

Approved: February 24, 2011
Date

MINUTES OF THE HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Clay Aurand at 9:00 a.m. On January 19, 2011, in Room 784 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
Eunice C. Peters, Kansas Revisor of Statutes
Norm Furse, Kansas Revisor of Statutes
Dale Dennis, Deputy Commissioner, Kansas State Department of Education
Jan Johnston, Committee Assistant

Conferees appearing before the Committee:

Representative Richard Carlson
Carrie Ross, concerned citizen
Travis Ross, concerned citizen
Mark Tallman, Kansas School Boards
Lana Oleen, Interim President, Midwestern Higher Education Compact

Written testimony:

Tara Underwood, Board President, USD 247 Southeast, Cherokee, KS

Others attending, see attached sheet.

HB 2004 - School districts; defining non-resident pupil.

Chairman Aurand opened the hearing on **HB 2004**. The bill pertains to school districts furnishing transportation to any non-resident pupil who is enrolled in and attending school in the district. Chairman Aurand introduced Eunice Peters from the Kansas Revisors' Office to give an overview to committee members of **HB 2004**.

Representative Carlson spoke to Committee members as a proponent of **HB 2004**. Representative Carlson told the committee this bill allows the parents of children to determine where their child will go to school. Presently our state statutes require a non-resident student to receive the approval of both school districts in order to attend a non-resident school when living ten or less miles from the attendance center in which the pupil resides. In other words the resident district may prohibit the non-resident school bus from entering his district. (Attachment 1)

Travis Ross also spoke to the Committee members as a proponent of **HB 2004**. Mr. Ross and his wife, Carrie, would like their child to attend the Onaga School District because not only are they both Alumni but they have many friends in the area. They live one-half mile from Onaga's bus stop but the bus is unable to pick up their son because they are located in the USD 323 School District and there is a ten mile law restriction. (Attachment 2)

A question and answer session followed the presentation.

Mark Tallman, Associate Executive Director for Advocacy, Kansas Association of School Boards spoke to Committee members in opposition of **HB 2004**. He thanked the Committee for giving him the opportunity to testify on **HB 2004** which **would** remove most limits on the authority of school districts to send buses into another district to transport students to and from school without the permission of the other district. (Attachment 3)

A question and answer session followed the presentation.

Tara Underwood provided written testimony only. (Attachment 4)

Unless specifically noted, the individual remarks recorded herein have not been transcribed verbatim. Individual remarks as reported herein have not been submitted to the individuals appearing before the committee for editing or corrections.

CONTINUATION SHEET

Minutes of the House Education Committee at 9:00 a.m. On January 19, 2011, in Room 784 of the Docking State Office Building.

Chairman Aurand then closed the hearing on **HB 2004**.

Ms. Lana Oleen, Interim President of the Midwestern Higher Education Compact (MHEC), thanked Committee members for the opportunity to give an overview of the purpose of MHEC.

MHEC is one of four statutorily created interstate compacts created for the purpose of advancing higher education through cooperation and resource sharing. MHEC was established in 1991 and serves Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota and Wisconsin. (Attachment 5)

A question and answer session followed the presentation.

Representative Ward moved to introduce a bill which would address transportation issues in Leavenworth, the language would be similar to SB 11. It was seconded by Representative Trimmer. The motion carried.

Chairman Aurand moved to introduce a bill for the State Board of Education for the School of Blind and Deaf. Representative Osterman seconded. The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:45 a.m. The next meeting is scheduled for January 25, 2011.

HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE GUEST LIST

DATE: 1/19/11

[illegible]

STATE OF KANSAS

RICHARD CARLSON

REPRESENTATIVE, 61ST DISTRICT

HOME ADDRESS: 26810 JEFFREY RD

ST. MARYS, KANSAS 66536

785-535-8271

EMAIL: crown_c@fastmail.fm

OFFICE ADDRESS: STATE CAPITOL--274-W

TOPEKA, KANSAS 66612

785-296-7660



TOPEKA

HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

CHAIRMAN: TAXATION

MEMBER: FEDERAL AND STATE AFFAIRS

MEMBER: EDUCATION BUDGET

Rep. Clay Aurand, Chairman
House Education Committee
Rm: Docking 784

Testimony HB 2004

January 19, 2011

Mr. Chairman, members of the Education Committee. Thank you for the opportunity to present my testimony concerning HB 2004.

HB 2004 allows the parents of children to determine where their child will go to school. Presently our state statutes require a non-resident student to receive the approval of both school districts in order to attend a non-resident school when living 10 or less miles from the attendance center in which the pupil resides. In other words the resident district may prohibit the non-resident school bus from entering his district.

HB 2004 simply removes these restrictions and allows the parents to send their children to the school of their choice. The highly populated counties already have no mileage restrictions. Those include Johnson, Sedgewick, Shawnee and Wyandotte counties.

I believe it is the fundamental right of parents to send their children to their public school of choice and should not be mandated by the government. We need parents more involved in the education of their children and this bill would encourage parents to seek the best possible public school.

I will make my presentation short to allow for Travis and Carrie Ross to present their testimony. They are a family who wish to send their children to a school which is outside their residence district. They have met the statute requirements except the release or approval of their residence district.

Thank you for your attention and consideration of this bill.

Sincerely,

Richard Carlson
State Representative
61st District

House Education Committee
Date 1/19/11
Attachment 1

Testimony on HB 2004
Presented to the House Education Committee
January 19, 2011

We are here today because we live ½ mile from Onaga's bus stop but they are unable to come pick up our son because we are located in the Rock Creek (USD 323) School District and there is a 10 mile Law. We pay taxes to both school districts yet we are getting denied bus transportation. We want our children to attend the Onaga School District because not only are we both Alumni but we have many friends and family in that area. Along with many children in our neighborhood that attend the Onaga School. We have nothing against Westmoreland. It's a nice small town and we support our small towns as much as possible. I like the Westmoreland Elementary School because it is a small school and it's close to our home. Only 7 miles. The problem is that we don't want our children to go to Rock Creek. Not only is it 14 miles away but it's out in the middle of nowhere. Which brings up lots of questions....such as "Who is responsible for my child when there are after school activities?" etc. etc.

I'm told that if our son goes to Westmoreland Elementary, he would be picked up at 6:50am. That's a whole hour just to go 7 miles! Not only that but on the way home it would be even longer because the bus has to make a few extra stops. A big concern is that the next child lives 15 minutes away. Why send a bus way out of its way when there is another bus that stops only ½ a mile from our house? Why have Westmoreland drive 5 miles out of their way which comes to 10 miles in the morning and 10 miles in the evening when Onaga could drive a total of 2 miles a day. That's 100 miles a week versus 10 miles a week. Isn't this a cost saving issue for the school districts and the people of the state of Kansas? This is also a cost saving to the tax payers! Not only are we talking about more fuel but we're talking about more wear and tear on the bus. We live 4 miles down a winding road with 90 degree turns. Did I mention there aren't any other Westmoreland children in our area?

We planned on sending our son to Onaga when we heard through the grapevine that Onaga wasn't going to be picking up our son. We immediately contacted the Onaga School and talked to the superintendent and he said that they would be willing to pick up our son but was unable to because of the 10 mile Law. On August 5th 2010 we received a letter from Onaga's Superintendent apologizing for the miscommunication between the two school districts and he restated the law and said Onaga would be willing to pick up our son if we could meet the bus somewhere in the Onaga district. We talked to the superintendent of Rock Creek (USD 323) to see if he would allow Onaga to come pick up our son. He said he couldn't allow it because it was the law and we lived less than 10 miles from the Westmoreland Grade School but once he started attending Rock Creek then we would be more than 10 miles from the attending school so then Onaga would be allowed to come pick him up. This makes no sense at all. Are we suppose to send him to Westmoreland until 6th grade and then turn around and take him away from the friends he's already made?

So on September 8th we went to St. George Elementary to attend the Board Meeting for USD 323 to ask once again for permission for Onaga to pick up our son. Once again he said it's the law. We left there and immediately started contacting our representatives. And eventually we were lead to Richard Carlson. Finally we found someone who was willing to help us! He told us to write a letter to the superintendent of USD 323 Rock Creek. We asked the superintendent who is and isn't being transported in and out of district. The Freedom of Information Act requires him to answer this. So on September 20th we sent this letter and on September 22nd we received a reply back that said no one in his district was getting transported by another district but "have one family that we transport from their out-of-district home." And according to Rock Creek's Transportation Director, "that family is easily eligible under the Ten Mile Rule and live on a road that is a boundary between school districts and on which our bus normally drives." He did send a copy of the Out-of-District School Attendance and Transportation Sheet along with his letter saying "As previously mentioned on several occasions, your family is not eligible for out-of-district transportation under state law."

We are currently loading 3 kids into our vehicle twice a day just so we can follow the bus from our current destination bus stop back to the neighbors where he picks up the next student. What about other families. What kind of predicament is this causing them?

We are not the only family having these transportation issues. Just like the superintendent stated in his letter that the family "lives on a road that is a boundary between school districts." Would you agree? We have transportation issues? As we tell our story we are finding more families with the same problem. And this is just in our area. What about the rest of the state?

So we ask if it would be reasonable to allow a one mile waiver that would allow another district to transport an out-of-district student without having approval from the superintendent.

Travis & Carrie Ross
17990 Moodyville Rd
Blaine, KS 66549

House Education Committee
Date 1/19/11
Attachment 2

Testimony before the
House Education Committee

on

Testimony on **HB 2004** – Transportation of Non-resident Pupils

by

Mark Tallman, Associate Executive Director for Advocacy
Kansas Association of School Boards**January 19, 2011**

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on **HB 2004**, which would remove most limits on the authority of school districts to send buses into another district to transport students to and from school without the permission of the other district. Under current law, districts generally may exercise this authority only to transport students living at least 10 miles from the school they would regularly attend in their home district, although many districts have reached voluntary agreements to allow cross-border transportation. The bill would continue an exception in the current law under which school districts with any territory in Johnson, Sedgwick, Shawnee and Wyandotte counties are NOT allowed to enter into other districts to transport students without permission.

KASB appears in opposition to this bill because of a position adopted by our membership. For the new members on the committee, I'd like to briefly explain how our association operates. KASB is a voluntary association providing a wide range of services to school boards and their districts, as well as to educational institutions such as regional service centers and special education cooperatives. Community and technical colleges are also eligible for membership and may join for certain services. This year, all but two of the state's unified school district boards of education are members.

KASB's revenue comes from membership dues, fees paid to our legal assistance fund, fees for professional services and meeting attendance, and various services designed to help districts manage costs. We provide extensive legal services, assistance in teacher negotiations, education and financial research, superintendent searches, training and assistance for school boards, clerks, superintendents, principals and other district staff, a workers compensation pool and loss control assistance, endorsed insurance programs such as student accident coverage, and a natural gas purchasing pool.

Our advocacy function includes testifying before for the Legislature, providing information to legislators and other officials, and reporting on the actions of state and federal government to our members. Our lobbying expenditures are reported to the Governmental Ethics Commission and are available to the public as

House Education Committee

Date 1/19/11Attachment 3-1

required by law. Every member school or governing board has one vote in our Delegate Assembly, which usually meets annually at our state convention. The Delegate Assembly determines our policy positions before the Legislature and other government authorities. As is the case of all deliberative bodies, those positions reflect the will of the voting majority, not necessarily all of our members. Of course, issues sometimes arise that our members have not previously considered. In that case, we look to guidance from our previous and more general positions.

Two years ago, our Delegate Assembly adopted a position specifically opposing further changes in the so-called "10 mile bus law" that would be changed by this bill. Therefore, we rise in opposition. At the same time, it is clear that changing the law will have no impact unless at least SOME of our members are willing to take advantage of it and provide additional transportation for non-resident students. We would encourage the committee to consider the following facts.

First, Kansas students are already free to attend a district in which they do not reside as long as the receiving district accepts them, and virtually all districts have at least some non-resident enrollment. Attached is a chart showing the number and percent of non-residents enrolled in each Kansas district, totaling over 22,400 students. There is already a great deal of "public school choice" in Kansas, and we support that. The question is whether the state should make it even easier for students to attend schools in other districts.

Second, when a student chooses to attend another district as a non-resident, it may be beneficial to that student and the new district, but it represents a financial loss to the home district that may very well have a negative impact on the remaining students. The simple fact is districts can rarely reduce costs at the same rate as they lose students. The loss of a few students rarely allows a district to reduce staff or operating costs at all, while the gaining district receives additional funding without incurring new costs.

Third, under current law, a district can accept non-resident students at its own convenience and stop accepting them when it becomes inconvenient. But a school district must always provide educational services to its own residents. Therefore, in weighing the competing values in these situations – the student seeking to attend another district versus the impact on remaining students – deference should be given to the district that has the ultimate legal and financial responsibility for educating the child.

Fourth, KASB supports incentives for, and removal of, barriers to voluntary school district consolidation and efficient use of buildings. In at least some cases, passage of this bill may discourage these actions. Closing a school is almost always a painful, controversial decision. Making it easier for neighboring districts to attract students when their school closes may make it more difficult to achieve the savings of closing a facility – especially when there is no guarantee the neighboring district will always want those students.

Fifth, passage of this bill will put a greater focus on the current exception for districts in the four largest counties in the state. Attached is a second report identifying these 41 districts, which enroll over half the students in the state. One reason these counties were originally excluded from this law was the idea that few students in these counties live more than 10 miles from school anyway. This bill would allow neighboring districts to enter these districts to transport any students, but these districts would not be able to act in kind.

Finally, if this law is passed and used, it will almost certainly increase district expenditures on transportation, which is a "non-instructional" or "non-classroom" expense under federal definitions and state law. Kansas districts have been criticized for not reaching the "state goal" of 65% of funds on instructional costs. To be very clear, KASB opposes the "65%" goal, because we believe it incorrectly focuses on inputs rather than outcomes. We believe all district spending should support student learning and the needs of students and their families. However, we do not believe the Legislature should pass a bill inviting districts to spend more on non-instructional costs – then criticize districts if non-instructional costs increase.

Thank you for your consideration. I would be happy to respond to any questions.

Selected Enrollment Information about Kansas USDs

County Name	USD	Unified School District Name	2009-10 Final Audited FTE	2009-10 Non- resident Total	2009-10 Non- resident %
Allen	256	Marmaton Valley	334.0	92	25.7%
Allen	257	Iola	1,286.9	50	3.7%
Allen	258	Humboldt	523.0	58	10.5%
Anderson	365	Garnett	1,100.9	51	4.4%
Anderson	479	Crest	223.0	30	12.8%
Atchison	377	Atchison County	655.6	77	11.1%
Atchison	409	Atchison	1,713.6	65	3.7%
Barber	254	Barber County North	452.5	3	0.6%
Barber	255	South Barber County	226.0	10	4.2%
Barton	354	Clafflin	208.0	10	4.6%
Barton	355	Ellinwood	406.7	34	7.3%
Barton	428	Great Bend	3,023.7	76	2.4%
Barton	431	Hoisington	610.9	43	6.5%
Bourbon	234	Ft. Scott	1,872.8	40	2.0%
Bourbon	235	Uniontown	430.6	43	9.2%
Brown	415	Hiawatha	835.9	61	6.9%
Brown	430	South Brown County	617.2	51	8.0%
Butler	205	Bluestem	537.0	78	14.2%
Butler	206	Remington-Whitewater	520.0	43	7.9%
Butler	375	Circle	1,628.2	306	18.2%
Butler	385	Andover	4,678.0	128	2.6%
Butler	394	Rose Hill	1,715.2	164	9.2%
Butler	396	Douglass	734.3	134	17.4%
Butler	402	Augusta	2,164.5	168	7.1%
Butler	490	El Dorado	1,978.0	95	4.5%
Butler	492	Flinthills	284.5	70	24.0%
Chase	284	Chase County	405.1	6	1.4%
Chautauqua	285	Cedar Vale	144.0	0	0.0%
Chautauqua	286	Chautauqua County	361.5	16	4.1%
Cherokee	404	Riverton	787.5	216	26.1%
Cherokee	493	Columbus	1,098.0	46	3.9%
Cherokee	499	Galena	747.5	105	13.1%
Cherokee	508	Baxter Springs	912.5	84	8.5%
Cheyenne	103	Cheylin	137.0	6	4.3%
Cheyenne	297	St. Francis	286.3	11	3.7%
Clark	219	Minneola	261.1	58	21.3%
Clark	220	Ashland	220.0	4	1.8%
Clay	379	Clay Center	1,339.8	26	1.9%
Cloud	333	Concordia	1,061.2	57	5.0%
Cloud	334	Southern Cloud	255.6	51	19.2%
Coffey	243	Lebo-Waverly	526.0	54	9.9%
Coffey	244	Burlington	816.5	90	10.4%
Coffey	245	Leroy-Gridley	246.5	17	6.7%
Comanche	300	Comanche County	317.1	0	0.0%
Cowley	462	Central	347.0	37	10.4%
Cowley	463	Udall	362.0	41	10.7%
Cowley	465	Winfield	2,332.1	78	3.2%
Cowley	470	Arkansas City	2,585.4	24	0.9%
Cowley	471	Dexter	151.2	57	36.1%
Crawford	246	Northeast	555.5	22	3.8%
Crawford	247	Cherokee	651.5	76	11.1%

County Name	USD	Unified School District Name	2009-10 Final Audited FTE	2009-10 Non- resident Total	2009-10 Non- resident %
Crawford	248	Girard	1,001.8	117	11.1%
Crawford	249	Frontenac	843.0	239	26.8%
Crawford	250	Pittsburg	2,680.2	207	7.2%
Decatur	294	Oberlin	358.0	6	1.6%
Dickinson	393	Solomon	369.0	39	10.1%
Dickinson	435	Abilene	1,526.7	141	8.5%
Dickinson	473	Chapman	955.2	112	11.4%
Dickinson	481	Rural Vista	400.8	56	13.1%
Dickinson	487	Herington	491.6	35	6.7%
Doniphan	111	Doniphan West*	368.1	37	9.4%
Doniphan	406	Wathena	406.0	48	11.2%
Doniphan	429	Troy	347.0	23	6.3%
Doniphan	486	Elwood	300.2	94	29.5%
Douglas	348	Baldwin City	1,314.4	108	7.7%
Douglas	491	Eudora	1,454.0	100	6.5%
Douglas	497	Lawrence	10,561.0	1118	10.0%
Edwards	347	Kinsley-Offerle	353.0	39	10.2%
Edwards	502	Lewis	107.5	8	6.8%
Elk	282	West Elk	332.0	18	5.0%
Elk	283	Elk Valley	186.6	53	25.7%
Ellis	388	Ellis	392.6	34	8.1%
Ellis	432	Victoria	257.0	24	8.9%
Ellis	489	Hays	2,819.3	155	5.1%
Ellsworth	327	Ellsworth	622.0	36	5.6%
Ellsworth	328	Lorraine	404.8	81	18.1%
Finney	363	Holcomb	928.3	160	15.8%
Finney	457	Garden City	6,835.8	9	0.1%
Ford	381	Spearville	358.0	158	42.4%
Ford	443	Dodge City	5,734.0	32	0.5%
Ford	459	Bucklin	243.2	15	5.8%
Franklin	287	West Franklin	700.5	36	5.0%
Franklin	288	Central Heights	527.0	99	17.9%
Franklin	289	Wellsville	842.7	48	5.5%
Franklin	290	Ottawa	2,421.8	114	4.4%
Geary	475	Junction City	7,271.3	132	1.7%
Gove	291	Grinnell	72.8	17	21.5%
Gove	292	Wheatland	102.0	3	2.8%
Gove	293	Quinter	263.5	39	13.9%
Graham	281	Hill City	363.1	16	4.0%
Grant	214	Ulysses	1,583.9	15	0.9%
Gray	102	Cimarron-Ensign	654.2	81	11.4%
Gray	371	Montezuma	228.8	27	10.2%
Gray	476	Copeland	120.0	5	4.5%
Gray	477	Ingalls	224.5	90	37.0%
Greeley	200	Greeley County	210.3	22	9.9%
Greenwood	386	Madison-Virgil	228.2	26	10.6%
Greenwood	389	Eureka	595.5	19	2.9%
Greenwood	390	Hamilton	92.0	0	0.0%
Hamilton	494	Syracuse	479.5	2	0.4%
Harper	361	Anthony-Harper	819.1	24	2.7%
Harper	511	Attica	139.0	28	19.1%
Harvey	369	Burrton	232.7	11	4.4%
Harvey	373	Newton	3,373.6	94	2.5%
Harvey	439	Sedgwick	554.5	130	22.7%
Harvey	440	Halstead	775.6	39	4.8%
Harvey	460	Hesston	812.0	96	11.4%

County Name	USD	Unified School District Name	2009-10 Final Audited FTE	2009-10 Non- resident Total	2009-10 Non- resident %
Haskell	374	Sublette	469.5	58	11.4%
Haskell	507	Satanta	328.5	14	3.8%
Hodgeman	227	Jetmore	264.5	6	2.2%
Hodgeman	228	Hanston	74.5	6	7.7%
Jackson	335	Jackson Heights	376.5	85	21.4%
Jackson	336	Holton	1,058.0	67	6.1%
Jackson	337	Royal Valley	908.2	59	6.2%
Jefferson	338	Valley Falls	408.3	21	4.9%
Jefferson	339	Jefferson County North	479.0	98	19.4%
Jefferson	340	Jefferson West	893.8	90	9.7%
Jefferson	341	Oskaloosa	529.1	52	9.0%
Jefferson	342	McLouth	480.0	28	5.3%
Jefferson	343	Perry	948.0	134	13.5%
Jewell	107	Rock Hills	288.0	21	6.8%
Johnson	229	Blue Valley	20,308.0	107	0.5%
Johnson	230	Spring Hill	2,821.8	1202	38.1%
Johnson	231	Gardner-Edgrtn-Antch	4,540.9	50	1.0%
Johnson	232	DeSoto	6,203.2	42	0.7%
Johnson	233	Olathe	25,448.4	222	0.8%
Johnson	512	Shawnee Mission	26,495.0	277	1.0%
Kearny	215	Lakin	622.0	20	3.0%
Kearny	216	Deerfield	240.9	36	13.4%
Kingman	331	Kingman	988.7	32	3.0%
Kingman	332	Cunningham	170.6	24	12.6%
Kiowa	422	Greensburg	203.8	40	18.8%
Kiowa	424	Mullinville	222.0	3	1.0%
Kiowa	474	Haviland	141.8	29	19.6%
Labette	503	Parsons	1,223.0	85	6.2%
Labette	504	Oswego	459.0	152	30.8%
Labette	505	Chetopa-St. Paul*	493.6	115	22.2%
Labette	506	Labette County	1,594.4	448	26.6%
Lane	468	Healy	92.5	21	21.7%
Lane	482	Dighton	239.0	16	6.1%
Leavenworth	207	Ft. Leavenworth	1,858.0	483	24.6%
Leavenworth	449	Easton	698.7	134	18.5%
Leavenworth	453	Leavenworth	3,738.0	386	9.5%
Leavenworth	458	Basehor-Linwood	2,121.6	333	14.8%
Leavenworth	464	Tonganoxie	1,860.9	96	5.0%
Leavenworth	469	Lansing	2,501.4	204	7.9%
Lincoln	298	Lincoln	334.5	15	4.2%
Lincoln	299	Sylvan Grove	137.4	30	20.6%
Linn	344	Pleasanton	315.5	26	7.6%
Linn	346	Jayhawk	514.6	54	9.9%
Linn	362	Prairie View	935.4	69	7.0%
Logan	274	Oakley	413.4	30	6.4%
Logan	275	TriPlains	82.5	16	18.8%
Lyon	251	North Lyon County	506.6	27	5.1%
Lyon	252	South Lyon County	493.3	86	16.1%
Lyon	253	Emporia	4,261.1	186	4.0%
Marion	397	Centre	238.5	9	3.6%
Marion	398	Peabody-Burns	320.7	10	2.9%
Marion	408	Marion	579.5	21	3.5%
Marion	410	Hillsboro-Durham	582.6	30	4.8%
Marion	411	Goessel	257.5	26	9.7%
Marshall	364	Marysville	711.2	27	3.5%
Marshall	380	Vermillion	523.6	18	3.2%

County Name	USD	Unified School District Name	2009-10 Final Audited FTE	2009-10 Non- resident Total	2009-10 Non- resident %
Marshall	488	Axtell	285.6	34	10.0%
Marshall	498	Valley Heights	363.5	19	4.9%
McPherson	400	Lindsborg	981.5	90	8.2%
McPherson	418	McPherson	2,241.1	78	3.3%
McPherson	419	Canton-Galva	368.9	34	8.6%
McPherson	423	Moundridge	413.0	26	6.0%
McPherson	448	Inman	449.5	52	11.0%
Meade	225	Fowler	157.5	18	10.4%
Meade	226	Meade	471.2	28	5.6%
Miami	367	Osawatomie	1,125.5	96	8.0%
Miami	368	Paola	2,028.1	151	7.1%
Miami	416	Louisburg	1,674.0	100	5.7%
Mitchell	272	Waconda	349.8	6	1.5%
Mitchell	273	Beloit	737.4	104	13.1%
Montgomery	436	Caney Valley	814.7	89	10.1%
Montgomery	445	Coffeyville	1,787.2	31	1.6%
Montgomery	446	Independence	1,823.7	83	4.1%
Montgomery	447	Cherryvale*	873.1	192	20.3%
Morris	417	Council Grove	743.4	37	4.7%
Morton	217	Rolla	199.5	12	5.9%
Morton	218	Elkhart	625.4	189	26.7%
Nemaha	441	Sabetha	924.6	93	9.7%
Nemaha	442	Nemaha Valley	425.1	34	7.0%
Nemaha	451	Baileyville-St. Benedict	186.5	9	4.7%
Neosho	101	Erie	502.5	55	10.4%
Neosho	413	Chanute	1,794.9	121	6.4%
Ness	106	Western Plains	164.0	13	7.6%
Ness	303	Ness City	291.0	35	11.1%
Norton	211	Norton	688.9	58	8.1%
Norton	212	Northern Valley	192.5	36	17.3%
Norton	213	West Solomon Valley	38.0	0	0.0%
Osage	420	Osage City	642.7	29	4.3%
Osage	421	Lyndon	428.0	32	7.2%
Osage	434	Santa Fe Trail	1,054.4	68	6.1%
Osage	454	Burlingame	312.5	34	10.2%
Osage	456	Marais Des Cygne	266.0	15	5.4%
Osborne	392	Osborne County	331.9	3	0.9%
Ottawa	239	North Ottawa County	619.2	34	5.3%
Ottawa	240	Twin Valley	594.5	164	25.4%
Pawnee	495	Ft. Larned	872.5	26	2.8%
Pawnee	496	Pawnee Heights	146.1	56	34.2%
Phillips	110	Thunder Ridge	236.5	12	4.9%
Phillips	325	Phillipsburg	628.1	43	6.6%
Phillips	326	Logan	181.5	14	7.3%
Pottawatomie	320	Wamego	1,305.5	67	4.9%
Pottawatomie	321	Kaw Valley	1,110.1	134	11.3%
Pottawatomie	322	Onaga-Hvllle-Whtn	320.5	6	1.8%
Pottawatomie	323	Rock Creek	845.1	95	10.8%
Pratt	382	Pratt	1,110.7	27	2.3%
Pratt	438	Skyline	342.4	214	60.1%
Rawlins	105	Rawlins County	312.2	19	5.9%
Reno	308	Hutchinson	4,626.5	317	6.5%
Reno	309	Nickerson	1,132.7	246	20.4%
Reno	310	Fairfield	304.6	2	0.6%
Reno	311	Pretty Prairie	258.4	39	14.6%
Reno	312	Haven	990.9	150	14.4%

County Name	USD	Unified School District Name	2009-10 Final Audited FTE	2009-10 Non- resident Total	2009-10 Non- resident %
Reno	313	Buhler	2,111.3	345	15.2%
Republic	109	Republic County	471.8	24	4.8%
Republic	426	Pike Valley	247.0	52	20.4%
Rice	376	Sterling	525.5	66	11.9%
Rice	401	Chase	134.5	23	15.4%
Rice	405	Lyons	780.4	51	5.8%
Rice	444	Little River	312.0	48	14.2%
Riley	378	Riley County	685.0	97	13.7%
Riley	383	Manhattan-Ogden	5,739.0	507	8.2%
Riley	384	Blue Valley-Randolph	211.0	31	13.5%
Rooks	269	Palco	145.5	7	4.5%
Rooks	270	Plainville	356.6	9	2.3%
Rooks	271	Stockton	285.3	12	4.0%
Rush	395	LaCrosse	294.5	6	2.0%
Rush	403	Otis-Bison	177.0	19	10.6%
Russell	399	Paradise	119.8	17	12.6%
Russell	407	Russell County	944.6	21	2.1%
Saline	305	Salina	7,006.0	74	1.0%
Saline	306	Southeast of Saline	690.8	172	24.0%
Saline	307	Ell-Saline	466.0	180	37.1%
Scott	466	Scott County	856.7	11	1.2%
Sedgwick	259	Wichita	45,269.0	520	1.1%
Sedgwick	260	Derby	6,185.1	99	1.5%
Sedgwick	261	Haysville	4,709.4	244	4.8%
Sedgwick	262	Valley Center	2,536.7	0	0.0%
Sedgwick	263	Mulvane	1,835.0	45	2.3%
Sedgwick	264	Clearwater	1,269.9	55	4.2%
Sedgwick	265	Goddard	4,858.0	170	3.3%
Sedgwick	266	Maize	6,361.4	153	2.3%
Sedgwick	267	Renwick	1,945.7	86	4.3%
Sedgwick	268	Cheney	773.8	66	8.0%
Seward	480	Liberal	4,278.0	19	0.4%
Seward	483	Kismet-Plains	706.0	9	1.2%
Shawnee	345	Seaman	3,527.0	147	3.9%
Shawnee	372	Silver Lake	735.4	60	7.7%
Shawnee	437	Auburn-Washburn	5,378.5	259	4.6%
Shawnee	450	Shawnee Heights	3,403.0	211	6.0%
Shawnee	501	Topeka	13,121.4	31	0.2%
Sheridan	412	Hoxie	286.7	28	9.0%
Sherman	352	Goodland	899.5	8	0.8%
Smith	237	Smith Center	433.0	27	6.0%
Stafford	349	Stafford	268.8	26	9.2%
Stafford	350	St. John	327.5	30	8.9%
Stafford	351	Macksville	258.1	22	7.9%
Stanton	452	Stanton County	451.0	4	0.8%
Stevens	209	Moscow	182.8	16	7.8%
Stevens	210	Hugoton	966.2	21	2.0%
Sumner	353	Wellington	1,641.3	30	1.7%
Sumner	356	Conway Springs	518.8	28	4.5%
Sumner	357	Belle Plaine	644.0	44	6.4%
Sumner	358	Oxford	332.5	16	4.7%
Sumner	359	Argonia	177.5	11	5.9%
Sumner	360	Caldwell	230.5	21	8.5%
Sumner	509	South Haven	221.5	59	25.5%
Thomas	314	Brewster	98.0	9	8.9%
Thomas	315	Colby	916.5	34	3.6%

County Name	USD	Unified School District Name	2009-10 Final Audited FTE	2009-10 Non- resident Total	2009-10 Non- resident %
Thomas	316	Golden Plains	202.0	50	23.0%
Trego	208	WaKeeney	411.2	0	0.0%
Wabaunsee	329	Mill Creek Valley	470.0	23	4.6%
Wabaunsee	330	Wabaunsee East	500.5	40	7.7%
Wallace	241	Wallace County	198.5	3	1.4%
Wallace	242	Weskan	103.0	27	25.2%
Washington	108	Washington County	396.5	28	6.9%
Washington	223	Barnes	329.7	39	9.3%
Washington	224	Clifton-Clyde	276.0	16	5.4%
Wichita	467	Leoti	421.5	10	2.2%
Wilson	387	Altoona-Midway	180.2	38	19.2%
Wilson	461	Neodesha	709.2	97	12.9%
Wilson	484	Fredonia	723.5	32	4.2%
Woodson	366	Yates Center	391.3	37	8.8%
Wyandotte	202	Turner	3,690.1	1	0.0%
Wyandotte	203	Piper	1,626.5	0	0.0%
Wyandotte	204	Bonner Springs	2,335.3	195	7.8%
Wyandotte	500	Kansas City	18,450.7	4	0.0%
			448,727.7	22,442	4.7%

* Consolidation of previous districts included in USD 111 total

High	45,269.0	1,202	60.1%
90th Percentile	2,821.3	167	20.4%
80th Percentile	1,590.2	100	13.3%
70th Percentile	919.7	78	10.2%
60th Percentile	701.6	53	8.2%
Median	523.0	39	6.7%
40th Percentile	410.6	30	5.3%
30th Percentile	332.0	24	4.3%
20th Percentile	257.7	16	2.9%
10th Percentile	186.5	8	1.2%
Low	38.0	0	0.0%

County Name	USD	USD Name	2009-10 FTE Enr	Non- resident Total
Johnson	229	Blue Valley	20,308.0	107.0
Johnson	230	Spring Hill	2,821.8	1,202.0
Johnson	231	Gardner-Edgerton	4,540.9	50.0
Johnson	232	De Soto	6,203.2	42.0
Johnson	233	Olathe	25,448.4	222.0
Johnson	289	Wellsville	842.7	48.0
Johnson	491	Eudora	1,454.0	100.0
Johnson	512	Shawnee Mission	26,495.0	277.0
Sedgwick	206	Remington-Whitewater	520.0	43.0
Sedgwick	259	Wichita	45,269.0	520.0
Sedgwick	260	Derby	6,185.1	99.0
Sedgwick	261	Haysville	4,709.4	244.0
Sedgwick	262	Valley Center	2,536.7	0.0
Sedgwick	263	Mulvane	1,835.0	45.0
Sedgwick	264	Clearwater	1,269.9	55.0
Sedgwick	265	Goddard	4,858.0	170.0
Sedgwick	266	Maize	6,361.4	153.0
Sedgwick	267	Renwick	1,945.7	86.0
Sedgwick	268	Cheney	773.8	66.0
Sedgwick	312	Haven	990.9	150.0
Sedgwick	331	Kingman - Norwich	988.7	32.0
Sedgwick	356	Conway Springs	518.8	28.0
Sedgwick	369	Burrton	232.7	11.0
Sedgwick	375	Circle	1,628.2	306.0
Sedgwick	385	Andover	4,678.0	128.0
Sedgwick	394	Rose Hill	1,715.2	164.0
Sedgwick	439	Sedgwick	554.5	130.0
Sedgwick	440	Halstead	775.6	39.0
Shawnee	321	Kaw Valley	1,110.1	134.0
Shawnee	330	Mission Valley	500.5	40.0
Shawnee	340	Jefferson West	893.8	90.0
Shawnee	345	Seaman	3,527.0	147.0
Shawnee	372	Silver Lake	735.4	60.0
Shawnee	434	Santa Fe Trail	1,054.4	68.0
Shawnee	437	Auburn Washburn	5,378.5	259.0
Shawnee	450	Shawnee Heights	3,403.0	211.0
Shawnee	501	Topeka	13,121.4	31.0
Wyandotte	202	Turner-Kansas City	3,690.1	1.0
Wyandotte	203	Piper-Kansas City	1,626.5	0.0
Wyandotte	204	Bonner Springs	2,335.3	195.0
Wyandotte	500	Kansas City	18,450.7	4.0
			<u>232,287.3</u>	<u>5,757.0</u>



Unified School District 247 Southeast
Box 270 506 S. Smelter Ave Cherokee, KS 66724
Home of the Lancers
Ph. 620-457-8350 Fax 620-457-8428



January 17, 2011

The Honorable Clay Aurand
State Capitol 143-N
Topeka, KS 66612

Dear Representative Aurand:

This letter is testimony of the USD 247 School Board's consensus to request that HB 2004 be rejected. It is the opinion of the Board that the provisions under HB 2004 would be highly detrimental to our district and the students, and extremely costly to Kansas.

The costs of educating students in Kansas would increase because of provisions in the finance formula. New students being brought to a district would garner state aid immediately for the new district. At the same time, the previous district would still be receiving money for the former student for two years using the three year averaging provisions.

The passage of HB 2004 would allow financially wealthier districts to bus our students to schools we cannot financially compete with in terms of facilities and equipment, i.e. new or newer buildings, newer sports facilities, newer buses, etc. We are not a wealthy district and priority has been in the classroom as evidenced by: 1 to 1 laptop initiative, IDL programs, MTSS and achieving academic standards of excellence and the 2010 Challenge Award at all three grade schools. The "glitz" of new facilities is an area we especially cannot afford to compete in, and we believe it is unfair to allow the recruiting of students by offering busing to districts that can afford luxuries above and beyond a quality education.

Our current buses are full in terms of riders and we cannot afford to purchase new buses to recruit and transport other districts' students. This is especially true with the budget cuts that we are being hit with this year and next. The more affluent districts around us can afford the fuel and buses to transport from within our attendance center communities. We cannot afford to compete in this manner.

The unpredictable ebb and flow of students would make budgeting a difficult challenge and possibly cause programs to be cut or restarted on a year to year basis. This prevents efficiency, continuity and improvements that result from continuous operation. A loss of students would cause district cuts in programs and result in offering less to our remaining students. A declining enrollment would result in cutbacks in faculty.

HB 2004 forces districts to become competitive businesses versus focusing on education. This bill would deteriorate relationships between districts and communities and quite probably cause closure of whole communities. The Board of Education of USD 247 Cherokee beseeches you to vote down HB 2004 to prevent irreparable harm from being done to students, the district, and our communities.

Tara Underwood
Board President

House Education Committee
Date 1/19/11
Attachment 4



Kansas Key to Establishing MHEC and to Shaping Compact's Programs and Services

1. Kansas was the first founding member state to pass authorizing legislation to join the Midwestern Higher Education Compact (MHEC), which was created in 1991.
2. Kansas legislators, members of the Midwestern Legislative Conference of The Council of State Governments, were instrumental in the formation of the compact.
3. Former Senate Majority Leader Lana Oleen has served as a MHEC commissioner, compact chair, and currently serves as interim president.
4. The MHEC Purchasing Initiatives Committee is chaired by Barry Swanson, director of purchasing from the University of Kansas.
5. Over 20 Kansans provide significant direction for MHEC programs and services through service as commissioners, commissioner alternates, and members of program committees.

Kansas Benefits from Participation in MHEC Programs and Services

1. By using MHEC's cost savings and student exchange programs, Kansas higher education institutions, school districts, state and local governments have achieved cost savings of \$47.8 million since 1991, when the state joined the compact.
2. In FY10, education institutions, school districts, state and local governments, and students achieved savings of \$4.2 million.
3. Kansas received a 44-fold return on its MHEC investment for FY10 when comparing total savings to the state's annual paid commitment (dues).
4. In FY10, 190 Kansas entities realized over \$1.3 million in cost savings by purchasing over \$11 million in technology hardware and software.
5. The MHEC property insurance program insures Johnson County Community College with total property values of \$295.6 million, saving the university over \$409 thousand since 1994 and over \$36 thousand in FY10.
6. Kansas students and families have saved \$41.1 million in tuition through the Midwest Student Exchange Program since 1994. In FY10, Kansas residents saved \$2.9 million.





7. MHEC is currently developing regional cost saving programs for energy-related purchases and health benefit services. These two new initiatives show promise for significant activity in member states.
8. Kansans have participated in numerous MHEC professional development programs and policy initiatives designed to inform decision making and improve practice, including MHEC's annual policy summits, the "Closing the Gap" and "Difficult Dialogues, Rewarding Solutions" initiatives, and the Midwest Credential Repository for Education, Skills, and Training (Midwest CREST).
9. All travel expenses for commissioners and program committee members who are attending MHEC meetings are paid by MHEC.
10. The locations of MHEC commission meetings rotate among the member states. MHEC held its Executive Committee Meeting in Topeka in June 2008.
11. All twelve member states pay the same annual state commitment, regardless of size or usage of MHEC programs. MHEC commissioners approved the annual state commitment of \$95,000, which will remain at that level through at least FY13.

