29%
	8 Math NSLP Not Eligible Score	2015	26	8	32%
	8 Read All Basic or Above	2015	17	4	25%
	8 Read All Proficient or Above	2015	25	8	33%
	8 Read All Score	2015	21	6	30%
	8 Read NSLP Eligible Basic or Above	2015	15	6	43%
	8 Read NSLP Eligible Proficient or Above	2015	25	8	33%
	8 Read NSLP Eligible Score	2015	12	5	45%
	8 Read NSLP Not Eligible Basic or Above	2015	12	3	27%
	8 Read NSLP Not Eligible Proficient or Above	2015	22	7	33%
	8 Read NSLP Not Eligible Score	2015	22	7	33%
	Overall Average of Ranks		10	0	

	Total Revenue Per Pupil	Rank of Average of Rank
State	20	
Massachusetts	\$17,315	1
New Hampshire	\$15,320	2
Vermont	\$18,103	3
Minnesota	\$13,340	4
Nebraska	\$12,514	5
New Jersey	\$20,191	6
Iowa	\$12,072	7
Wisconsin	\$12,506	8
Connecticut	\$19,519	9
Kansas	\$11,596	10
North Dakota	\$13,478	11
Indiana	\$11,955	12
Virginia	\$11,846	13
Montana	\$11,566	14
Colorado	\$10,319	15
Wyoming	\$18,498	16
Washington	\$11,562	17
Utah	\$ 7,650	18
Maine	\$14,101	19
Ohio	\$13,467	20
Pennsylvania	\$16,644	21
Illinois	\$14,200	22
Missouri	\$11,179	23
Kentucky	\$10,533	24
South Dakota	\$10,087	25
Idaho	\$ 7,408	26
North Carolina	\$ 8,670	27
Oregon	\$10,677	28
Maryland	\$16,072	29
Rhode Island	\$16,580	30
New York	\$22,587	31
Florida	\$ 9,207	32
Texas	\$10,191	33
Tennessee	\$ 8,953	34
Oklahoma	\$ 8,751	35
Delaware	\$15,837	36
Georgia	\$10,370	37
Michigan	\$12,584	38
Arizona	\$ 8,599	39
Arkansas	\$10,573	40
Hawaii	\$12,621	41
South Carolina	\$11,412	42
California	\$10,702	43
West Virginia	\$12,309	44
Alaska	\$19,415	45
Mississippi	\$ 8,995	46
Alabama	\$ 9,607	47
Louisiana	\$12,045	48
New Mexico	\$10,753	49
Nevada	\$ 9,566	50