

Approved: March 15, 2011

Date

MINUTES OF THE HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Clay Aurand at 9:00 a.m. On February 22, 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 Pat Colloton
Mark Tallman, Kansas Association of School Boards
Peg Dunlap, KNEA
Dr. Cynthia Lane, Superintendent, Kansas City, Kansas School District
Diane Gjerstad, Wichita Public Schools
Patrick Woods, Topeka Public Schools

Others attending, see attached sheet.

HB 2193 - School districts; amendment to definition of at-risk pupil

Chairman Aurand opened the hearing on **HB 2193**

Eunice Peters, Kansas Revisor of Statutes explain to the committee that **HB 2193** changes definition of At-Risk students.

Representative Colloton, State Representative, spoke to the committee as a proponent on **HB 2193**. In order to reduce state spending on education a choice must be made between reducing the base state aid funding for all students or choosing to implement a new policy that would target at-risk dollars to those students who are not proficient in reading or math by the end of third grade. **HB 2193** is meant to replace the loss of dollars to all students from the \$150 reduction in the base state aid proposed in the Governor's budget. The Governor in his state of the state address invited the legislature to find better ways to reduce education spending than simply cutting down base state aid to every public school child in Kansas. Adjustment of the at-risk student definition in the school finance formula is a more educationally sound way of spending our education dollars. (Attachment 1)

A question and answer session following the testimony.

Representative Ward gave out a handout. (Attachment 2)

Dr. Cynthia Lane, KCKPS Superintendent, spoke to the committee as an opponent on **HB 2193**. **HB 2193** would radically alter the definition of "At-risk pupils" as it applies to the school finance funding formula. It would replace the current definition of at-risk funding for students in grades 4-12, (which defined them as students who are eligible for free meals under the national school lunch act) with one that defines them as students who scored less than proficient on the state assessments. This change would completely alter the intention of at-risk funding, and have a devastating impact upon children who have benefited tremendously from the current definition. I urge you to reject this change. (Attachment 3)

Mark Tallman, Kansas Association of School Boards, spoke to the committee as an opponent on **HB 2193**. The bill would change the basis of at-risk weighting in grades four through twelve from the number of students eligible for free lunch to the number of students who do not meet reading or

CONTINUATION SHEET

Minutes of the House Education Committee at 9:00 a.m. On February 22, 2011, in room 784 of the Docking State Office Building.

math proficiency on state tests in the previous years. KASB has consistently supported using free lunch eligibility as the main basis of at-risk funding, and also supports the use of other measures to supplement free lunch. The School Finance Resolution adopted by our members for the current year supports increasing both poverty-and non-poverty based programs to help at-risk students. This bill is estimated to reduce at-risk funding by over \$100 million. As a result, we strongly oppose this bill. (Attachment 4)

Diane Gjerstad, Wichita Public Schools, spoke to the committee as an opponent on **HB 2193**. **HB 2193** if enacted, would substantially reduce at-risk funding for grades 4 through 12. Yet just last month the speaker from the Goldwater Institute commended Kansas' 5th in the nation ranking for economically disadvantaged students on NAEP. This bill would take away \$121 million from a successful element of the school finance formula. (Attachment 5)

Patrick Woods, 501 School Board President, spoke to the committee as an opponent on **HB 2193**. **HB 2193** amends the definition of at-risk and would reduce the number of students who would be eligible for at-risk funding in the school finance formula. The bill would change the definition of an at-risk student to include only students in grades below fourth grade who are eligible for free meals, as well as pupils in fourth through twelfth grade who do not meet proficiency in math or reading assessments the preceding year. (Attachment 6)

Representative Colloton gave out a handout. (Attachment 7)

A question and answer session following the testimony.

Representative Aurand closed the hearing on **HB 2193**.

HB 2202 - Nontraditional teacher licensure program

Representative Aurand open the hearing on **HB 2202**.

Eunice Peters, Office of the Revisor of Statutes explained to the committee the subsection (a) (b) and ©.

Mark Tallman, Kansas Association of School Boards, spoke to the committee as an opponent of **HB 2202**. KASB appears today as a proponent of this bill, based on a long standing position of our Delegate Assembly that is in favor of alternative paths for teacher and administrator licensure. This does not mean KASB believes, as the saying sometimes goes, "just anyone can teach". It does not mean we think that knowledge of content in a particular area automatically means an individual can effectively teach that content to students. But we believe that completion of a traditional teacher training program also does not guarantee a teacher is effective, or that the lack of such training means a prospective teacher cannot be effective. (Attachment 8)

Peg Dunlap, KNEA, spoke to the committee as an opponent on **HB 2202**. Kansas has a proud tradition of high student achievement. Much of that is due to the rigorous standards that we require of our teachers, standards which apply to all teachers, regardless of their choice of route to licensure. (Attachment 9)

A question and answer session followed the testimony.

Representative Aurand closed the hearing on **HB 2202**.

HB 2269 - School districts; finance; amendments to funding formula

Representative Aurand gave a brief explanation of the bill.

Representative Aurand open the discussion to the committee.

CONTINUATION SHEET

Minutes of the House Education Committee at 9:00 a.m. On February 22, 2011, in Room 784 of the Docking State Office Building.

Representative Huebert moved to have the Revisors correct page 4, line 20 from 79 to 72 of HB 2269. The motion was seconded by Representative Howell. Motion carried.

Representative Huebert moved to pass out HB 2269 as amended. The motion was seconded by Representative Howell. The motion carried.

Representative Aurand explained to the Committee that this was our last meeting before Turn Around and if there was anything they wanted out of their folder to take it with them now. We would have new folders at our next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 10:50 a.m. The next meet will be March 3, 2011.

HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

GUEST LIST

DATE: 2/22/11

NAME	REPRESENTING
Dodie Decker	USA / Kansas
Gian Djustad	USD 259- Wichita
Edward Larson	KS Catholic Conference
Reg Dunlap	Kansas NEA
Dr. Cynthia Lane	KCKPS - USD # 500
David A. Smith	" " "
Patrick Woods	USD 502, Topeka Public Schools
Dr. Cynthia Lane	USD 500 KCK Public Schools
Jennifer Gray	USD 501 Topeka
Ed Miller	NW Tech College
Nathan Lindsay	Learner + Associates
Mike Ryelet	K12
Mark Tallum	K12
Bob Vancouver	USD 229
Scott Frank	Post Audit
Bill Brady	STF
Tracy Reese	SGA
Tyler Curtis	KBOB / ECU

STATE OF KANSAS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



PAT COLLOTON
28TH DISTRICT

2513 W. 118TH STREET
LEAWOOD, KANSAS 66211
(913) 339-9246
pat@patcolloton.com

STATE CAPITOL, ROOM 167-W
TOPEKA, KANSAS 66612
(785) 296-7631
pat.colloton@house.ks.gov
COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS
CORRECTIONS AND JUVENILE JUSTICE, CHAIR
EDUCATION
JUDICIARY
JOINT COMMITTEE ON CORRECTIONS AND
JUVENILE JUSTICE OVERSIGHT, CHAIR

February 22, 2011

Honorable Clay Aurand, Chairperson
House Committee on Education
Statehouse, Room 174W
Topeka, KS 66612

Re: HB 2193

Dear Chairman Aurand and Committee Members:

In order to reduce state spending on education a choice must be made between reducing the base state aid funding for all students or choosing to implement a new policy that would target at-risk dollars to those students who are not proficient in reading or math by the end of third grade. HB2193 is meant to replace the loss of dollars to all students from the \$150 reduction in the base state aid proposed in the Governor's budget. The Governor in his state of the state address invited the legislature to find better ways to reduce education spending than simply cutting down base state aid to every public school child in Kansas. Adjustment of the at-risk student definition in the school finance formula is a more educationally sound way of spending our education dollars.

HB2193 keeps the poverty based funding for all at-risk students through the 3rd Grade. It keeps the high-density at risk weighting as well. This is in accord with the studies that show the effect of poverty on the early years in school. However, after the third grade, under HB 2193 the at risk money goes to those students who are not proficient in either reading or math assessment tests during the preceding school year. After the 8th grade, for any student who is not proficient in either reading or math, the weighting continues throughout high school in recognition of the need to tailor a pathway to graduation for that student that likely will involve special support. This simple reallocation based upon proficiency after third grade saves \$104 Million in state spending and could be done instead of a cut to all students of \$150 in the base funding per student. It is better educational policy and a better use of state funding for education.

I urge favorable consideration of HB 2193

Respectfully submitted,

Pat Colloton

State Rep. Pat Colloton

House Education Committee
Date 2/22/11
Attachment# 1

COLUMN EXPLANATION

- Column
- 1 -- September 20, 2010 FTE enrollment
 - 2 -- 2010-11 Estimated at-risk weighted FTE enrollment
 - 3 -- 2010-11 Estimated non-proficient weighted FTE enrollment
 - 4 -- 2010-11 Estimated at-risk weighted FTE enrollment
(Column 2 + 3)
 - 5 -- 2010-11 Estimated at-risk budget at \$3,937 BSAPP
(Column 4 x \$3,937)
 - 6 -- 2010-11 Estimated grades Pre-K through 3 free meal
headcount enrollment
 - 7 -- 2009-10 Grades 4 through 12 headcount enrollment of students
not meeting proficiency on math or reading state assessments
 - 8 -- 2011-12 Estimated at-risk headcount enrollment under HB 2193
(Column 6 + 7)
 - 9 -- 2011-12 Estimated at-risk weighted enrollment under HB 2193
 - 10 -- 2011-12 Estimated at-risk budget at \$3,937 (Column 9 x \$3,937)
 - 11 -- Difference (Column 10 – 5)

	2/18/2011		Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5	Col 6	Col 7	Col 8	Col 9	Col 10	Col 11
USD #	County	District Name	2010-11 Est. FTE Enroll	2010-11 Est. At Risk WTD FTE	2010-11 Est. Non-Proficient WTD FTE	2010-11 Est. At Risk WTD FTE (Col 2 + Col 3)	2010-11 Est. At Risk Budget \$3,937	2010-11 Est. PK-3 Free Meal Headcount	2009-2010 Gr 4-12 Non-Prof Headcount	2011-12 Est. At Risk HCDT (Col 6 + Col 7)	2011-12 Est. At Risk WTD FTE	2011-12 Est. At Risk Budget \$3,937	Difference (Col 10 - Col 5)
256	Allen	Marmaton Valley	336.5	78.4	0.9	79.3	312,204	65	34	99	45.1	177,732	-134,472
257	Allen	Iola	1,266.4	285.0	3.9	288.9	1,137,399	276	119	395	180.1	709,132	-428,267
258	Allen	Humboldt	541.5	92.6	1.0	93.6	368,503	76	40	116	52.9	208,252	-160,252
365	Anderson	Garnett	1,082.2	202.5	3.1	205.6	809,447	169	84	253	115.4	454,204	-355,243
479	Anderson	Crest	211.5	43.3	0.7	44.0	173,228	41	28	69	31.5	123,874	-49,354
377	Atchison	Atchison County	630.6	108.5	1.7	110.2	433,857	88	60	148	67.5	265,700	-168,157
409	Atchison	Atchison	1,638.4	425.9	5.5	431.4	1,698,422	392	192	584	266.3	1,048,439	-649,983
254	Barber	Barber Co.	438.5	54.3	1.5	55.8	219,685	57	31	88	40.1	157,984	-61,701
255	Barber	South Barber Co.	217.7	33.7	0.6	34.3	135,039	31	22	53	24.2	95,149	-39,890
355	Barton	Ellinwood	391.8	63.4	1.5	64.9	255,511	55	43	98	44.7	175,937	-79,575
428	Barton	Great Bend	3,032.5	774.3	5.2	779.5	3,068,892	575	236	811	369.8	1,455,966	-1,612,926
431	Barton	Hoisington	651.5	116.7	1.8	118.5	466,535	103	33	136	62.0	244,157	-222,378
234	Bourbon	Ft. Scott	1,871.2	469.2	5.3	474.5	1,868,107	392	251	643	293.2	1,154,360	-713,747
235	Bourbon	Uniontown	451.1	98.5	1.1	99.6	392,125	83	37	120	54.7	215,433	-176,693
415	Brown	Hiawatha	841.8	153.2	1.9	155.1	610,629	132	57	189	86.2	339,306	-271,322
430	Brown	Brown County	582.4	161.0	1.4	162.4	639,369	131	62	193	88.0	346,487	-292,881
205	Butler	Bluestem	523.6	80.7	2.3	83.0	326,771	54	58	112	51.1	201,070	-125,701
206	Butler	Remington-Whitewater	532.0	69.8	1.6	71.4	281,102	69	38	107	48.8	192,094	-89,008
375	Butler	Circle	1,748.5	149.6	7.7	157.3	619,290	135	144	279	127.2	500,881	-118,409
385	Butler	Andover	4,953.7	234.4	10.1	244.5	962,597	168	181	349	159.1	626,550	-336,047
394	Butler	Rose Hill	1,732.5	167.8	6.8	174.6	687,400	141	147	288	131.3	517,038	-170,362
396	Butler	Douglass	719.0	78.0	3.6	81.6	321,259	62	74	136	62.0	244,157	-77,102
402	Butler	Augusta	2,153.8	302.3	5.6	307.9	1,212,202	281	134	415	189.2	745,038	-467,164
490	Butler	El Dorado	1,920.0	390.3	4.7	395.0	1,555,115	344	178	522	238.0	937,132	-617,983
492	Butler	Flinthills	259.4	34.7	0.5	35.2	138,582	16	13	29	13.2	52,063	-86,520
284	Chase	Chase County	388.5	46.1	1.3	47.4	186,614	28	44	72	32.8	129,260	-57,354
285	Chautauqua	Cedar Vale	134.7	26.9	0.4	27.3	107,480	27	14	41	18.7	73,606	-33,874
286	Chautauqua	Chautauqua	346.5	75.2	1.6	76.8	302,362	71	45	116	52.9	208,252	-94,110
404	Cherokee	Riverton	766.0	158.7	2.8	161.5	635,826	121	94	215	98.0	385,983	-249,842
493	Cherokee	Columbus	1,020.5	201.1	5.1	206.2	811,809	160	171	331	150.9	594,235	-217,574
499	Cherokee	Galena	798.8	217.1	1.2	218.3	859,447	181	63	244	111.3	438,046	-421,401
508	Cherokee	Baxter Springs	977.5	237.6	2.4	240.0	944,880	213	84	297	135.4	533,196	-411,684
103	Cheyenne	Cheylin	137.5	32.4	0.3	32.7	128,740	24	10	34	15.5	61,039	-67,701
297	Cheyenne	St. Francis	289.8	40.1	0.7	40.8	160,630	27	18	45	20.5	80,787	-79,842
219	Clark	Minneola	266.3	41.0	0.6	41.6	163,779	40	16	56	25.5	100,535	-63,244
220	Clark	Ashland	206.0	27.4	1.2	28.6	112,598	24	28	52	23.7	93,354	-19,244
379	Clay	Clay Center	1,333.2	164.6	3.2	167.8	660,629	146	66	212	96.7	380,598	-280,031
333	Cloud	Concordia	1,061.4	194.7	2.6	197.3	776,770	153	77	230	104.9	412,913	-363,858
334	Cloud	Southern Cloud	250.0	52.9	0.8	53.7	211,417	25	35	60	27.4	107,716	-103,701
243	Coffey	Lebo-Waverly	516.5	78.4	2.6	81.0	318,897	50	70	120	54.7	215,433	-103,464
244	Coffey	Burlington	841.0	126.8	2.4	129.2	508,660	95	70	165	75.2	296,220	-212,441
245	Coffey	LeRoy-Gridley	224.5	34.2	1.2	35.4	139,370	25	37	62	28.3	111,307	-28,063

	2/18/2011		Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5	Col 6	Col 7	Col 8	Col 9	Col 10	Col 11
USD #	County	District Name	2010-11 Est. FTE Enroll	2010-11 Est. At Risk WTD FTE	2010-11 Est. Non-Proficient WTD FTE	2010-11 Est. At Risk WTD FTE (Col 2 + Col 3)	2010-11 Est. At Risk Budget \$3,937	2010-11 Est. PK-3 Free Meal Headcount	2009-2010 Gr 4-12 Non-Prof Headcount	2011-12 Est. At Risk HCDT (Col 6 + Col 7)	2011-12 Est. At Risk WTD FTE	2011-12 Est. At Risk Budget \$3,937	Difference (Col 10 - Col 5)
300	Comanche	Comanche County	311.0	33.3	1.3	34.6	136,220	18	20	38	17.3	68,220	-68,000
462	Cowley	Central	357.9	76.2	0.7	76.9	302,755	62	18	80	36.5	143,622	-159,134
463	Cowley	Udall	358.0	53.4	1.7	55.1	216,929	40	37	77	35.1	138,236	-78,693
465	Cowley	Winfield	2,345.9	490.2	7.3	497.5	1,958,658	434	191	625	285.0	1,122,045	-836,613
470	Cowley	Arkansas City	2,605.0	700.9	6.4	707.3	2,784,640	611	265	876	399.5	1,572,658	-1,211,982
471	Cowley	Dexter	138.9	19.6	0.7	20.3	79,921	12	18	30	13.7	53,858	-26,063
246	Crawford	Northeast	544.0	132.7	2.2	134.9	531,101	106	74	180	82.1	323,149	-207,952
247	Crawford	Cherokee	705.5	156.0	1.7	157.7	620,865	127	67	194	88.5	348,283	-272,582
248	Crawford	Girard	1,008.5	190.6	2.4	193.0	759,841	148	98	246	112.2	441,637	-318,204
249	Crawford	Frontenac	866.0	140.4	3.3	143.7	565,747	116	75	191	87.1	342,897	-222,850
250	Crawford	Pittsburg	2,628.0	717.7	6.6	724.3	2,851,569	560	361	921	420.0	1,653,446	-1,198,124
294	Decatur	Oberlin	350.5	48.8	1.6	50.4	198,425	43	53	96	43.8	172,346	-26,079
393	Dickinson	Solomon	349.7	47.4	1.9	49.3	194,094	38	48	86	39.2	154,393	-39,701
435	Dickinson	Abilene	1,545.3	184.7	4.8	189.5	746,062	150	113	263	119.9	472,157	-273,905
473	Dickinson	Chapman	931.1	114.0	3.2	117.2	461,416	110	66	176	80.3	315,968	-145,449
481	Dickinson	Rural Vista	366.5	45.1	0.9	46.0	181,102	41	21	62	28.3	111,307	-69,795
487	Dickinson	Herington	489.7	102.1	1.0	103.1	405,905	88	18	106	48.3	190,299	-215,606
111	Doniphan	Doniphan West Schools	346.5	44.2	1.5	45.7	179,921	45	41	86	39.2	154,393	-25,528
114	Doniphan	Riverside	746.7	145.9	3.8	149.7	589,369	138	102	240	109.4	430,865	-158,504
429	Doniphan	Troy	347.5	56.1	1.7	57.8	227,559	40	39	79	36.0	141,826	-85,732
348	Douglas	Baldwin City	1,351.9	138.2	4.7	142.9	562,597	134	96	230	104.9	412,913	-149,685
491	Douglas	Eudora	1,488.5	190.2	5.1	195.3	768,896	133	131	264	120.4	473,952	-294,944
497	Douglas	Lawrence	10,845.5	1,289.1	37.4	1,326.5	5,222,431	1,057	998	2,055	937.1	3,689,284	-1,533,147
347	Edwards	Kinsely-Offlerle	364.0	72.0	0.8	72.8	286,614	63	28	91	41.5	163,370	-123,244
502	Edwards	Lewis	101.0	14.6	0.1	14.7	57,874	14	0	14	6.4	25,134	-32,740
282	Elk	West Elk	310.5	64.3	0.9	65.2	256,692	53	23	76	34.7	136,441	-120,252
283	Elk	Elk Valley	181.5	53.4	0.8	54.2	213,385	50	37	87	39.7	156,189	-57,197
388	Ellis	Ellis	396.5	45.1	1.2	46.3	182,283	44	30	74	33.7	132,850	-49,433
432	Ellis	Victoria	256.5	14.1	0.6	14.7	57,874	13	11	24	10.9	43,087	-14,787
489	Ellis	Hays	2,926.4	424.5	4.1	428.6	1,687,398	389	126	515	234.8	924,565	-762,833
112	Ellsworth	Central Plains	585.0	75.2	1.1	76.3	300,393	65	40	105	47.9	188,504	-111,890
327	Ellsworth	Ellsworth	615.0	101.7	1.3	103.0	405,511	70	44	114	52.0	204,661	-200,850
363	Finney	Holcomb	965.9	188.8	2.0	190.8	751,180	169	66	235	107.2	421,889	-329,291
457	Finney	Garden City	7,033.5	1,930.7	20.3	1,951.0	7,681,087	1,701	993	2,694	1,228.5	4,836,463	-2,844,624
381	Ford	Spearsville	362.0	27.8	1.1	28.9	113,779	21	16	37	16.9	66,425	-47,354
443	Ford	Dodge City	6,046.2	1,987.7	15.3	2,003.0	7,885,811	1,706	870	2,576	1,174.7	4,624,621	-3,261,190
459	Ford	Bucklin	243.2	53.4	0.7	54.1	212,992	53	25	78	35.6	140,031	-72,960
287	Franklin	West Franklin	646.0	128.1	2.8	130.9	515,353	93	71	164	74.8	294,425	-220,929
288	Franklin	Central Heights	550.9	124.9	2.0	126.9	499,605	92	62	154	70.2	276,472	-223,133
289	Franklin	Wellsville	810.1	87.6	2.3	89.9	353,936	66	49	115	52.4	206,456	-147,480
290	Franklin	Ottawa	2,420.2	522.6	6.7	529.3	2,083,854	452	248	700	319.2	1,256,690	-827,164
475	Geary	Junction City	7,698.1	1,362.5	20.8	1,383.3	5,446,052	1,265	656	1,921	876.0	3,448,718	-1,997,335

3-18

	2/18/2011		Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5	Col 6	Col 7	Col 8	Col 9	Col 10	Col 11
USD #	County	District Name	2010-11 Est. FTE Enroll	2010-11 Est. At Risk WTD FTE	2010-11 Est. Non-Proficient WTD FTE	2010-11 Est. At Risk WTD FTE (Col 2 + Col 3)	2010-11 Est. At Risk Budget \$3,937	2010-11 Est. PK-3 Free Meal Headcount	2009-2010 Gr 4-12 Non-Prof Headcount	2011-12 Est. At Risk HCDT (Col 6 + Col 7)	2011-12 Est. At Risk WTD FTE	2011-12 Est. At Risk Budget \$3,937	Difference (Col 10 - Col 5)
291	Gove	Grinnell	72.0	5.9	0.1	6.0	23,622	4	7	11	5.0	19,748	-3,874
292	Gove	Wheatland	101.5	12.8	0.4	13.2	51,968	12	3	15	6.8	26,929	-25,039
293	Gove	Quinter	266.0	33.7	1.3	35.0	137,795	26	30	56	25.5	100,535	-37,260
281	Graham	Graham County	362.0	48.8	1.0	49.8	196,063	33	24	57	26.0	102,331	-93,732
214	Grant	Ulysses	1,616.5	364.3	5.3	369.6	1,455,115	312	223	535	244.0	960,471	-494,645
102	Gray	Cimarron-Ensign	670.8	101.2	2.1	103.3	406,692	85	29	114	52.0	204,661	-202,031
371	Gray	Montezuma	229.6	27.4	0.7	28.1	110,630	20	11	31	14.1	55,653	-54,976
476	Gray	Copeland	103.0	18.2	0.3	18.5	72,835	14	16	30	13.7	53,858	-18,976
477	Gray	Ingalls	229.7	41.0	0.5	41.5	163,386	33	15	48	21.9	86,173	-77,212
200	Greeley	Greeley County	190.5	32.8	1.2	34.0	133,858	30	32	62	28.3	111,307	-22,551
386	Greenwood	Madison-Virgil	241.6	40.6	0.7	41.3	162,598	34	21	55	25.1	98,740	-63,858
389	Greenwood	Eureka	623.9	152.3	1.9	154.2	607,085	140	66	206	93.9	369,826	-237,259
390	Greenwood	Hamilton	90.0	18.7	0.5	19.2	75,590	14	20	34	15.5	61,039	-14,551
494	Hamilton	Syracuse	473.0	121.3	1.8	123.1	484,645	111	51	162	73.9	290,834	-193,811
361	Harper	Anthony-Harper	841.6	215.2	1.9	217.1	854,723	192	76	268	122.2	481,133	-373,590
511	Harper	Attica	146.5	19.2	0.3	19.5	76,772	12	16	28	12.8	50,268	-26,504
369	Harvey	Burton	244.0	55.6	0.9	56.5	222,441	47	30	77	35.1	138,236	-84,205
373	Harvey	Newton	3,346.1	689.9	8.3	698.2	2,748,813	555	286	841	383.5	1,509,824	-1,238,990
439	Harvey	Sedgwick	536.6	51.1	2.8	53.9	212,204	41	65	106	48.3	190,299	-21,905
440	Harvey	Halstead	781.0	112.6	1.2	113.8	448,031	80	35	115	52.4	206,456	-241,574
460	Harvey	Hesston	819.8	83.0	1.2	84.2	331,495	61	37	98	44.7	175,937	-155,559
374	Haskell	Sublette	485.9	130.0	0.9	130.9	515,353	92	35	127	57.9	228,000	-287,354
507	Haskell	Satanta	333.5	84.4	0.7	85.1	335,039	81	31	112	51.1	201,070	-133,968
227	Hodgeman	Jetmore	269.0	38.3	0.7	39.0	153,543	32	20	52	23.7	93,354	-60,189
228	Hodgeman	Hanston	37.0	2.7	0.0	2.7	10,630	3	3	6	2.7	10,772	142
335	Jackson	North Jackson	391.0	58.4	1.6	60.0	236,220	45	37	82	37.4	147,212	-89,008
336	Jackson	Holton	1,077.5	149.1	2.7	151.8	597,637	117	64	181	82.5	324,944	-272,692
337	Jackson	Mayetta	912.1	143.6	2.9	146.5	576,771	113	62	175	79.8	314,173	-262,598
338	Jefferson	Valley Falls	398.5	57.0	0.7	57.7	227,165	37	15	52	23.7	93,354	-133,811
339	Jefferson	Jefferson County	477.5	52.4	1.8	54.2	213,385	39	40	79	36.0	141,826	-71,559
340	Jefferson	Jefferson West	862.0	73.0	3.2	76.2	299,999	49	79	128	58.4	229,795	-70,205
341	Jefferson	Oskaloosa	514.6	119.9	2.1	122.0	480,314	94	93	187	85.3	335,716	-144,598
342	Jefferson	McLouth	491.2	73.0	2.1	75.1	295,669	50	50	100	45.6	179,527	-116,142
343	Jefferson	Perry	934.1	122.7	3.5	126.2	496,849	91	76	167	76.2	299,810	-197,039
107	Jewell	Rock Hills	286.0	36.9	0.6	37.5	147,638	37	15	52	23.7	93,354	-54,283
229	Johnson	Blue Valley	20,599.1	483.4	35.6	519.0	2,043,303	373	560	933	425.4	1,674,989	-368,314
230	Johnson	Spring Hill	3,172.4	198.8	4.7	203.5	801,180	165	133	298	135.9	534,991	-266,188
231	Johnson	Gardner-Edgerton	4,752.3	538.5	6.5	545.0	2,145,665	438	188	626	285.5	1,123,840	-1,021,825
232	Johnson	DeSoto	6,369.7	316.9	20.1	337.0	1,326,769	232	356	588	268.1	1,055,620	-271,149
233	Johnson	Olathe	26,098.1	2,399.5	61.1	2,460.6	9,687,382	2,007	1,381	3,388	1,544.9	6,082,382	-3,605,001
512	Johnson	Shawnee Mission	26,654.0	3,230.8	75.9	3,306.7	13,018,478	2,796	1,891	4,687	2,137.3	8,414,440	-4,604,038
215	Kearny	Lakin	594.0	126.8	1.1	127.9	503,542	113	55	168	76.6	301,606	-201,937

	2/18/2011		Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5	Col 6	Col 7	Col 8	Col 9	Col 10	Col 11
			2010-11 Est.	2010-11 Est.	2010-11 Est.	2010-11 Est.	2010-11 Est.	2010-11 Est.	2009-2010	2011-12 Est.	2011-12 Est.	2011-12 Est.	
USD #	County	District Name	FTE Enroll	At Risk WTD FTE	Non-Proficient WTD FTE	At Risk WTD FTE (Col 2 + Col 3)	At Risk Budget \$3,937	PK-3 Free Meal Headcount	Gr 4-12 Non-Prof Headcount	At Risk HCDT (Col 6 + Col 7)	At Risk WTD FTE	At Risk Budget \$3,937	Difference (Col 10 - Col 5)
216	Kearny	Deerfield	296.1	77.1	0.5	77.6	305,511	61	28	89	40.6	159,779	-145,732
331	Kingman	Kingman	1,005.7	167.4	3.8	171.2	674,014	136	120	256	116.7	459,590	-214,425
332	Kingman	Cunningham	166.0	31.5	1.1	32.6	128,346	28	20	48	21.9	86,173	-42,173
422	Kiowa	Greensburg	201.0	26.4	0.6	27.0	106,299	14	18	32	14.6	57,449	-48,850
424	Kiowa	Mullinville	254.7	10.9	0.1	11.0	43,307	11	47	58	26.4	104,126	60,819
474	Kiowa	Haviland	115.0	13.7	0.4	14.1	55,512	8	10	18	8.2	32,315	-23,197
503	Labette	Parsons	1,176.3	327.4	2.8	330.2	1,299,997	276	117	393	179.2	705,542	-594,456
504	Labette	Oswego	475.5	107.2	1.4	108.6	427,558	89	37	126	57.5	226,204	-201,354
505	Labette	Chetopa - St. Paul	468.1	99.4	1.2	100.6	396,062	65	56	121	55.2	217,228	-178,834
506	Labette	Labette County	1,600.2	304.6	2.4	307.0	1,208,659	226	69	295	134.5	529,605	-679,054
468	Lane	Healy	74.0	13.2	0.5	13.7	53,937	12	12	24	10.9	43,087	-10,850
482	Lane	Dighton	240.5	32.4	0.3	32.7	128,740	33	6	39	17.8	70,016	-58,724
207	Leavenworth	Ft. Leavenworth	2,061.5	55.2	6.3	61.5	242,126	70	127	197	89.8	353,669	111,543
449	Leavenworth	Easton	675.4	63.8	3.2	67.0	263,779	47	71	118	53.8	211,842	-51,937
453	Leavenworth	Leavenworth	3,533.6	799.4	12.9	812.3	3,198,025	698	585	1,283	585.0	2,303,334	-894,691
458	Leavenworth	Basehor-Linwood	2,146.2	118.1	4.7	122.8	483,464	96	135	231	105.3	414,708	-68,756
464	Leavenworth	Tonganoxie	1,845.6	207.5	7.8	215.3	847,636	150	199	349	159.1	626,550	-221,086
469	Leavenworth	Lansing	2,549.1	204.3	10.3	214.6	844,880	146	217	363	165.5	651,684	-193,196
298	Lincoln	Lincoln	357.0	71.6	1.1	72.7	286,220	53	38	91	41.5	163,370	-122,850
299	Lincoln	Sylvan Grove	231.0	36.0	0.2	36.2	142,519	30	5	35	16.0	62,835	-79,685
344	Linn	Pleasanton	325.0	88.0	0.7	88.7	349,212	78	34	112	51.1	201,070	-148,141
346	Linn	Jayhawk	501.3	103.5	2.0	105.5	415,354	87	75	162	73.9	290,834	-124,519
362	Linn	Prairie View	952.5	180.1	3.4	183.5	722,440	133	87	220	100.3	394,960	-327,480
274	Logan	Oakley	403.0	68.9	1.2	70.1	275,984	41	32	73	33.3	131,055	-144,929
275	Logan	Triplains	77.8	16.4	0.1	16.5	64,961	8	3	11	5.0	19,748	-45,213
251	Lyon	North Lyon Co.	437.3	72.0	1.1	73.1	287,795	55	27	82	37.4	147,212	-140,582
252	Lyon	Southern Lyon Co.	520.8	73.9	1.0	74.9	294,881	58	29	87	39.7	156,189	-138,693
253	Lyon	Emporia	4,325.5	1,172.8	8.6	1,181.4	4,651,172	913	479	1,392	634.8	2,499,019	-2,152,153
397	Marion	Centre	268.5	37.4	0.7	38.1	150,000	29	20	49	22.3	87,968	-62,031
398	Marion	Peabody-Burns	304.5	59.7	1.1	60.8	239,370	38	45	83	37.8	149,008	-90,362
408	Marion	Marion	563.6	82.1	1.5	83.6	329,133	66	30	96	43.8	172,346	-156,787
410	Marion	Durham-Hills	562.2	73.9	1.4	75.3	296,456	63	40	103	47.0	184,913	-111,543
411	Marion	Goessel	248.5	22.8	0.6	23.4	92,126	18	15	33	15.0	59,244	-32,882
364	Marshall	Marysville	700.0	100.8	2.5	103.3	406,692	87	73	160	73.0	287,244	-119,449
380	Marshall	Vermillon	514.3	59.7	0.4	60.1	236,614	64	12	76	34.7	136,441	-100,173
498	Marshall	Valley Heights	354.5	69.8	0.6	70.4	277,165	63	25	88	40.1	157,984	-119,181
400	McPherson	Smoky Valley	959.3	90.7	3.4	94.1	370,472	66	76	142	64.8	254,929	-115,543
418	McPherson	McPherson	2,299.3	315.6	9.5	325.1	1,279,919	279	237	516	235.3	926,360	-353,558
419	McPherson	Canton-Galva	368.3	40.1	1.4	41.5	163,386	34	29	63	28.7	113,102	-50,283
423	McPherson	Moundridge	404.0	51.5	1.3	52.8	207,874	35	28	63	28.7	113,102	-94,771
448	McPherson	Inman	419.5	26.0	2.4	28.4	111,811	21	45	66	30.1	118,488	6,677
225	Meade	Fowler	166.0	38.8	0.7	39.5	155,512	33	29	62	28.3	111,307	-44,205

2-5

	2/18/2011		Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5	Col 6	Col 7	Col 8	Col 9	Col 10	Col 11
USD #	County	District Name	2010-11 Est. FTE Enroll	2010-11 Est. At Risk WTD FTE	2010-11 Est. Non-Proficient WTD FTE	2010-11 Est. At Risk WTD FTE (Col 2 + Col 3)	2010-11 Est. At Risk Budget \$3,937	2010-11 Est. PK-3 Free Meal Headcount	2009-2010 Gr 4-12 Non-Prof Headcount	2011-12 Est. At Risk HCDT (Col 6 + Col 7)	2011-12 Est. At Risk WTD FTE	2011-12 Est. At Risk Budget \$3,937	Difference (Col 10 - Col 5)
226	Meade	Meade	453.0	61.6	1.3	62.9	247,637	43	36	79	36.0	141,826	-105,811
367	Miami	Osawatomie	1,124.0	267.7	2.9	270.6	1,065,352	207	124	331	150.9	594,235	-471,117
368	Miami	Paola	2,011.1	253.5	5.5	259.0	1,019,683	189	121	310	141.4	556,534	-463,149
416	Miami	Louisburg	1,653.0	130.4	3.6	134.0	527,558	99	58	157	71.6	281,858	-245,700
272	Mitchell	Waconda	378.3	75.2	0.2	75.4	296,850	61	1	62	28.3	111,307	-185,543
273	Mitchell	Beloit	728.3	88.0	2.1	90.1	354,724	92	58	150	68.4	269,291	-85,433
436	Montgomery	Caney	845.4	160.1	1.8	161.9	637,400	154	51	205	93.5	368,031	-269,370
445	Montgomery	Coffeyville	1,815.1	503.4	5.5	508.9	2,003,539	437	292	729	332.4	1,308,753	-694,786
446	Montgomery	Independence	1,811.9	415.0	6.2	421.2	1,658,264	362	200	562	256.3	1,008,943	-649,322
447	Montgomery	Cherryvale	944.1	185.1	2.4	187.5	738,188	169	82	251	114.5	450,613	-287,574
417	Morris	Morris County	740.5	111.7	2.6	114.3	449,999	91	67	158	72.0	283,653	-166,346
217	Morton	Rolla	193.5	38.3	0.7	39.0	153,543	17	22	39	17.8	70,016	-83,527
218	Morton	Elkhart	838.6	135.4	1.6	137.0	539,369	84	97	181	82.5	324,944	-214,425
113	Nemaha	Prairie Hills	1,181.3	129.5	2.2	131.7	518,503	105	62	167	76.2	299,810	-218,692
442	Nemaha	Nemaha Valley	421.8	37.8	0.7	38.5	151,575	33	14	47	21.4	84,378	-67,197
451	Nemaha	B & B	169.5	7.3	0.0	7.3	28,740	0	1	1	0.5	1,795	-26,945
101	Neosho	Erie	518.6	119.5	1.8	121.3	477,558	88	49	137	62.5	245,952	-231,606
413	Neosho	Chanute	1,850.5	429.1	5.4	434.5	1,710,627	368	204	572	260.8	1,026,896	-683,731
106	Ness	Western Plains	165.5	39.7	0.7	40.4	159,055	35	30	65	29.6	116,693	-42,362
303	Ness	Ness City	302.4	31.9	1.6	33.5	131,890	25	33	58	26.4	104,126	-27,764
211	Norton	Norton	726.3	96.7	2.5	99.2	390,550	58	55	113	51.5	202,866	-187,685
212	Norton	Northern Valley	201.0	50.6	0.7	51.3	201,968	42	16	58	26.4	104,126	-97,842
420	Osage	Osage City	674.4	117.2	1.9	119.1	468,897	96	51	147	67.0	263,905	-204,992
421	Osage	Lyndon	454.5	41.0	1.9	42.9	168,897	23	39	62	28.3	111,307	-57,590
434	Osage	Santa Fe	1,045.9	164.2	3.3	167.5	659,448	145	88	233	106.2	418,298	-241,149
454	Osage	Burlingame	339.0	53.4	0.9	54.3	213,779	34	20	54	24.6	96,945	-116,834
456	Osage	Marais Des Cygnes	261.0	59.7	0.4	60.1	236,614	45	19	64	29.2	114,897	-121,716
392	Osborne	Osborne	315.2	76.2	0.6	76.8	302,362	45	36	81	36.9	145,417	-156,945
239	Ottawa	North Ottawa Co.	608.5	74.3	2.0	76.3	300,393	44	53	97	44.2	174,141	-126,252
240	Ottawa	Twin Valley	604.3	76.6	2.2	78.8	310,236	52	33	85	38.8	152,598	-157,637
495	Pawnee	Ft. Larned	901.0	174.2	3.5	177.7	699,605	152	127	279	127.2	500,881	-198,724
496	Pawnee	Pawnee Heights	179.7	16.4	0.3	16.7	65,748	19	7	26	11.9	46,677	-19,071
110	Phillips	Thunder Ridge	250.0	45.6	0.9	46.5	183,071	41	21	62	28.3	111,307	-71,764
325	Phillips	Phillipsburg	613.4	92.1	1.3	93.4	367,716	70	38	108	49.2	193,889	-173,826
326	Phillips	Logan	176.0	36.0	0.5	36.5	143,701	24	23	47	21.4	84,378	-59,323
320	Pottawatomie	Wamego	1,349.5	137.7	4.1	141.8	558,267	113	103	216	98.5	387,779	-170,488
321	Pottawatomie	Kaw Valley	1,138.5	186.0	3.3	189.3	745,274	157	105	262	119.5	470,361	-274,913
322	Pottawatomie	Onaga	309.0	43.3	1.3	44.6	175,590	24	34	58	26.4	104,126	-71,464
323	Pottawatomie	Westmoreland	842.6	73.4	1.2	74.6	293,700	65	20	85	38.8	152,598	-141,102
382	Pratt	Pratt	1,044.1	174.6	3.2	177.8	699,999	138	103	241	109.9	432,661	-267,338
438	Pratt	Skyline	369.7	38.3	1.3	39.6	155,905	34	28	62	28.3	111,307	-44,598
105	Rawlins	Rawlins County	300.0	43.8	1.0	44.8	176,378	31	29	60	27.4	107,716	-68,661

2-6

	2/18/2011		Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5	Col 6	Col 7	Col 8	Col 9	Col 10	Col 11
USD #	County	District Name	2010-11 Est. FTE Enroll	2010-11 Est. At Risk WTD FTE	2010-11 Est. Non-Proficient WTD FTE	2010-11 Est. At Risk WTD FTE (Col 2 + Col 3)	2010-11 Est. At Risk Budget \$3,937	2010-11 Est. PK-3 Free Meal Headcount	2009-2010 Gr 4-12 Non-Prof Headcount	2011-12 Est. At Risk HCDT (Col 6 + Col 7)	2011-12 Est. At Risk WTD FTE	2011-12 Est. At Risk Budget \$3,937	Difference (Col 10 - Col 5)
308	Reno	Hutchinson	4,671.0	1,153.7	13.0	1,166.7	4,593,298	938	538	1,476	673.1	2,649,821	-1,943,476
309	Reno	Nickerson	1,136.5	253.1	2.3	255.4	1,005,510	232	68	300	136.8	538,582	-466,928
310	Reno	Fairfield	275.2	65.2	0.9	66.1	260,236	48	27	75	34.2	134,645	-125,590
311	Reno	Pretty Prairie	265.0	32.8	0.8	33.6	132,283	25	22	47	21.4	84,378	-47,905
312	Reno	Haven	1,034.4	142.7	2.0	144.7	569,684	112	68	180	82.1	323,149	-246,535
313	Reno	Buhler	2,153.0	262.7	6.0	268.7	1,057,872	230	181	411	187.4	737,857	-320,015
109	Republic	Republic County	483.5	81.2	1.3	82.5	324,803	77	40	117	53.4	210,047	-114,756
426	Republic	Pike Valley	241.0	40.6	0.5	41.1	161,811	31	17	48	21.9	86,173	-75,638
376	Rice	Sterling	524.2	63.4	1.6	65.0	255,905	56	51	107	48.8	192,094	-63,811
401	Rice	Chase	146.3	41.5	0.5	42.0	165,354	30	29	59	26.9	105,921	-59,433
405	Rice	Lyons	784.6	211.1	1.1	212.2	835,431	205	77	282	128.6	506,267	-329,165
444	Rice	Little River	333.5	30.6	1.0	31.6	124,409	23	18	41	18.7	73,606	-50,803
378	Riley	Riley County	688.5	54.7	2.6	57.3	225,590	41	38	79	36.0	141,826	-83,764
383	Riley	Manhattan	6,047.1	704.5	17.3	721.8	2,841,727	668	449	1,117	509.4	2,005,319	-836,408
384	Riley	Blue Valley	215.0	18.2	0.6	18.8	74,016	15	5	20	9.1	35,905	-38,110
269	Rooks	Palco	143.0	24.2	0.8	25.0	98,425	18	23	41	18.7	73,606	-24,819
270	Rooks	Plainville	368.9	50.6	1.6	52.2	205,511	52	29	81	36.9	145,417	-60,094
271	Rooks	Stockton	278.6	42.9	0.7	43.6	171,653	43	11	54	24.6	96,945	-74,709
395	Rush	LaCrosse	294.0	52.9	1.1	54.0	212,598	27	33	60	27.4	107,716	-104,882
403	Rush	Otis-Bison	179.0	25.1	0.4	25.5	100,394	15	21	36	16.4	64,630	-35,764
399	Russell	Paradise	149.0	20.1	0.7	20.8	81,890	13	12	25	11.4	44,882	-37,008
407	Russell	Russell	825.0	155.0	2.3	157.3	619,290	104	91	195	88.9	350,078	-269,212
305	Saline	Salina	6,971.8	1,524.0	18.2	1,542.2	6,071,641	1,215	669	1,884	859.1	3,382,292	-2,689,349
306	Saline	Southeast of Saline	713.0	52.4	2.8	55.2	217,322	40	49	89	40.6	159,779	-57,543
307	Saline	Ell-Saline	461.0	42.9	2.1	45.0	177,165	37	52	89	40.6	159,779	-17,386
466	Scott	Scott County	861.9	157.3	2.6	159.9	629,526	151	77	228	104.0	409,322	-220,204
259	Sedgwick	Wichita	46,256.4	14,440.6	145.7	14,586.3	57,426,263	12,855	8,435	21,290	9,708.2	38,221,341	-19,204,922
260	Sedgwick	Derby	6,220.4	946.7	22.6	969.3	3,816,134	776	584	1,360	620.2	2,441,570	-1,374,564
261	Sedgwick	Haysville	4,987.6	979.5	19.5	999.0	3,933,063	746	663	1,409	642.5	2,529,538	-1,403,525
262	Sedgwick	Valley Center	2,583.2	295.5	6.3	301.8	1,188,187	246	182	428	195.2	768,376	-419,810
263	Sedgwick	Mulvane	1,822.6	188.8	7.1	195.9	771,258	160	137	297	135.4	533,196	-238,063
264	Sedgwick	Clearwater	1,243.9	107.2	5.0	112.2	441,731	97	87	184	83.9	330,330	-111,401
265	Sedgwick	Goddard	4,924.8	401.3	11.0	412.3	1,623,225	260	234	494	225.3	886,864	-736,361
266	Sedgwick	Maize	6,401.2	338.8	22.0	360.8	1,420,470	216	443	659	300.5	1,183,084	-237,385
267	Sedgwick	Renwick	1,918.5	92.1	4.0	96.1	378,346	52	85	137	62.5	245,952	-132,393
268	Sedgwick	Cheney	765.4	58.8	1.8	60.6	238,582	52	40	92	42.0	165,165	-73,417
480	Seward	Liberal	4,456.0	1,427.3	14.7	1,442.0	5,677,154	1,329	815	2,144	977.7	3,849,063	-1,828,091
483	Seward	Kismet-Plains	714.5	211.1	1.4	212.5	836,613	194	77	271	123.6	486,519	-350,094
345	Shawnee	Seaman	3,608.8	414.0	12.4	426.4	1,678,737	351	268	619	282.3	1,111,273	-567,463
372	Shawnee	Silver Lake	715.8	41.5	1.2	42.7	168,110	37	26	63	28.7	113,102	-55,008
437	Shawnee	Auburn Washburn	5,541.2	539.4	12.1	551.5	2,171,256	472	262	734	334.7	1,317,730	-853,526
450	Shawnee	Shawnee Heights	3,402.2	375.7	15.6	391.3	1,540,548	263	381	644	293.7	1,156,155	-384,393

2-7

	2/18/2011		Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5	Col 6	Col 7	Col 8	Col 9	Col 10	Col 11
USD #	County	District Name	2010-11 Est. FTE Enroll	2010-11 Est. At Risk WTD FTE	2010-11 Est. Non-Proficient WTD FTE	2010-11 Est. At Risk WTD FTE (Col 2 + Col 3)	2010-11 Est. At Risk Budget \$3,937	2010-11 Est. PK-3 Free Meal Headcount	2009-2010 Gr 4-12 Non-Prof Headcount	2011-12 Est. At Risk HCDT (Col 6 + Col 7)	2011-12 Est. At Risk WTD FTE	2011-12 Est. At Risk Budget \$3,937	Difference (Col 10 - Col 5)
501	Shawnee	Topeka	13,222.7	4,119.5	37.9	4,157.4	16,367,684	3,654	2,159	5,813	2,650.7	10,435,916	-5,931,768
412	Sheridan	Hoxie	305.5	26.9	1.2	28.1	110,630	25	19	44	20.1	78,992	-31,638
352	Sherman	Goodland	924.5	155.5	2.7	158.2	622,833	152	111	263	119.9	472,157	-150,677
237	Smith	Smith Center	416.5	60.2	1.4	61.6	242,519	50	29	79	36.0	141,826	-100,693
349	Stafford	Stafford	268.6	66.6	0.5	67.1	264,173	40	20	60	27.4	107,716	-156,456
350	Stafford	St. John-Hudson	305.5	58.8	1.7	60.5	238,189	50	27	77	35.1	138,236	-99,953
351	Stafford	Macksville	274.5	55.2	1.3	56.5	222,441	41	36	77	35.1	138,236	-84,205
452	Stanton	Stanton County	472.1	100.3	2.0	102.3	402,755	99	61	160	73.0	287,244	-115,512
209	Stevens	Moscow	180.5	44.2	0.9	45.1	177,559	27	29	56	25.5	100,535	-77,023
210	Stevens	Hugoton	1,007.6	208.8	2.4	211.2	831,494	196	103	299	136.3	536,786	-294,708
353	Sumner	Wellington	1,626.1	323.8	7.2	331.0	1,303,147	259	184	443	202.0	795,305	-507,842
356	Sumner	Conway Springs	503.8	62.5	1.6	64.1	252,362	34	34	68	31.0	122,078	-130,283
357	Sumner	Belle Plaine	617.0	99.4	2.4	101.8	400,787	80	50	130	59.3	233,385	-167,401
358	Sumner	Oxford	336.7	57.5	0.9	58.4	229,921	46	28	74	33.7	132,850	-97,071
359	Sumner	Argonia	171.0	15.5	0.7	16.2	63,779	18	16	34	15.5	61,039	-2,740
360	Sumner	Caldwell	240.5	50.6	0.9	51.5	202,756	46	20	66	30.1	118,488	-84,268
509	Sumner	South Haven	213.5	30.1	1.0	31.1	122,441	14	24	38	17.3	68,220	-54,220
314	Thomas	Brewster	91.5	17.8	0.5	18.3	72,047	12	12	24	10.9	43,087	-28,961
315	Thomas	Colby	915.3	127.7	3.3	131.0	515,747	96	107	203	92.6	364,440	-151,307
316	Thomas	Golden Plains	203.6	46.5	0.7	47.2	185,826	41	30	71	32.4	127,464	-58,362
208	Trego	WaKeeney	376.0	37.8	1.8	39.6	155,905	30	37	67	30.6	120,283	-35,622
329	Wabaunsee	Alma	459.0	42.0	2.6	44.6	175,590	31	39	70	31.9	125,669	-49,921
330	Wabaunsee	Wabaunsee East	485.0	56.1	1.7	57.8	227,559	36	41	77	35.1	138,236	-89,323
241	Wallace	Wallace	188.0	32.4	0.3	32.7	128,740	27	10	37	16.9	66,425	-62,315
242	Wallace	Weskan	110.0	10.5	0.3	10.8	42,520	9	5	14	6.4	25,134	-17,386
108	Washington	Washington Co. Schools	399.0	54.3	1.3	55.6	218,897	48	35	83	37.8	149,008	-69,890
223	Washington	Barnes	343.3	44.2	0.4	44.6	175,590	33	7	40	18.2	71,811	-103,779
224	Washington	Clifton-Clyde	285.5	40.1	0.5	40.6	159,842	36	9	45	20.5	80,787	-79,055
467	Wichita	Leoti	421.0	91.7	1.2	92.9	365,747	74	51	125	57.0	224,409	-141,338
387	Wilson	Altoona-Midway	177.0	45.6	0.8	46.4	182,677	45	25	70	31.9	125,669	-57,008
461	Wilson	Neodesha	698.0	140.4	1.9	142.3	560,235	110	70	180	82.1	323,149	-237,086
484	Wilson	Fredonia	714.3	138.6	3.3	141.9	558,660	115	86	201	91.7	360,850	-197,811
366	Woodson	Woodson	429.2	93.0	0.5	93.5	368,110	90	22	112	51.1	201,070	-167,039
202	Wyandotte	Turner	3,766.4	1,083.0	10.5	1,093.5	4,305,110	876	507	1,383	630.6	2,482,861	-1,822,248
203	Wyandotte	Piper	1,644.5	100.8	4.7	105.5	415,354	78	115	193	88.0	346,487	-68,866
204	Wyandotte	Bonner Springs	2,382.0	415.4	9.6	425.0	1,673,225	317	259	576	262.7	1,034,077	-639,148
500	Wyandotte	Kansas City	18,729.9	7,319.7	43.1	7,362.8	28,987,344	6,265	3,788	10,053	4,584.2	18,047,869	-10,939,474
	TOTALS		455,232.4	81,838.6	1,297.3	83,135.9	327,306,038	69,217	45,516	114,733	52,318.2	205,976,942	-121,329,096

8-2



Kansas City, Kansas Public Schools

Unified School District No. 500

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION HB 2193 February 22, 2011

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

I am Dr. Cynthia Lane, superintendent for the Kansas City, Kansas Public Schools.

HB 2193 would radically alter the definition of "At-risk pupils" as it applies to the school finance funding formula. It would replace the current definition of at-risk funding for students in grades 4-12, (which defined them as students who are eligible for free meals under the national school lunch act) with one that defines them as students who scored less than proficient on the state assessments. This change would completely alter the intention of at-risk funding, and have a devastating impact upon children who have benefited tremendously from the current definition. I urge you to reject this change.

School districts are held to a common standard of accountability, which is just as it should be. All students deserve the same opportunity that a strong education provides, regardless of the zip code they live in. At the same time, research has made clear that certain students cost more to get to the same standard as other students, because of the challenges that they bring with them to school. Students who grow up in poverty (for which eligibility for free and/or reduced lunch serves as a proxy) are capable of reaching the same high levels of achievement as their more advantaged peers, but they need extra resources and support to get there. The same is true for students for whom English is not their primary language.

Studies by this legislature's own Kansas Legislative Division of Post Audit affirm the value of the current definition of "at-risk student," as do the funding decisions in the vast majority of other states that provide funding for at-risk students. Our district has used at-risk funding to continue and accelerate the academic achievement of our students, and to close the achievement gap between groups of students. The changes that are proposed in this legislation would change Kansas from a state that provides additional funding to support the students who most need it, and reward districts that fail to educate certain students well. Such a change is not good for our children, or for the state of Kansas.

Dr. Cynthia Lane
KCKPS Superintendent



Testimony before the
House Committee on Education
on
HB 2193 – At-Risk Weighting Calculation

by
Mark Tallman, Associate Executive Director for Advocacy
Kansas Association of School Boards

February 22, 2011

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on **HB 2193**. The bill would change the basis of at-risk weighting in grades four through twelve from the number of students eligible for free lunch to the number of students who do not meet reading or math proficiency on state tests in the previous year. KASB has consistently supported using free lunch eligibility as the main basis of at-risk funding, and also supports the use of other measures to supplement free lunch. The School Finance Resolution adopted by our members for the current year supports increasing both poverty- and non-poverty based programs to help at-risk students. This bill is estimated to *reduce* at-risk funding by over \$100 million. As a result, we strongly oppose this bill.

Fundamentally, we support using the free lunch indicator because there is abundant evidence that lower income students are more likely to be “at-risk” of academic difficulties. The evidence includes the actual results of state and national assessments, drop-out rates and completion rates for decades, as well as Kansas Legislative Post Audit studies and other national studies. The reasons are simple: lower income children are less likely to have the stable, supportive environment that students need to excel. It’s not that these students are intellectually less able or that their schools are inferior. The issue is that these children face challenges from outside of the school that affect learning. Hunger, illness, needing glasses or dental care, homelessness, transience, lack of books in the home, parents’ education, vocabulary and ability to assist with homework, difficulty in getting to school, substance abuse, crime, incarceration....the list goes on. Of course, there are numerous exceptions at both ends of the income scale, but as a general rule schools and districts with more low income students have traditionally had more difficulty getting students to proficiency and beyond. This is true of private schools as well as public.

At-risk programs based on income or poverty allows districts to do three things. First, they can put supports in place to help children before they *start* “failing” on state assessments. Second, they allow districts to immediately intervene if students demonstrate they are below proficient. Third, they allow districts to maintain support for these students even after they have achieved proficiency. The same conditions put students “at-risk” in the first place are likely still present

House Education Committee

Date 2/22/11

Attachment# 4-1

HB 2193, on the other hand, would only provide funding if students actually fail on state assessments in grades 4-12. Districts would lose resources to help “at-risk” students before they are tested. If schools are successful with these students after they are identified by testing, the districts lose the revenue to support them in the future. Instead of a reasonably stable funding source, at-risk funding would likely rise as test scores fall, then be reduced as interventions are successful, then be increased again as new students enter fourth grade and older students fall behind when support programs are removed. We do not believe this “fail first” model is appropriate.

At-risk funding has significantly increased over the past decade from state, federal and local sources. The track record of that funding is clear. Students scoring proficient or above on the state reading test rose from 70.5 percent in 2004 to 86.3 percent in 2010, and the percentage in math rose from 65.3 to 83.6 percent. For students eligible for free or reduced lunch, proficiency rose from 57.8 to 77.7 percent in reading and 52.2 percent to 75.0 percent in math over the same time period. Stated another way, we can estimate the actual number of students scoring below proficient decreased by about 50,000 in reading and 70,000 in math (assuming an average of approximately 315,000 students in grades 4-12).

The fiscal note for this bill indicates that about 60,000 students would be removed from funding. This is essentially the number of fourth grade and other students who are both proficient *and* qualify for free lunch, and is comparable to the *increase* in the number of students who are now proficient. Because districts increased the number of successful students as funding increased, we believe that reducing that funding by over \$100 million will significantly reduce student achievement.

While we urge you to oppose this bill and maintain at-risk funding at least at current levels, KASB would also support efforts to increase funding for programs targeted at *other* factors causing students to be at-risk.

Thank you for your consideration.



House Education Committee
Rep. Aurand, Chair

H.B. 2193 – Amending at-risk definition

*Submitted by Diane Gjerstad
Wichita Public Schools*

February 22, 2011

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

H.B. 2193, if enacted, would substantially reduce at-risk funding for grades 4 through 12. Yet just last month the speaker from the Goldwater Institute commended Kansas' 5th in the nation ranking for economically disadvantaged students on NAEP. This bill would take away \$121 *million* from a successful element of the school finance formula.

Legislative Post Audit 2006 Cost Study on school finance outlined the academic difficulty economically disadvantaged students have experienced historically compared to their peers. The legislature has on numerous occasions studied the at-risk portion of the school finance formula. Each study has confirmed our current policy which appropriates funding based on the number of students eligible for free lunch and allows districts the flexibility to spend those dollars on the students who need additional support.

The 2007 At Risk Education Committee, chaired by Dr. Andy Tompkins and included former Education Commissioner Bob Corkins, was charged with a thorough examination of the system of identifying and funding the education of at-risk students. From their report:

- The Council continues to believe that the best state proxy for identifying at-risk students is poverty, whether measured by free, or free and reduced price lunches.
- The Council believes that a single tool, such as state assessment scores, is too narrow to determine if a child is at risk.
- The Council affirmed differentiating at risk funding with the core funding being decided on poverty, the second level taking into account density, and found the third level based on proficiency as “interesting and potentially effective approach which needs further study”.

Mr. Chairman, we urge the committee to reject this bill which would undo an effective system of targeting dollars which contributes to Kansas ranking 5th in the nation in the performance of economically disadvantaged students.

House Education Committee
Date 2/22/11
Attachment# 5

February 22, 2011
Chairman Clay Aurand
House Education Committee
HB 2193



Chairman Aurand and Members of the House Education Committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to appear on behalf of Topeka Public Schools, USD 501. My name is Patrick Woods, and I am the President of the Topeka Public Schools School Board. I appear in opposition to HB 2193.

HB 2193 amends the definition of at-risk and would reduce the number of students who would be eligible for at-risk funding in the school finance formula. The bill would change the definition of an at-risk student to include only students in grades below fourth grade who are eligible for free meals, as well as pupils in fourth through twelfth grade who do not meet proficiency in math or reading assessments the preceding year.

Passage of this bill would dismantle a key component of the school finance formula that is dedicated to supporting the needs of the states' students that are at risk. While the number of students eligible for free lunch determines the amount of money each district receives for at-risk students, all students who meet the definition of at-risk are eligible to receive benefits. An at-risk student is defined as a student who meets one or more of the following:

- *A student who is not meeting the requirements necessary for promotion to the next grade level or graduation from high school.
- *A student whose education attainment is below other students of their age or grade level.
- *A student who is a potential dropout.
- *A student who is failing two or more courses of study.
- *A student who has been retained.
- *A student who is not reading on grade level.

Topeka Public Schools currently educates a large majority of students who are considered at risk of failure in school. As committee members have stated, there is not a 1:1 correlation between at-risk and non-proficiency, however the data is irrefutable that achieving proficiency for a child in one year does not eliminate their at-risk status in years to come. Our students face many challenges outside the doors of the schoolhouse. At-risk funding is crucial in order to provide balance and support for each child in order to help deal with outside influences that are proven to impact a child's success in school.

Intervention is appropriate ahead of time in order to avoid more costly remediation after failure. By focusing on proficiency, the state would instill a standard that could provide a disincentive for districts to make progress, in a time when state funding support for schools is being depleted from year to year, and the challenges in educating our students are increasing. Our ELL population alone has grown dramatically in past years (and 75% of those students were born in Topeka). We expect our ELL population to grow by 14% yet again this year.

The State conducts a Communities That Care youth survey each year, which provides a measurable level of factors that influence behavior, attitudes and opinions of Kansas teens. The data provides an objective profile of the problem behaviors, risk factors and protective factors that exist in Topeka Public Schools when compared to other school districts statewide. The district uses the data to help assess current conditions and prioritize areas of risk and protective factors that can be linked to specific types of interventions. Our Domain Risk Profile shows Topeka students at greater risk than students across the state. Specifically, USD 501 students were found to be 50% at risk of academic failure as compared to 40.5% statewide. Likewise, statewide, 40.7% of students show a low commitment to school as compared to 43.4% in our district. This data demonstrates the challenges that our district faces, and the lopsided approach a school finance formula that is not based on at-risk factors beyond fourth grade would have on student achievement. While we appreciate the focus on the early years, the bill does not consider the sociological issues that are inherent in the middle school and high school years.

Your local school boards are elected and charged with providing the education that best serves the students in your community. In order to best serve our students, our School Board has prioritized direct classroom teachers and supports, as well as offerings outside of the regular school day in order to tailor needed supports to each individual student. Our at risk funds support early childhood programs such as Parents as Teachers, PreK, and full day Kindergarten, which are proven to impact elementary school success, extended day programming for those students who need more individualized intervention outside of the regular classroom setting, credit recovery programs for students who are at risk of not graduating from high school, and truancy programs. Through a new partnership with the Topeka City Police Force, we were able to reduce truancy by 90%. But such a success has no meaning unless we can likewise provide the remediation that is needed for such students once they return to school.

It is apparent that there may not be a good understanding of what at-risk is. It does not disappear with proficiency on a state assessment, and it usually results in students that teeter on the brink of failure throughout their school experience. We invite the committee to visit Hope Street School in Topeka, which is a specialized high school that has incorporated the extended day since its inception. 100% of the students at Hope Street meet the at-risk criteria, and are at risk of dropping out or not reaching graduation or achieving a GED. But because each child has a personally tailored instructional package that is geared to their needs, which may include things like transportation to school or child care, Hope Street has repeatedly made AYP for many years.

If you want an education system that produces productive members of society, at-risk factors cannot be ignored. For that reason, we oppose HB 2193.

Thank you,

Patrick Woods
School Board President
USD 501

COLUMN EXPLANATION

Column	1 --	September 20, 2010 FTE enrollment
	2 --	2010-11 Estimated weighted FTE enrollment (excluding special education)
	3 --	2010-11 Estimated at-risk weighted FTE enrollment (free meal and non-proficient)
	4 --	2010-11 Estimated at-risk budget at \$3,937 BSAPP (Column 3 x \$3,937)
	5 --	2010-11 Estimated grades Pre-K through 3 free meal headcount enrollment
	6 --	2009-10 Grades 4 through 12 headcount enrollment of students not meeting proficiency on math or reading state assessments
	7 --	2011-12 Estimated at-risk headcount enrollment under HB 2193 (Column 5 + 6)
	8 --	2011-12 Estimated at-risk weighted enrollment under HB 2193
	9 --	2011-12 Estimated at-risk budget at \$3,937 (Column 8 x \$3,937)
	10 --	2011-12 Estimated reduction in budget authority under HB 2193
	11 --	2011-12 Estimated total weighted FTE enrollment (excluding special education)
	12 --	2011-12 Estimated base state aid per pupil increase of \$191
	13 --	Difference (Column 10 – 12)

	2/21/2011		Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5	Col 6	Col 7	Col 8	Col 9	Col 10	Col 11	Col 12	Col 13
			2010-11 Est.	2010-11 Est.	2010-11 Est.	2010-11 Est.	2010-11 Est.	2009-2010	2011-12 Est.	2011-12 Est.	2011-12 Est.	Est. Loss of	2011-12 Est.	2011-12 Est.	
D #	County	District Name	FTE Enroll	WTD FTE (ex Sped)	At Risk WTD FTE (ex High Density)	At Risk Budget \$3,937	PK-3 Free Meal Headcount	Gr 4-12 Non-Prof Headcount	At Risk HCDT (Col 5 + Col 6)	At Risk WTD FTE	At Risk Budget \$3,937	Budget Authority (Col 9 - Col 4)	Total WTD (ex Sped)	Budget Incr. \$191	Difference (Col 12 + Col 10)
256	Allen	Marmaton Valley	336.5	642.1	79.3	312,204	65	34	99	45.1	177,732	-134,472	607.9	116,117	-18,355
257	Allen	Iola	1,266.4	1,926.6	288.9	1,137,399	276	119	395	180.1	709,132	-428,267	1,817.8	347,204	-81,063
258	Allen	Humboldt	541.5	892.1	93.6	368,503	76	40	116	52.9	208,252	-160,252	851.4	162,617	2,365
365	Anderson	Garnett	1,082.2	1,688.8	205.6	809,447	169	84	253	115.4	454,204	-355,243	1,598.6	305,326	-49,917
479	Anderson	Crest	211.5	466.4	44.0	173,228	41	28	69	31.5	123,874	-49,354	453.9	86,688	37,334
377	Atchison	Atchison County	630.6	1,115.0	110.2	433,857	88	60	148	67.5	265,700	-168,157	1,072.3	204,807	36,650
409	Atchison	Atchison	1,638.4	2,387.2	431.4	1,698,422	392	192	584	266.3	1,048,439	-649,983	2,222.1	424,422	-225,561
254	Barber	Barber Co.	438.5	766.0	55.8	219,685	57	31	88	40.1	157,984	-61,701	750.3	143,313	81,612
255	Barber	South Barber Co.	217.7	445.2	34.3	135,039	31	22	53	24.2	95,149	-39,890	435.1	83,098	43,208
355	Barton	Ellinwood	391.8	690.9	64.9	255,511	55	43	98	44.7	175,937	-79,575	670.7	128,101	48,527
428	Barton	Great Bend	3,032.5	4,348.8	779.5	3,068,892	575	236	811	369.8	1,455,966	-1,612,926	3,939.1	752,371	-860,555
431	Barton	Hoisington	651.5	1,056.3	118.5	466,535	103	33	136	62.0	244,157	-222,378	999.8	190,965	-31,413
234	Bourbon	Ft. Scott	1,871.2	2,690.9	474.5	1,868,107	392	251	643	293.2	1,154,360	-713,747	2,509.6	479,335	-234,411
235	Bourbon	Uniontown	451.1	849.0	99.6	392,125	83	37	120	54.7	215,433	-176,693	804.1	153,587	-23,106
415	Brown	Hiawatha	841.8	1,334.0	155.1	610,629	132	57	189	86.2	339,306	-271,322	1,265.1	241,631	-29,691
430	Brown	Brown County	582.4	1,128.7	162.4	639,369	131	62	193	88.0	346,487	-292,881	1,054.3	201,373	-91,508
205	Butler	Bluestem	523.6	935.7	83.0	326,771	54	58	112	51.1	201,070	-125,701	903.8	172,620	46,920
206	Butler	Remington-Whitewater	532.0	901.2	71.4	281,102	69	38	107	48.8	192,094	-89,008	878.6	167,811	78,803
375	Butler	Circle	1,748.5	2,206.2	157.3	619,290	135	144	279	127.2	500,881	-118,409	2,176.1	415,640	297,230
385	Butler	Andover	4,953.7	5,676.9	244.5	962,597	168	181	349	159.1	626,550	-336,047	5,591.5	1,067,985	731,938
394	Butler	Rose Hill	1,732.5	2,060.4	174.6	687,400	141	147	288	131.3	517,038	-170,362	2,017.1	385,271	214,910
396	Butler	Douglass	719.0	1,140.8	81.6	321,259	62	74	136	62.0	244,157	-77,102	1,121.2	214,152	137,050
402	Butler	Augusta	2,153.8	2,679.3	307.9	1,212,202	281	134	415	189.2	745,038	-467,164	2,560.6	489,082	21,918
490	Butler	El Dorado	1,920.0	2,608.8	395.0	1,555,115	344	178	522	238.0	937,132	-617,983	2,451.8	468,300	-149,683
492	Butler	Flinthills	259.4	527.5	35.2	138,582	16	13	29	13.2	52,063	-86,520	505.5	96,555	10,036
284	Chase	Chase County	388.5	705.5	47.4	186,614	28	44	72	32.8	129,260	-57,354	690.9	131,968	74,614
285	Chautauqua	Cedar Vale	134.7	315.6	27.3	107,480	27	14	41	18.7	73,606	-33,874	307.0	58,636	24,762
286	Chautauqua	Chautauqua	346.5	666.6	76.8	302,362	71	45	116	52.9	208,252	-94,110	642.7	122,755	28,645
404	Cherokee	Riverton	766.0	1,297.7	161.5	635,826	121	94	215	98.0	385,983	-249,842	1,234.2	235,740	-14,102
493	Cherokee	Columbus	1,020.5	1,697.3	206.2	811,809	160	171	331	150.9	594,235	-217,574	1,642.0	313,629	96,055
499	Cherokee	Galena	798.8	1,342.4	218.3	859,447	181	63	244	111.3	438,046	-421,401	1,235.4	235,955	-185,446
508	Cherokee	Baxter Springs	977.5	1,564.9	240.0	944,880	213	84	297	135.4	533,196	-411,684	1,460.3	278,923	-132,761
103	Cheyenne	Cheylin	137.5	331.5	32.7	128,740	24	10	34	15.5	61,039	-67,701	314.3	60,032	-7,669
297	Cheyenne	St. Francis	289.8	509.9	40.8	160,630	27	18	45	20.5	80,787	-79,842	489.6	93,517	13,675
219	Clark	Minneola	266.3	481.3	41.6	163,779	40	16	56	25.5	100,535	-63,244	465.2	88,860	25,616
220	Clark	Ashland	206.0	430.5	28.6	112,598	24	28	52	23.7	93,354	-19,244	425.6	81,292	62,048
379	Clay	Clay Center	1,333.2	1,833.3	167.8	660,629	146	66	212	96.7	380,598	-280,031	1,762.2	336,575	56,544
333	Cloud	Concordia	1,061.4	1,608.2	197.3	776,770	153	77	230	104.9	412,913	-363,858	1,515.8	289,514	-74,344
334	Cloud	Southern Cloud	250.0	489.7	53.7	211,417	25	35	60	27.4	107,716	-103,701	463.4	88,502	-15,199
243	Coffey	Lebo-Waverly	516.5	878.9	81.0	318,897	50	70	120	54.7	215,433	-103,464	852.6	162,850	59,386
244	Coffey	Burlington	841.0	1,299.8	129.2	508,660	95	70	165	75.2	296,220	-212,441	1,245.8	237,955	25,515
245	Coffey	LeRoy-Gridley	224.5	468.0	35.4	139,370	25	37	62	28.3	111,307	-28,063	460.9	88,027	59,964
300	Comanche	Comanche County	311.0	564.7	34.6	136,220	18	20	38	17.3	68,220	-68,000	547.4	104,559	36,559
462	Cowley	Central	357.9	665.3	76.9	302,755	62	18	80	36.5	143,622	-159,134	624.9	119,352	-39,781
463	Cowley	Udall	358.0	630.0	55.1	216,929	40	37	77	35.1	138,236	-78,693	610.0	116,512	37,820

	2/21/2011		Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5	Col 6	Col 7	Col 8	Col 9	Col 10	Col 11	Col 12	Col 13
			2010-11 Est.	2010-11 Est.	2010-11 Est.	2010-11 Est.	2010-11 Est.	2009-2010	2011-12 Est.	2011-12 Est.	2011-12 Est.	Est. Loss of	2011-12 Est.	2011-12 Est.	
USD #	County	District Name	FTE Enroll	WTD FTE (ex Sped)	At Risk WTD FTE (ex High Density)	At Risk Budget \$3,937	PK-3 Free Meal Headcount	Gr 4-12 Non-Prof Headcount	At Risk HCDDT (Col 5 + Col 6)	At Risk WTD FTE	At Risk Budget \$3,937	Budget Authority (Col 9 - Col 4)	Total WTD (ex Sped)	Budget Incr. \$191	Difference (Col 12 + C
465	Cowley	Winfield	2,345.9	3,196.0	497.5	1,958,658	434	191	625	285.0	1,122,045	-836,613	2,983.5	569,849	-266,104
470	Cowley	Arkansas City	2,605.0	3,911.2	707.3	2,784,640	611	265	876	399.5	1,572,658	-1,211,982	3,603.4	688,241	-523,741
471	Cowley	Dexter	138.9	322.8	20.3	79,921	12	18	30	13.7	53,858	-26,063	316.2	60,390	34,327
246	Crawford	Northeast	544.0	997.6	134.9	531,101	106	74	180	82.1	323,149	-207,952	944.8	180,453	-27,499
247	Crawford	Cherokee	705.5	1,206.6	157.7	620,865	127	67	194	88.5	348,283	-272,582	1,137.4	217,237	-55,346
248	Crawford	Girard	1,008.5	1,567.6	193.0	759,841	148	98	246	112.2	441,637	-318,204	1,486.8	283,974	-34,230
249	Crawford	Frontenac	866.0	1,288.8	143.7	565,747	116	75	191	87.1	342,897	-222,850	1,232.2	235,349	12,499
250	Crawford	Pittsburg	2,628.0	3,877.0	724.3	2,851,569	560	361	921	420.0	1,653,446	-1,198,124	3,572.7	682,381	-515,742
294	Decatur	Oberlin	350.5	615.9	50.4	198,425	43	53	96	43.8	172,346	-26,079	609.3	116,372	90,293
393	Dickinson	Solomon	349.7	626.0	49.3	194,094	38	48	86	39.2	154,393	-39,701	615.9	117,640	77,939
435	Dickinson	Abilene	1,545.3	1,944.5	189.5	746,062	150	113	263	119.9	472,157	-273,905	1,874.9	358,111	84,206
473	Dickinson	Chapman	931.1	1,463.5	117.2	461,416	110	66	176	80.3	315,968	-145,449	1,426.6	272,472	127,024
481	Dickinson	Rural Vista	366.5	710.7	46.0	181,102	41	21	62	28.3	111,307	-69,795	693.0	132,358	62,563
487	Dickinson	Herington	489.7	865.3	103.1	405,905	88	18	106	48.3	190,299	-215,606	810.5	154,812	-60,793
111	Doniphan	Doniphan West Schools	346.5	661.6	45.7	179,921	45	41	86	39.2	154,393	-25,528	655.1	125,127	99,600
114	Doniphan	Riverside	746.7	1,196.7	149.7	589,369	138	102	240	109.4	430,865	-158,504	1,156.4	220,880	62,376
429	Doniphan	Troy	347.5	596.6	57.8	227,559	40	39	79	36.0	141,826	-85,732	574.8	109,791	24,059
348	Douglas	Baldwin City	1,351.9	1,830.4	142.9	562,597	134	96	230	104.9	412,913	-149,685	1,792.4	342,345	192,660
491	Douglas	Eudora	1,488.5	2,099.0	195.3	768,896	133	131	264	120.4	473,952	-294,944	2,024.1	386,600	91,656
497	Douglas	Lawrence	10,845.5	13,413.1	1,326.5	5,222,431	1,057	998	2,055	937.1	3,689,284	-1,533,147	13,023.7	2,487,523	954,376
347	Edwards	Kinsely-Offierle	364.0	686.3	72.8	286,614	63	28	91	41.5	163,370	-123,244	655.0	125,104	1,860
502	Edwards	Lewis	101.0	248.0	14.7	57,874	14	0	14	6.4	25,134	-32,740	239.7	45,780	13,040
282	Elk	West Elk	310.5	668.2	65.2	256,692	53	23	76	34.7	136,441	-120,252	637.7	121,792	1,541
283	Elk	Elk Valley	181.5	426.5	54.2	213,385	50	37	87	39.7	156,189	-57,197	412.0	78,687	21,490
388	Ellis	Ellis	396.5	655.4	46.3	182,283	44	30	74	33.7	132,850	-49,433	642.8	122,783	73,350
432	Ellis	Victoria	256.5	450.3	14.7	57,874	13	11	24	10.9	43,087	-14,787	446.5	85,290	70,503
489	Ellis	Hays	2,926.4	3,790.3	428.6	1,687,398	389	126	515	234.8	924,565	-762,833	3,596.5	686,939	-75,894
112	Ellsworth	Central Plains	585.0	1,137.9	76.3	300,393	65	40	105	47.9	188,504	-111,890	1,109.5	211,911	100,021
327	Ellsworth	Ellsworth	615.0	1,029.8	103.0	405,511	70	44	114	52.0	204,661	-200,850	978.8	186,948	-13,902
363	Finney	Holcomb	965.9	1,533.8	190.8	751,180	169	66	235	107.2	421,889	-329,291	1,450.2	276,981	-52,310
457	Finney	Garden City	7,033.5	10,800.4	1,951.0	7,681,087	1,701	993	2,694	1,228.5	4,836,463	-2,844,624	10,077.9	1,924,872	-919,752
381	Ford	Spearville	362.0	583.9	28.9	113,779	21	16	37	16.9	66,425	-47,354	571.9	109,228	61,873
443	Ford	Dodge City	6,046.2	9,996.2	2,003.0	7,885,811	1,706	870	2,576	1,174.7	4,624,621	-3,261,190	9,167.9	1,751,060	-1,510,130
459	Ford	Bucklin	243.2	492.3	54.1	212,992	53	25	78	35.6	140,031	-72,960	473.8	90,490	17,529
287	Franklin	West Franklin	646.0	1,203.9	130.9	515,353	93	71	164	74.8	294,425	-220,929	1,147.8	219,227	-1,702
288	Franklin	Central Heights	550.9	1,007.2	126.9	499,605	92	62	154	70.2	276,472	-223,133	950.5	181,550	-41,583
289	Franklin	Wellsville	810.1	1,255.3	89.9	353,936	66	49	115	52.4	206,456	-147,480	1,217.8	232,607	85,127
290	Franklin	Ottawa	2,420.2	3,244.2	529.3	2,083,854	452	248	700	319.2	1,256,690	-827,164	3,034.1	579,513	-247,651
475	Geary	Junction City	7,698.1	10,107.4	1,383.3	5,446,052	1,265	656	1,921	876.0	3,448,718	-1,997,335	9,600.1	1,833,615	-163,720
291	Gove	Grinnell	72.0	172.5	6.0	23,622	4	7	11	5.0	19,748	-3,874	171.5	32,760	28,886
292	Gove	Wheatland	101.5	249.2	13.2	51,968	12	3	15	6.8	26,929	-25,039	242.8	46,382	21,343
293	Gove	Quinter	266.0	483.8	35.0	137,795	26	30	56	25.5	100,535	-37,260	474.3	90,598	53,338
281	Graham	Graham County	362.0	627.0	49.8	196,063	33	24	57	26.0	102,331	-93,732	603.2	115,210	21,478
214	Grant	Ulysses	1,616.5	2,323.9	369.6	1,455,115	312	223	535	244.0	960,471	-494,645	2,198.3	419,868	-74,777
102	Gray	Cimarron-Ensign	670.8	1,113.1	103.3	406,692	85	29	114	52.0	204,661	-202,031	1,061.8	202,801	770

	2/21/2011		Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5	Col 6	Col 7	Col 8	Col 9	Col 10	Col 11	Col 12	Col 13
			2010-11 Est.	2010-11 Est.	2010-11 Est.	2010-11 Est.	2010-11 Est.	2009-2010	2011-12 Est.	2011-12 Est.	2011-12 Est.	Est. Loss of	2011-12 Est.	2011-12 Est.	
D #	County	District Name	FTE Enroll	WTD FTE (ex Sped)	At Risk WTD FTE (ex High Density)	At Risk Budget \$3,937	PK-3 Free Meal Headcount	Gr 4-12 Non-Prof Headcount	At Risk HCDT (Col 5 + Col 6)	At Risk WTD FTE	At Risk Budget \$3,937	Budget Authority (Col 9 - Col 4)	Total WTD (ex Sped)	Budget Incr. \$191	Difference (Col 12 + Col 10)
371	Gray	Montezuma	229.6	459.6	28.1	110,630	20	11	31	14.1	55,653	-54,976	445.6	85,116	30,140
476	Gray	Copeland	103.0	306.6	18.5	72,835	14	16	30	13.7	53,858	-18,976	301.8	57,640	38,664
477	Gray	Ingalls	229.7	465.7	41.5	163,386	33	15	48	21.9	86,173	-77,212	446.1	85,203	7,990
200	Greeley	Greeley County	190.5	437.8	34.0	133,858	30	32	62	28.3	111,307	-22,551	432.1	82,526	59,975
386	Greenwood	Madison-Virgil	241.6	468.6	41.3	162,598	34	21	55	25.1	98,740	-63,858	452.4	86,405	22,546
389	Greenwood	Eureka	623.9	1,115.6	154.2	607,085	140	66	206	93.9	369,826	-237,259	1,055.3	201,569	-35,690
390	Greenwood	Hamilton	90.0	224.0	19.2	75,590	14	20	34	15.5	61,039	-14,551	220.3	42,078	27,527
494	Hamilton	Syracuse	473.0	941.8	123.1	484,645	111	51	162	73.9	290,834	-193,811	892.6	170,481	-23,329
361	Harper	Anthony-Harper	841.6	1,485.5	217.1	854,723	192	76	268	122.2	481,133	-373,590	1,390.6	265,606	-107,984
511	Harper	Attica	146.5	304.8	19.5	76,772	12	16	28	12.8	50,268	-26,504	298.1	56,931	30,427
369	Harvey	Burrton	244.0	485.9	56.5	222,441	47	30	77	35.1	138,236	-84,205	464.5	88,722	4,517
373	Harvey	Newton	3,346.1	4,613.4	698.2	2,748,813	555	286	841	383.5	1,509,824	-1,238,990	4,298.7	821,051	-417,939
439	Harvey	Sedgwick	536.6	856.9	53.9	212,204	41	65	106	48.3	190,299	-21,905	851.3	162,605	140,700
440	Harvey	Halstead	781.0	1,242.2	113.8	448,031	80	35	115	52.4	206,456	-241,574	1,180.8	225,540	-16,034
460	Harvey	Hesston	819.8	1,204.4	84.2	331,495	61	37	98	44.7	175,937	-155,559	1,164.9	222,494	66,935
374	Haskell	Sublette	485.9	947.5	130.9	515,353	92	35	127	57.9	228,000	-287,354	874.5	167,032	-120,322
507	Haskell	Satanta	333.5	693.7	85.1	335,039	81	31	112	51.1	201,070	-133,968	659.7	125,997	-7,971
227	Hodgeman	Jetmore	269.0	493.5	39.0	153,543	32	20	52	23.7	93,354	-60,189	478.2	91,338	31,150
228	Hodgeman	Hanston	37.0	165.8	2.7	10,630	3	3	6	2.7	10,772	142	165.8	31,675	31,816
335	Jackson	North Jackson	391.0	726.7	60.0	236,220	45	37	82	37.4	147,212	-89,008	704.1	134,482	45,474
336	Jackson	Holton	1,077.5	1,567.3	151.8	597,637	117	64	181	82.5	324,944	-272,692	1,498.0	286,125	13,433
337	Jackson	Mayetta	912.1	1,465.4	146.5	576,771	113	62	175	79.8	314,173	-262,598	1,398.7	267,152	4,554
338	Jefferson	Valley Falls	398.5	709.1	57.7	227,165	37	15	52	23.7	93,354	-133,811	675.1	128,946	-4,864
339	Jefferson	Jefferson County	477.5	799.6	54.2	213,385	39	40	79	36.0	141,826	-71,559	781.4	149,252	77,693
340	Jefferson	Jefferson West	862.0	1,325.2	76.2	299,999	49	79	128	58.4	229,795	-70,205	1,307.4	249,707	179,503
341	Jefferson	Oskaloosa	514.6	970.8	122.0	480,314	94	93	187	85.3	335,716	-144,598	934.1	178,408	33,810
342	Jefferson	McLouth	491.2	840.8	75.1	295,669	50	50	100	45.6	179,527	-116,142	811.3	154,958	38,817
343	Jefferson	Perry	934.1	1,450.2	126.2	496,849	91	76	167	76.2	299,810	-197,039	1,400.2	267,429	70,390
107	Jewell	Rock Hills	286.0	527.3	37.5	147,638	37	15	52	23.7	93,354	-54,283	513.5	98,081	43,797
229	Johnson	Blue Valley	20,599.1	27,861.4	519.0	2,043,303	373	560	933	425.4	1,674,989	-368,314	27,767.8	5,303,659	4,935,345
230	Johnson	Spring Hill	3,172.4	3,827.0	203.5	801,180	165	133	298	135.9	534,991	-266,188	3,759.4	718,043	451,855
231	Johnson	Gardner-Edgerton	4,752.3	5,721.9	545.0	2,145,665	438	188	626	285.5	1,123,840	-1,021,825	5,462.4	1,043,310	21,485
232	Johnson	DeSoto	6,369.7	8,006.8	337.0	1,326,769	232	356	588	268.1	1,055,620	-271,149	7,937.9	1,516,144	1,244,995
233	Johnson	Olathe	26,098.1	35,687.5	2,460.6	9,687,382	2,007	1,381	3,388	1,544.9	6,082,382	-3,605,001	34,771.8	6,641,419	3,036,418
512	Johnson	Shawnee Mission	26,654.0	34,712.2	3,306.7	13,018,478	2,796	1,891	4,687	2,137.3	8,414,440	-4,604,038	33,542.8	6,406,669	1,802,631
215	Kearny	Lakin	594.0	1,101.8	127.9	503,542	113	55	168	76.6	301,606	-201,937	1,050.5	200,647	-1,290
216	Kearny	Deerfield	296.1	587.6	77.6	305,511	61	28	89	40.6	159,779	-145,732	550.6	105,162	-40,570
331	Kingman	Kingman	1,005.7	1,522.7	171.2	674,014	136	120	256	116.7	459,590	-214,425	1,468.2	280,433	66,008
332	Kingman	Cunningham	166.0	374.1	32.6	128,346	28	20	48	21.9	86,173	-42,173	363.4	69,407	27,234
422	Kiowa	Greensburg	201.0	445.2	27.0	106,299	14	18	32	14.6	57,449	-48,850	432.8	82,663	33,813
424	Kiowa	Mullinville	254.7	354.3	11.0	43,307	11	47	58	26.4	104,126	60,819	369.7	70,622	131,441
474	Kiowa	Haviland	115.0	300.0	14.1	55,512	8	10	18	8.2	32,315	-23,197	294.1	56,175	32,978
503	Labette	Parsons	1,176.3	1,878.5	330.2	1,299,997	276	117	393	179.2	705,542	-594,456	1,727.5	329,954	-264,501
504	Labette	Oswego	475.5	814.1	108.6	427,558	89	37	126	57.5	226,204	-201,354	763.0	145,725	-55,629
705	Labette	Chetopa - St. Paul	468.1	867.5	100.6	396,062	65	56	121	55.2	217,228	-178,834	822.1	157,017	-21,818

	2/21/2011		Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5	Col 6	Col 7	Col 8	Col 9	Col 10	Col 11	Col 12	Col 13
			2010-11 Est.	2010-11 Est.	2010-11 Est.	2010-11 Est.	2010-11 Est.	2009-2010	2011-12 Est.	2011-12 Est.	2011-12 Est.	Est. Loss of	2011-12 Est.	2011-12 Est.	
USD #	County	District Name	FTE Enroll	WTD FTE (ex Sped)	At Risk WTD FTE (ex High Density)	At Risk Budget \$3,937	PK-3 Free Meal Headcount	Gr 4-12 Non-Prof Headcount	At Risk HCDDT (Col 5 + Col 6)	At Risk WTD FTE	At Risk Budget \$3,937	Budget Authority (Col 9 - Col 4)	Total WTD (ex Sped)	Budget Incr. \$191	Difference (Col 12 + Col 13)
506	Labette	Labette County	1,600.2	2,224.7	307.0	1,208,659	226	69	295	134.5	529,605	-679,054	2,052.2	391,974	-287,080
468	Lane	Healy	74.0	215.9	13.7	53,937	12	12	24	10.9	43,087	-10,850	213.1	40,711	29,860
482	Lane	Dighton	240.5	450.8	32.7	128,740	33	6	39	17.8	70,016	-58,724	435.9	83,254	24,530
207	Leavenworth	Ft. Leavenworth	2,061.5	2,409.2	61.5	242,126	70	127	197	89.8	353,669	111,543	2,437.5	465,569	577,112
449	Leavenworth	Easton	675.4	1,112.1	67.0	263,779	47	71	118	53.8	211,842	-51,937	1,098.9	209,891	157,955
453	Leavenworth	Leavenworth	3,533.6	5,185.2	812.3	3,198,025	698	585	1,283	585.0	2,303,334	-894,691	4,957.9	946,968	52,277
458	Leavenworth	Basehor-Linwood	2,146.2	2,750.4	122.8	483,464	96	135	231	105.3	414,708	-68,756	2,732.9	521,991	453,235
464	Leavenworth	Tonganoxie	1,845.6	2,311.9	215.3	847,636	150	199	349	159.1	626,550	-221,086	2,255.7	430,847	209,761
469	Leavenworth	Lansing	2,549.1	2,948.5	214.6	844,880	146	217	363	165.5	651,684	-193,196	2,899.4	553,791	360,594
298	Lincoln	Lincoln	357.0	647.4	72.7	286,220	53	38	91	41.5	163,370	-122,850	616.2	117,693	-5,157
299	Lincoln	Sylvan Grove	231.0	467.1	36.2	142,519	30	5	35	16.0	62,835	-79,685	446.9	85,350	5,665
344	Linn	Pleasanton	325.0	624.0	88.7	349,212	78	34	112	51.1	201,070	-148,141	586.4	111,997	-36,144
346	Linn	Jayhawk	501.3	944.3	105.5	415,354	87	75	162	73.9	290,834	-124,519	912.7	174,320	49,801
362	Linn	Prairie View	952.5	1,565.5	183.5	722,440	133	87	220	100.3	394,960	-327,480	1,482.3	283,123	-44,357
274	Logan	Oakley	403.0	707.3	70.1	275,984	41	32	73	33.3	131,055	-144,929	670.5	128,063	-16,866
275	Logan	Triplains	77.8	198.2	16.5	64,961	8	3	11	5.0	19,748	-45,213	186.7	35,663	-9,550
251	Lyon	North Lyon Co.	437.3	874.4	73.1	287,795	55	27	82	37.4	147,212	-140,582	838.7	160,190	19,608
252	Lyon	Southern Lyon Co.	520.8	882.7	74.9	294,881	58	29	87	39.7	156,189	-138,693	847.5	161,867	23,175
253	Lyon	Emporia	4,325.5	6,658.1	1,181.4	4,651,172	913	479	1,392	634.8	2,499,019	-2,152,153	6,111.5	1,167,287	-984,866
397	Marion	Centre	268.5	523.7	38.1	150,000	29	20	49	22.3	87,968	-62,031	507.9	97,017	34,986
398	Marion	Peabody-Burns	304.5	582.9	60.8	239,370	38	45	83	37.8	149,008	-90,362	559.9	106,950	16,588
408	Marion	Marion	563.6	947.8	83.6	329,133	66	30	96	43.8	172,346	-156,787	908.0	173,423	16,636
410	Marion	Durham-Hills	562.2	949.4	75.3	296,456	63	40	103	47.0	184,913	-111,543	921.1	175,924	64,381
411	Marion	Goessel	248.5	465.3	23.4	92,126	18	15	33	15.0	59,244	-32,882	456.9	87,277	54,395
364	Marshall	Marysville	700.0	1,147.6	103.3	406,692	87	73	160	73.0	287,244	-119,449	1,117.3	213,397	93,948
380	Marshall	Vermillion	514.3	888.3	60.1	236,614	64	12	76	34.7	136,441	-100,173	862.9	164,805	64,632
498	Marshall	Valley Heights	354.5	672.2	70.4	277,165	63	25	88	40.1	157,984	-119,181	641.9	122,608	3,427
400	McPherson	Smoky Valley	959.3	1,439.8	94.1	370,472	66	76	142	64.8	254,929	-115,543	1,410.5	269,396	153,853
418	McPherson	McPherson	2,299.3	2,783.6	325.1	1,279,919	279	237	516	235.3	926,360	-353,558	2,693.8	514,515	160,957
419	McPherson	Canton-Galva	368.3	636.5	41.5	163,386	34	29	63	28.7	113,102	-50,283	623.7	119,132	68,849
423	McPherson	Moundridge	404.0	693.2	52.8	207,874	35	28	63	28.7	113,102	-94,771	669.1	127,803	33,032
448	McPherson	Inman	419.5	723.1	28.4	111,811	21	45	66	30.1	118,488	6,677	724.8	138,436	145,113
225	Meade	Fowler	166.0	367.4	39.5	155,512	33	29	62	28.3	111,307	-44,205	356.2	68,029	23,824
226	Meade	Meade	453.0	782.1	62.9	247,637	43	36	79	36.0	141,826	-105,811	755.2	144,248	38,437
367	Miami	Osawatomie	1,124.0	1,756.6	270.6	1,065,352	207	124	331	150.9	594,235	-471,117	1,636.9	312,655	-158,462
368	Miami	Paola	2,011.1	2,540.9	259.0	1,019,683	189	121	310	141.4	556,534	-463,149	2,423.3	462,843	-306
416	Miami	Louisburg	1,653.0	2,010.0	134.0	527,558	99	58	157	71.6	281,858	-245,700	1,947.6	371,990	126,290
272	Mitchell	Waconda	378.3	695.7	75.4	296,850	61	1	62	28.3	111,307	-185,543	648.6	123,877	-61,666
273	Mitchell	Beloit	728.3	1,147.0	90.1	354,724	92	58	150	68.4	269,291	-85,433	1,125.3	214,932	129,499
436	Montgomery	Caney	845.4	1,364.4	161.9	637,400	154	51	205	93.5	368,031	-269,370	1,296.0	247,532	-21,837
445	Montgomery	Coffeyville	1,815.1	2,634.3	508.9	2,003,539	437	292	729	332.4	1,308,753	-694,786	2,457.8	469,444	-225,342
446	Montgomery	Independence	1,811.9	2,499.9	421.2	1,658,264	362	200	562	256.3	1,008,943	-649,322	2,335.0	445,980	-203,342
447	Montgomery	Cherryvale	944.1	1,477.0	187.5	738,188	169	82	251	114.5	450,613	-287,574	1,404.0	268,156	-19,419
417	Morris	Morris County	740.5	1,208.8	114.3	449,999	91	67	158	72.0	283,653	-166,346	1,166.5	222,811	56,465
217	Morton	Rolla	193.5	427.9	39.0	153,543	17	22	39	17.8	70,016	-83,527	406.7	77,677	-851

	2/21/2011		Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5	Col 6	Col 7	Col 8	Col 9	Col 10	Col 11	Col 12	Col 13
ID #	County	District Name	2010-11 Est. FTE Enroll	2010-11 Est. WTD FTE (ex Sped)	2010-11 Est. At Risk WTD FTE (ex High Density)	2010-11 Est. At Risk Budget \$3,937	2010-11 Est. PK-3 Free Meal Headcount	2009-2010 Gr 4-12 Non-Prof Headcount	2011-12 Est. At Risk HCDT (Col 5 + Col 6)	2011-12 Est. At Risk WTD FTE	2011-12 Est. At Risk Budget \$3,937	Est. Loss of Budget Authority (Col 9 - Col 4)	2011-12 Est. Total WTD (ex Sped)	2011-12 Est. Budget Incr. \$191	Difference (Col 12 + Col 10)
218	Morton	Elkhart	838.6	1,306.4	137.0	539,369	84	97	181	82.5	324,944	-214,425	1,251.9	239,120	24,695
113	Nemaha	Prairie Hills	1,181.3	1,700.1	131.7	518,503	105	62	167	76.2	299,810	-218,692	1,644.6	314,109	95,417
442	Nemaha	Nemaha Valley	421.8	769.9	38.5	151,575	33	14	47	21.4	84,378	-67,197	752.8	143,791	76,594
451	Nemaha	B & B	169.5	374.0	7.3	28,740	0	1	1	0.5	1,795	-26,945	367.2	70,127	43,182
101	Neosho	Erie	518.6	1,008.9	121.3	477,558	88	49	137	62.5	245,952	-231,606	950.1	181,464	-50,142
413	Neosho	Chanute	1,850.5	2,591.4	434.5	1,710,627	368	204	572	260.8	1,026,896	-683,731	2,417.7	461,787	-221,944
106	Ness	Western Plains	165.5	384.3	40.4	159,055	35	30	65	29.6	116,693	-42,362	373.5	71,346	28,984
303	Ness	Ness City	302.4	511.7	33.5	131,890	25	33	58	26.4	104,126	-27,764	504.6	96,388	68,624
211	Norton	Norton	726.3	1,135.0	99.2	390,550	58	55	113	51.5	202,866	-187,685	1,087.3	207,680	19,995
212	Norton	Northern Valley	201.0	443.1	51.3	201,968	42	16	58	26.4	104,126	-97,842	418.2	79,885	-17,957
420	Osage	Osage City	674.4	1,063.8	119.1	468,897	96	51	147	67.0	263,905	-204,992	1,011.7	193,241	-11,751
421	Osage	Lyndon	454.5	741.3	42.9	168,897	23	39	62	28.3	111,307	-57,590	726.7	138,794	81,204
434	Osage	Santa Fe	1,045.9	1,639.8	167.5	659,448	145	88	233	106.2	418,298	-241,149	1,578.5	301,503	60,354
454	Osage	Burlingame	339.0	585.1	54.3	213,779	34	20	54	24.6	96,945	-116,834	555.4	106,086	-10,748
456	Osage	Marais Des Cygnes	261.0	534.1	60.1	236,614	45	19	64	29.2	114,897	-121,716	503.2	96,108	-25,608
392	Osborne	Osborne	315.2	616.3	76.8	302,362	45	36	81	36.9	145,417	-156,945	576.4	110,099	-46,845
239	Ottawa	North Ottawa Co.	608.5	1,021.1	76.3	300,393	44	53	97	44.2	174,141	-126,252	989.0	188,905	62,653
240	Ottawa	Twin Valley	604.3	1,006.9	78.8	310,236	52	33	85	38.8	152,598	-157,637	966.9	184,670	27,033
495	Pawnee	Ft. Larned	901.0	1,438.8	177.7	699,605	152	127	279	127.2	500,881	-198,724	1,388.3	265,170	66,446
496	Pawnee	Pawnee Heights	179.7	353.8	16.7	65,748	19	7	26	11.9	46,677	-19,071	349.0	66,651	47,580
110	Phillips	Thunder Ridge	250.0	507.1	46.5	183,071	41	21	62	28.3	111,307	-71,764	488.9	93,375	21,611
325	Phillips	Phillipsburg	613.4	1,008.1	93.4	367,716	70	38	108	49.2	193,889	-173,826	963.9	184,114	10,288
326	Phillips	Logan	176.0	390.2	36.5	143,701	24	23	47	21.4	84,378	-59,323	375.1	71,650	12,327
320	Pottawatomie	Wamego	1,349.5	1,767.7	141.8	558,267	113	103	216	98.5	387,779	-170,488	1,724.4	329,360	158,872
321	Pottawatomie	Kaw Valley	1,138.5	1,679.4	189.3	745,274	157	105	262	119.5	470,361	-274,913	1,609.6	307,428	32,515
322	Pottawatomie	Onaga	309.0	562.6	44.6	175,590	24	34	58	26.4	104,126	-71,464	544.4	103,990	32,525
323	Pottawatomie	Westmoreland	842.6	1,372.9	74.6	293,700	65	20	85	38.8	152,598	-141,102	1,337.1	255,378	114,276
382	Pratt	Pratt	1,044.1	1,582.3	177.8	699,999	138	103	241	109.9	432,661	-267,338	1,514.4	289,250	21,912
438	Pratt	Skyline	369.7	629.7	39.6	155,905	34	28	62	28.3	111,307	-44,598	618.4	118,109	73,511
105	Rawlins	Rawlins County	300.0	547.3	44.8	176,378	31	29	60	27.4	107,716	-68,661	529.9	101,203	32,542
308	Reno	Hutchinson	4,671.0	6,645.2	1,166.7	4,593,298	938	538	1,476	673.1	2,649,821	-1,943,476	6,151.6	1,174,947	-768,529
309	Reno	Nickerson	1,136.5	1,771.4	255.4	1,005,510	232	68	300	136.8	538,582	-466,928	1,652.8	315,685	-151,243
310	Reno	Fairfield	275.2	618.6	66.1	260,236	48	27	75	34.2	134,645	-125,590	586.7	112,060	-13,531
311	Reno	Pretty Prairie	265.0	488.1	33.6	132,283	25	22	47	21.4	84,378	-47,905	475.9	90,903	42,998
312	Reno	Haven	1,034.4	1,566.8	144.7	569,684	112	68	180	82.1	323,149	-246,535	1,504.2	287,298	40,763
313	Reno	Buhler	2,153.0	2,709.3	268.7	1,057,872	230	181	411	187.4	737,857	-320,015	2,628.0	501,951	181,936
109	Republic	Republic County	483.5	831.0	82.5	324,803	77	40	117	53.4	210,047	-114,756	801.9	153,154	38,398
426	Republic	Pike Valley	241.0	476.0	41.1	161,811	31	17	48	21.9	86,173	-75,638	456.8	87,247	11,609
376	Rice	Sterling	524.2	915.3	65.0	255,905	56	51	107	48.8	192,094	-63,811	899.1	171,727	107,916
401	Rice	Chase	146.3	340.6	42.0	165,354	30	29	59	26.9	105,921	-59,433	325.5	62,171	2,738
405	Rice	Lyons	784.6	1,360.0	212.2	835,431	205	77	282	128.6	506,267	-329,165	1,276.4	243,791	-85,374
444	Rice	Little River	333.5	565.4	31.6	124,409	23	18	41	18.7	73,606	-50,803	552.5	105,527	54,724
378	Riley	Riley County	688.5	1,106.5	57.3	225,590	41	38	79	36.0	141,826	-83,764	1,085.2	207,278	123,514
383	Riley	Manhattan	6,047.1	7,497.2	721.8	2,841,727	668	449	1,117	509.4	2,005,319	-836,408	7,284.8	1,391,388	554,980
284	Riley	Blue Valley	215.0	433.5	18.8	74,016	15	5	20	9.1	35,905	-38,110	423.8	80,950	42,839

7-6

	2/21/2011		Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5	Col 6	Col 7	Col 8	Col 9	Col 10	Col 11	Col 12	Col 13
			2010-11 Est.	2010-11 Est.	2010-11 Est.	2010-11 Est.	2010-11 Est.	2009-2010	2011-12 Est.	2011-12 Est.	2011-12 Est.	Est. Loss of	2011-12 Est.	2011-12 Est.	
USD #	County	District Name	FTE Enroll	WTD FTE (ex Sped)	At Risk WTD FTE (ex High Density)	At Risk Budget \$3,937	PK-3 Free Meal Headcount	Gr 4-12 Non-Prof Headcount	At Risk HCDT (Col 5 + Col 6)	At Risk WTD FTE	At Risk Budget \$3,937	Budget Authority (Col 9 - Col 4)	Total WTD (ex Sped)	Budget Incr. \$191	Differe (Col 12 + C
269	Rooks	Palco	143.0	333.8	25.0	98,425	18	23	41	18.7	73,606	-24,819	327.5	62,552	37,733
270	Rooks	Plainville	368.9	617.9	52.2	205,511	52	29	81	36.9	145,417	-60,094	602.6	115,103	55,009
271	Rooks	Stockton	278.6	509.9	43.6	171,653	43	11	54	24.6	96,945	-74,709	490.9	93,766	19,058
395	Rush	LaCrosse	294.0	536.6	54.0	212,598	27	33	60	27.4	107,716	-104,882	510.0	97,402	-7,479
403	Rush	Otis-Bison	179.0	391.9	25.5	100,394	15	21	36	16.4	64,630	-35,764	382.8	73,118	37,354
399	Russell	Paradise	149.0	325.8	20.8	81,890	13	12	25	11.4	44,882	-37,008	316.4	60,432	23,425
407	Russell	Russell	825.0	1,426.2	157.3	619,290	104	91	195	88.9	350,078	-269,212	1,357.8	259,344	-9,868
305	Saline	Salina	6,971.8	9,311.0	1,542.2	6,071,641	1,215	669	1,884	859.1	3,382,292	-2,689,349	8,627.9	1,647,930	-1,041,419
306	Saline	Southeast of Saline	713.0	1,123.0	55.2	217,322	40	49	89	40.6	159,779	-57,543	1,108.4	211,701	154,158
307	Saline	Ell-Saline	461.0	782.3	45.0	177,165	37	52	89	40.6	159,779	-17,386	777.9	148,576	131,190
466	Scott	Scott County	861.9	1,410.6	159.9	629,526	151	77	228	104.0	409,322	-220,204	1,354.7	258,742	38,537
259	Sedgwick	Wichita	46,256.4	70,730.1	14,586.3	57,426,263	12,855	8,435	21,290	9,708.2	38,221,341	-19,204,922	65,852.0	12,577,740	-6,627,183
260	Sedgwick	Derby	6,220.4	7,896.9	969.3	3,816,134	776	584	1,360	620.2	2,441,570	-1,374,564	7,547.8	1,441,622	67,058
261	Sedgwick	Haysville	4,987.6	6,696.5	999.0	3,933,063	746	663	1,409	642.5	2,529,538	-1,403,525	6,340.0	1,210,941	-192,584
262	Sedgwick	Valley Center	2,583.2	3,257.0	301.8	1,188,187	246	182	428	195.2	768,376	-419,810	3,150.4	601,720	181,910
263	Sedgwick	Mulvane	1,822.6	2,220.5	195.9	771,258	160	137	297	135.4	533,196	-238,063	2,160.0	412,566	174,504
264	Sedgwick	Clearwater	1,243.9	1,694.7	112.2	441,731	97	87	184	83.9	330,330	-111,401	1,666.4	318,283	206,882
265	Sedgwick	Goddard	4,924.8	6,202.3	412.3	1,623,225	260	234	494	225.3	886,864	-736,361	6,015.3	1,148,915	412,555
266	Sedgwick	Maize	6,401.2	8,158.3	360.8	1,420,470	216	443	659	300.5	1,183,084	-237,385	8,098.0	1,546,719	1,309,333
267	Sedgwick	Renwick	1,918.5	2,336.7	96.1	378,346	52	85	137	62.5	245,952	-132,393	2,303.1	439,887	307,493
268	Sedgwick	Cheney	765.4	1,146.6	60.6	238,582	52	40	92	42.0	165,165	-73,417	1,128.0	215,439	142,022
480	Seward	Liberal	4,456.0	7,034.9	1,442.0	5,677,154	1,329	815	2,144	977.7	3,849,063	-1,828,091	6,570.6	1,254,978	-573,113
483	Seward	Kismet-Plains	714.5	1,518.3	212.5	836,613	194	77	271	123.6	486,519	-350,094	1,429.4	273,011	-77,083
345	Shawnee	Seaman	3,608.8	4,523.8	426.4	1,678,737	351	268	619	282.3	1,111,273	-567,463	4,379.7	836,516	269,052
372	Shawnee	Silver Lake	715.8	1,094.0	42.7	168,110	37	26	63	28.7	113,102	-55,008	1,080.0	206,285	151,278
437	Shawnee	Auburn Washburn	5,541.2	6,920.8	551.5	2,171,256	472	262	734	334.7	1,317,730	-853,526	6,704.0	1,280,465	426,939
450	Shawnee	Shawnee Heights	3,402.2	4,317.1	391.3	1,540,548	263	381	644	293.7	1,156,155	-384,393	4,219.5	805,918	421,525
501	Shawnee	Topeka	13,222.7	19,289.0	4,157.4	16,367,684	3,654	2,159	5,813	2,650.7	10,435,916	-5,931,768	17,782.3	3,396,425	-2,535,343
412	Sheridan	Hoxie	305.5	518.8	28.1	110,630	25	19	44	20.1	78,992	-31,638	510.8	97,556	65,918
352	Sherman	Goodland	924.5	1,427.5	158.2	622,833	152	111	263	119.9	472,157	-150,677	1,389.2	265,343	114,666
237	Smith	Smith Center	416.5	742.8	61.6	242,519	50	29	79	36.0	141,826	-100,693	717.2	136,990	36,297
349	Stafford	Stafford	268.6	523.7	67.1	264,173	40	20	60	27.4	107,716	-156,456	484.0	92,436	-64,020
350	Stafford	St. John-Hudson	305.5	569.0	60.5	238,189	50	27	77	35.1	138,236	-99,953	543.6	103,830	3,877
351	Stafford	Macksville	274.5	545.4	56.5	222,441	41	36	77	35.1	138,236	-84,205	524.0	100,086	15,882
452	Stanton	Stanton County	472.1	888.0	102.3	402,755	99	61	160	73.0	287,244	-115,512	858.7	164,004	48,492
209	Stevens	Moscow	180.5	429.6	45.1	177,559	27	29	56	25.5	100,535	-77,023	410.0	78,317	1,293
210	Stevens	Hugoton	1,007.6	1,647.8	211.2	831,494	196	103	299	136.3	536,786	-294,708	1,572.9	300,432	5,724
353	Sumner	Wellington	1,626.1	2,166.9	331.0	1,303,147	259	184	443	202.0	795,305	-507,842	2,037.9	389,240	-118,601
356	Sumner	Conway Springs	503.8	853.7	64.1	252,362	34	34	68	31.0	122,078	-130,283	820.6	156,736	26,453
357	Sumner	Belle Plaine	617.0	1,048.7	101.8	400,787	80	50	130	59.3	233,385	-167,401	1,006.2	192,180	24,779
358	Sumner	Oxford	336.7	592.6	58.4	229,921	46	28	74	33.7	132,850	-97,071	567.9	108,477	11,407
359	Sumner	Argonia	171.0	356.0	16.2	63,779	18	16	34	15.5	61,039	-2,740	355.3	67,863	65,123
360	Sumner	Caldwell	240.5	474.9	51.5	202,756	46	20	66	30.1	118,488	-84,268	453.5	86,618	2,350
509	Sumner	South Haven	213.5	434.5	31.1	122,441	14	24	38	17.3	68,220	-54,220	420.7	80,359	26,139
314	Thomas	Brewster	91.5	228.1	18.3	72,047	12	12	24	10.9	43,087	-28,961	220.7	42,162	13,202

	2/21/2011		Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5	Col 6	Col 7	Col 8	Col 9	Col 10	Col 11	Col 12	Col 13
			2010-11 Est.	2010-11 Est.	2010-11 Est.	2010-11 Est.	2010-11 Est.	2009-2010	2011-12 Est.	2011-12 Est.	2011-12 Est.	Est. Loss of	2011-12 Est.	2011-12 Est.	
SD #	County	District Name	FTE Enroll	WTD FTE (ex Sped)	At Risk WTD FTE (ex High Density)	At Risk Budget \$3,937	PK-3 Free Meal Headcount	Gr 4-12 Non-Prof Headcount	At Risk HCDT (Col 5 + Col 6)	At Risk WTD FTE	At Risk Budget \$3,937	Budget Authority (Col 9 - Col 4)	Total WTD (ex Sped)	Budget Incr. \$191	Difference (Col 12 + Col 10)
315	Thomas	Colby	915.3	1,397.4	131.0	515,747	96	107	203	92.6	364,440	-151,307	1,359.0	259,563	108,256
316	Thomas	Golden Plains	203.6	443.4	47.2	185,826	41	30	71	32.4	127,464	-58,362	428.6	81,858	23,496
208	Trego	WaKeeney	376.0	672.9	39.6	155,905	30	37	67	30.6	120,283	-35,622	663.9	126,796	91,174
329	Wabaunsee	Alma	459.0	794.2	44.6	175,590	31	39	70	31.9	125,669	-49,921	781.5	149,270	99,349
330	Wabaunsee	Wabaunsee East	485.0	873.6	57.8	227,559	36	41	77	35.1	138,236	-89,323	850.9	162,524	73,202
241	Wallace	Wallace	188.0	404.5	32.7	128,740	27	10	37	16.9	66,425	-62,315	388.7	74,236	11,922
242	Wallace	Weskan	110.0	250.9	10.8	42,520	9	5	14	6.4	25,134	-17,386	246.5	47,078	29,693
108	Washington	Washington Co. Schools	399.0	692.2	55.6	218,897	48	35	83	37.8	149,008	-69,890	674.4	128,820	58,930
223	Washington	Barnes	343.3	604.9	44.6	175,590	33	7	40	18.2	71,811	-103,779	578.5	110,501	6,722
224	Washington	Clifton-Clyde	285.5	529.1	40.6	159,842	36	9	45	20.5	80,787	-79,055	509.0	97,223	18,168
467	Wichita	Leoti	421.0	815.8	92.9	365,747	74	51	125	57.0	224,409	-141,338	779.9	148,961	7,623
387	Wilson	Altoona-Midway	177.0	418.9	46.4	182,677	45	25	70	31.9	125,669	-57,008	404.4	77,244	20,236
461	Wilson	Neodesha	698.0	1,163.8	142.3	560,235	110	70	180	82.1	323,149	-237,086	1,103.6	210,784	-26,302
484	Wilson	Fredonia	714.3	1,213.5	141.9	558,660	115	86	201	91.7	360,850	-197,811	1,163.3	222,182	24,371
366	Woodson	Woodson	429.2	779.6	93.5	368,110	90	22	112	51.1	201,070	-167,039	737.2	140,800	-26,239
202	Wyandotte	Turner	3,766.4	5,587.7	1,093.5	4,305,110	876	507	1,383	630.6	2,482,861	-1,822,248	5,124.8	978,846	-843,402
203	Wyandotte	Piper	1,644.5	2,184.5	105.5	415,354	78	115	193	88.0	346,487	-68,866	2,167.0	413,899	345,033
204	Wyandotte	Bonner Springs	2,382.0	3,085.2	425.0	1,673,225	317	259	576	262.7	1,034,077	-639,148	2,922.9	558,265	-80,883
500	Wyandotte	Kansas City	18,729.9	30,866.5	7,362.8	28,987,344	6,265	3,788	10,053	4,584.2	18,047,869	-10,939,474	28,087.9	5,364,783	-5,574,691
	TOTALS		455,232.4		83,135.9	327,306,038	69,217	45,516	114,733	52,318.2	205,976,942	-121,329,096	635,338.4	121,349,644	20,548

7-8



Testimony before the
House Committee on Education
on
HB 2202 – Non-Traditional Teacher Licensure

by
Mark Tallman, Associate Executive Director for Advocacy
Kansas Association of School Boards

February 22, 2011

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on **HB 2202**. The bill would allow the Kansas State Board of Education to offer and operate a nontraditional teacher licensure program and provide grants for financial assistance to organizations that train individuals seeking to obtain nontraditional teacher licenses, subject to appropriation. However, no source of funding for such grants has been provided.

KASB appears today as a proponent of this bill, based on a long-standing position of our Delegate Assembly that is in favor of alternative paths for teacher and administrator licensure. This does not mean KASB believes, as the saying sometimes goes, “just anyone can teach.” It does not mean we think that knowledge of content in a particular area automatically means an individual can effectively teach that content to students. But we believe that completion of a traditional teacher training program also does not guarantee a teacher is effective, or that the lack of such training means a prospective teacher cannot be effective.

Basically, we have advocated two things. First, we should allow individuals a period of time to *demonstrate* their effectiveness in the classroom based on student outcomes. If they can demonstrate satisfactory results, completion of a traditional teacher education program should not be required. Second, we believe more institutions should be allowed to offer teacher training, and likewise be evaluated and allowed to continue based on the effectiveness of the teachers they train. In any case, it should up be to the local school board, which is both the employer and the entity actually responsible for student achievement, to determine whether to employ alternatively licensed teachers and administrators.

We do not believe either of these steps requires additional funding. They simply need approval from the State Board. We believe the State Board already has the authority to act. The challenge for the Legislature is to encourage the State Board to take these steps. KASB does not believe non-traditional or alternative licensure programs will substantially change who teaches in our state’s public schools, but they could be an additional tool for student improvement.

Thank you for your consideration.

House Education Committee
Date 2/22/11
Attachment# 8



Making public schools great for every child

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

Peg Dunlap
House Committee on Education
February 22, 2011

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, my name is Peg Dunlap. I direct the Instructional Advocacy program for Kansas NEA and am here today representing our members. I speak in opposition to **HB 2202**, not because we oppose nontraditional licensure programs [KNEA has supported alternative routes since 1991], but because this bill duplicates opportunities that have been in place for a number of years and is, we believe, unnecessary.

Kansas has a proud tradition of high student achievement. Much of that is due to the rigorous standards that we require of our teachers, standards which apply to all teachers, regardless of their choice of route to licensure.

I'd like to provide a bit of history, starting on a personal note. I was prepared as a teacher through a nontraditional licensure program. That was in the mid-1970's, and in another state, but Kansas has a similar long tradition of recognizing the importance of multiple paths to educator licensure.

In January, 1982, the State Board of Education adopted SBR 91-1-141, Innovative and Experimental Programs, which allowed colleges and universities to develop and implement nontraditional licensure programs. Many colleges and universities used that authority to begin such programs.

When the State Board adopted a redesigned licensure system in July, 2003, it removed that regulation and included what it considered the equivalent, a license called the Restricted Teaching License, 91-1-203(h), which allowed any person with at least a BA and content knowledge, to immediately begin working in Kansas classrooms. They also had to be concurrently enrolled in a program with a college or university to ensure that within 3 years, they meet the same high standards required of all Kansas educators.

In August, 2007, at the request of Kansas colleges and universities, the State Board reauthorized the establishment of innovative and experimental programs, adopting SBR 91-1-234.

Many Kansas colleges and universities offer nontraditional licensure programs and have graduated hundreds of new educators. Pamela Coleman, director of teacher education and licensure at the State Department of Education, has information on that, which she can share with you, if you are interested.

As you can see, Kansas has had nontraditional license programs available for almost 30 years. We have already accomplished what this bill outlines, and we urge you to take no further action on it.

House Education Committee
Date 2/22/11
Attachment# 9