



**Testimony on HB 2410  
Before the Senate Select Committee on Education Finance**

**By  
Mark Tallman, Associate Executive Director**

**May 18, 2017**

This document provides [KASB's policy positions](#) on school funding (first column), the bill as referred without recommendation (second column), explanation of the Senate substitute bill as explained May 17 (third column), and KASB's specific comments or concerns in the fourth column.

A school finance system should have the following components:	HB 2410 as amended through May 15	Senate alternative, as described May 17	KASB comments and concerns
<b>B. State School Finance</b>  <b>1. Accountability</b> The school finance formula must support the Kansas State Board of Education's vision that an excellent school system must focus on helping each student succeed and setting accountable outcomes to measure that goal.			
a. The formula must allow districts to meet or exceed the Rose capacities identified by the Kansas Supreme Court and adopted by the Kansas Legislature. To do so, it should also assist districts in improving district outcomes under the State Board of Education's Kansans Can vision: kindergarten readiness, higher graduation rates, more postsecondary participation, individual plans of study and social and emotional indicators.	The State Board is required to annually report to the Legislature on its school accreditation system. The statute regarding school accreditation and academic standards is changed to more closely align with the Rose capacities.  The State Department of Education shall provide annual reports on funding for each district; and state assessment data in reading and math for all students and subgroups of students.		KASB strongly supports the implementation of the new accreditation system based on the Rose capacities and Kansas Can outcomes.  Any new reporting system on school performance should show how the district compares to districts with comparable student demographics.
b. The formula must be monitored regularly to ensure the state is meeting its responsibility to provide adequate and equitable funding.	Legislative Post Audit is to conduct various performance audits on various components of the act over the first nine years. These include a study the cost of providing educational opportunities for every student to meet performance standards in FY 2019, 2022 and 2025; similar to 2006 LPA cost study, but more limited.		

<p><b>2. Adequacy.</b> The school finance formula must provide each student an equal opportunity to be college and career ready and recognize the additional needs of students who require special services. Adequacy should include the following:</p>			
<p>a. A foundational amount per pupil, which should be significantly higher than previous base state aid per pupil to recognize the effect of inflation and mandatory costs that have been shifted to the local option budget.</p>	<p>Sets foundation state aid per pupil at \$4,006 in 2017-18 and \$4,128 in 2018-19. After that, the base is indexed to the Consumer Price Index-Midwest.</p>		<p>KASB believes the increase in foundational support should be substantially higher, based on inflation, growth in state personal income, comparison to higher achieving states and the State Board of Education recommendations. (We have attached analysis to this testimony, p 13-14.)</p>
<p>b. Foundational funding should include additional funding for the full cost of full time kindergarten students and expanded funding for preschool programs. It should also support additional staff if necessary to effectively implement individual career plans and meet the social and emotional needs of each student.</p>	<p>Fully funds full-time students in full-time kindergarten in the first year (FY 2018).  Adds \$2 million in funding for at-risk four-year-old pre-school in each year from FY 2018 and 2019.  Adds \$1.7 million for professional development aid in FY 2018 and 2019.  Adds \$800,000 for mentor teacher state aid in FY 2018 and 2019.</p>		<p>KASB strongly supports these provisions.</p>
<p>c. The foundational amount should be adjusted annually based on changes in the consumer price index. In addition, this increase should be supplemented if necessary based on employment costs and other costs imposed by the state requirements.</p>	<p>Foundation aid will increase each year based on the Midwest Consumer Price Index, beginning in 2020.</p>	<p>Foundation aid will be indexed using a three-year rolling average.</p>	<p>KASB supports this provision, but believes that total education funding will need to increase more than inflation to fund enhancements that will continue to improve educational outcomes.</p>
<p>d. In the transition to a new formula, no district should lose funding on a per pupil basis. Thereafter, if any district loses budget authority under the school finance system, the reduction should be phased in through some mechanism.</p>	<p>See enrollment count.</p>		<p>It appears most districts do not lose money on a <i>per pupil</i> basis unless they are also losing consolidation incentive authority.</p>

<p><b>3. Equity.</b> A new school finance formula must provide adequate and equitable funding as required by the Kansas Constitution. Such a formula would provide equalization to allow similar funding based on similar local effort.</p>			
<p>a. The foundational amount should be adjusted to address differences in district student populations, programs or other factors based on evidence that demonstrates an impact on the cost of each student reaching educational outcomes as defined by the State Board. At a minimum, these should include:</p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full funding of the costs of special education services required by federal and state law.</li> </ul>	<p>No change in special education formula. \$12 million is added FY 2018 and an additional \$12 million in FY 2019.</p>		<p>Special education funding would remain below the 92% of excess cost target in state law.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The impact of poverty and other student risk factors, including concentration of poverty.</li> </ul>	<p>Provides regular at-risk weighting based on number of free lunch students, multiplied by 0.484, an increase from 0.456 in the previous formula.</p> <p>Districts with less than 10% of students on free meals receive at-risk funding as if 10% of students are eligible, must document to the State Board services provided to at-risk students. (Applies only to K-12 districts.)</p> <p>Provides for high density at-risk as previous formula.</p>	<p>Return at-risk weighting to previous 0.456.</p>	<p>The House version provides greater funding to target at low performing students, and is based on actual cost study.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The additional costs of teaching English as a Second Language.</li> </ul>	<p>Provides bilingual weighting at either contact hours of students in bilingual programs multiplied by 0.361 (compared to current 0.395) or headcount of students who qualify for bilingual services multiplied by 0.185, using the greater.</p>		<p>Both approaches (contact hours and headcount) appear to have a rational basis; KASB would prefer no districts lose funding in serving a group of students often under-performing.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The additional costs of student transportation.</li> </ul>	<p>Transportation weighting similar to previous formula except "math error" is changed and assumed cost factor is increased from 2.0 to 2.8. If that is lower than 2016-17, district may use the higher amount for five years.</p>	<p>The transportation aid grandfather provision is for two years rather than five.</p>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The additional costs of career and technical education programs.</li> </ul>	<p>Used the previous law's Career Tech Ed/vocational weighting of 0.5 in FY 2018, expires July 1, 2018.</p> <p>Directs State Board to conduct a study of the cost of providing career education and make report to legislature January 2018.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional costs based on density and district size.</li> </ul>	Restores low and high enrollment weighting from the previous formula.	Provides for a Legislative review of enrollment weighting, consideration of a sparsity factor.	KASB supports consideration of sparsity as a factor, but not the sole factor.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other adjustments as necessary based on evidence of cost differences.</li> </ul>	<p>Virtual school state aid continues the same as in current law: full-time students multiplied by \$5,000; part-time students by \$1,700 and adult students by \$709 per course.</p> <p>Continues new facilities weighting under previous formula for bond issues approved prior to July 1, 2015; phases out after those projects.</p> <p>Ancillary school facilities weighting is continued as was under the previous formula (funded by local property tax with approval of state board of tax appeals).</p> <p>The cost of living weighting is repealed. In its place, districts may access a new Local Excellence Budget (see below.)</p> <p>Declining enrollment weighting is provided at 50% of the previous formula entitlement in FY 18, then eliminated.</p>	Cost of living weighting is maintained; no local excellence budget.	KASB believes the current cost of living weighting should be equalized if continued, but has concerns about the local excellence budget. See below.
b. Funding for the foundation level and adjustments should be fully funded by the state.	The foundation level and weightings are fully funding by the statewide mill levy and general state aid except for certain local effort deductions from the previous formula.		
c. Capital costs should continue to be the responsibility of local districts through local bond issues and capital outlay levies, provided both receive state equalization aid that meets constitutional standards of equity.	Capital outlay and bond and interest state aid are continued under current law, except that for districts with less than 260 students, State Board approved is required to be eligible for state aid to construct new facilities.	<p>The maximum capital outlay levy is raised from 8 to 10 mills.</p> <p>Local government would not be allowed to abate capital outlay property taxes for economic development purposes.</p> <p>Authorized use of capital outlay funding is further</p>	<p>KASB does not have a specific position about the increase and expanded uses of capital outlay.</p> <p>Positives: This would provide needed additional funding and greater flexibility for districts, and is equalized.</p>

	Authorized use of the capital outlay fund is expanded to include utilities.	expanded to include property and casualty insurance and computer upkeep.	<p>Negatives: even with equalization, there remain wide differences in what districts can raise for each mill of capital outlay.</p> <p>The Kansas Supreme Court accepted a lower level of equalization for capital outlay because it was capital costs, not general operations. Expanding to utilities and other purposes moves more general operating costs into capital outlay. We think the Supreme Court will have concerns about this issue. If this step is taken, we suggest equalization should be increased. (See KASB spreadsheet.)</p>
d.	An adequate foundation level should reduce the need for local funding, the cost of equalization and challenges of fluctuating local tax bases.		

<b>4. Efficiency.</b> A new school finance formula must give local districts the responsibility to respond to unique community needs while encouraging efficiencies through cooperation among districts. Efficiency should include:			
a.	<p>Locally elected boards should determine the most efficient way to spend resources to meet their specific student and community needs. The state should focus on results, not process.</p>	<p>Beginning in FY 2018-19, school districts are required to provide applied behavioral analysis therapy to students with an autism spectrum disorder, to extent such theory is ordered by a licensed physician, psychologist or special clinical social worker, provided a licensed clinician is located in the school district.</p> <p>If such a student has an Individualized Educational Program, the therapy shall not conflict with the IEP and not be required for a free appropriate public education as required by federal or state law.</p>	<p>The requirement for ABA services for students on the autism spectrum is removed, as well as funding mechanism.</p> <p>KASB supports the Senate position on removing the autism requirement for three reasons.</p> <p>First, the House version would require districts to provide a specific type of treatment on the order of a single provider, not associated with the student's educational process, rather than as part of an IEP team of parents, educators and experts.</p> <p>Second, it would require school districts to pay for a medical treatment, not an educational service, without determining it to be a "related service" for special education purposes.</p>

	A fund equal to \$4 per pupil statewide is created to reimburse districts for the cost of providing these services.		Third, there has been no determination of what the actual costs of providing these services would be, and whether the proposed funding would be adequate.  An "issue paper" on this topic is attached to this testimony, pp 10-12.
b. Both school districts and the state would have greater predictability by using the previous year's enrollment or a three-year average for determining foundation aid, with the ability to appeal to the State Board of Education for funding for extraordinary costs.	Funding based on FTE enrollment on single count date, Sept. 20, of the prior year or second preceding year, whichever is higher, except for net increase in military students between Sept. 20 and Feb. 20. In addition, the count of weighted students is based on the prior year only.  Four-year-old at-risk students are counted based on the current year, since new funding is added.  No three-year average.  Maintains previous provisions for students in private school tax credit scholarship program or districts impacted by disasters.	A further adjustment is made for the military student count.	.
c. Districts should be able to carry reasonable operating funds reserves for cash flow, enrollment changes, revenue shortfalls or delays and savings for large projects without incurring debt. If new limits on balances are imposed, districts should be given time to spend down to that level.	No change in current law.		
d. The system should provide incentives for sharing high cost programs on a regional basis and for voluntary district cooperation and consolidation.	Restores previous incentive provisions allowing consolidating districts to retain their previous higher budget for a period of time.		

<p><b>5. Excellence.</b> A new school finance formula must allow flexibility for districts to go beyond state requirements, foster innovation and promote improvement. Many communities want more freedom and flexibility to enhance their public schools</p>			
<p>a. Local boards of education should be able to authorize additional funding beyond the foundation level, provided such authority includes equalization that meets constitutional standards of equity.</p>	<p><b>Local Foundation Budget</b></p> <p>Returns to structure of the previous Local Option Budget, up to 33% of base.</p> <p>Renames LOB “Local Foundation Budget.”</p> <p>Any percent of over 30% is subject to protest petition, not election.</p> <p>Uses artificial base of \$4,490 until actual base reaches that level.</p> <p>Provides for a three-year average of assessed valuation per pupil for determining LOB/LFB and capital outlay state aid.</p> <p><b>Local Excellence Budget</b></p> <p>Certain districts are allowed to adopt a Local Excellent Budget, of up to five percent of the general fund budget, which is the maximum amount of the cost of living weighting.</p> <p>The authority to adopt such a budget is based on the free lunch enrollment of the district. Essentially, districts with the highest percentage of free lunch students are NOT eligible to use this authority; while the lower percent of free lunch students in a district, the more authority a district receives (maximum of five percent of general fund).</p> <p>The Local Excellence Budget may be authorized by vote of the local school board, subject to protest petition.</p> <p>The LEB may receive equalization aid based on the formula used for capital outlay. (That formula was approved for capital outlay by the Kansas Supreme Court, but not for the Local</p>	<p>Continues to use “Local Option Budget” name.</p> <p>Indexes the artificial base to the consumer price index.</p> <p>The local excellence budget is not included.</p>	<p>KASB strongly supports movement from election to protest petition.</p> <p>Indexing the artificial base will help provide additional operating funds as costs rise, if equalized; however, a better method would to raise the foundational base higher and faster.</p> <p>KASB does not have a specific position on the LEB, but has several major concerns.</p> <p>Positives: the concept would offer additional funding authority for many districts, and some equalization aid is provided.</p> <p>Negatives: First, the additional authority is limited to districts with fewer low income students, yet these are the districts that generally already have a higher percentage of students on grade level and college ready. In other words, districts generally having more successful students are allowed to do even; other districts are not.</p> <p>Second, the equalization aid rate is lower than for the local option budget, although these funds would be used for general operating purposes.</p>

	<p>Option Budget.) However, the calculation of state aid uses a combination of assessed valuate per pupil and average approved value of single family residences to determine the ranking of districts for equalization purposes.</p> <p>Funds raised by the LEB may be used "solely for the provision of educational opportunities that exceed the curriculum standards established by the State Board (of Education)."</p> <p>It appears approximately 165 districts could qualify for this special budget authority, for a total of \$61 million, compared to the use of COL weighting by six districts for \$24.4 million currently. If full LEB authority was used, districts would receive a total of \$4.0 million. Actual usage is expected to be much lower.</p>		<p>Third, we see no practical way to define or audit how these funds would be restricted to enhancements beyond the Rose capacities. Practically, districts will simply be able to shift funding of current programs to this tier of budget, allowing these districts to offer higher salaries and benefits and more competitive programs than districts with more high need students.</p> <p>KASB believe the real solution is to further increase base state aid, which would allow districts to use local option budget funds for enhancement; or to provide additional, fully equalized LOB authority for all districts.</p>
<p>b. The system should provide incentives for accomplishment of student outcomes or other policy goals, provided foundational aid and equalization aid are fully funded and all districts have the ability to meet such outcomes.</p>	<p>Not addressed.</p>		

<p><b>E. Tuition Tax Credits, Voucher Systems and Choice Plans</b></p> <p><b>1. Public accountability for public funding.</b> KASB supports voluntary efforts to experiment with public school choice plans, such as charter and magnet schools, provided those plans are approved by the local school board. However, KASB opposes legislation that would use tuition tax credits, voucher systems or choice plans to aid private elementary or secondary schools which are not subject to the same legal requirements as public school districts.</p>	<p>Beginning in FY 19, students eligible to participate in the tax credit for low income private school scholarships program would be changed from those attending a Priority or Focus school under the old No Child Left Behind waiver to one of the lowest 100 schools based on academic performance as determined by the State Board.</p> <p>Under current law, participating students must be eligible for free meals under the national student lunch program. Under the bill, at least 50% of</p>		<p>KASB opposes the private school tax credit program. It should be stressed that the lowest performing schools are most likely the schools with highest percentage of high need students. These are not "failing" schools; they are schools serving the hardest-to-educate students in the state.</p> <p>KASB believes the provision to require 50% of eligible low income student be "directly certified" for free meals helps insure the program</p>
---	---	--	---



	<p>scholarships must be made to students who are direct certified under the national student lunch program, rather than being due to income alone.</p> <p>New non-public schools participating in the program must be State Board accredited if they do not offer secondary grades. Private high schools must have a postsecondary effective rate that exceeds the trendline for all school districts and accredited non-public schools, or have a composite ACT score that exceeds the state average, or have been a participating school in the past. (Under current law, there are no accreditation or performance requirements for participating private school schools.)</p>		<p>will serve more truly disadvantaged students.</p> <p>However, there is no provision in the bill or current law requiring that scholarships go to students who are actually underperforming. Many low-income students in public schools are at grade level or higher.</p> <p>KASB strongly supports the additional accountability provisions in the bill. We believe non-public schools receiving public funding should meet the same requirements expected of public schools.</p> <p>Accreditation is a positive step. We would support requiring this next year, and requiring current schools to move to state accredited status.</p>
--	---	--	--

<p><b>C. Revenues Sources and Tax Policy</b></p> <p><b>1. State Tax Policy.</b> The state should strive to achieve from the major revenue sources, sales, income and property taxes, a balanced and equitable mix of revenues that are suitable to support public services, including funding for quality education. Taxes should be broadly based to ensure all Kansans share fairly in the cost of public services.</p> <p><b>4. Property Tax Abatement.</b> KASB supports legislation to limit the authority of the state, cities and counties to grant property tax abatements to existing property valuation. KASB also believes school district approval should be required before abatements of school district tax levies are granted to newly created valuation and that state approval should be required before the state-imposed minimum levy is abated.</p>	<p>The 20-mill statewide levy is reauthorized for the constitutional maximum of two years.</p>	<p>In addition, a fee on residential utility bills of \$2.25 for residential and \$10 for commercial is proposed to raise \$150 million.</p> <p>Both the 20-mill statewide levy and the capital outlay levy would be exempted from authority of local governments to abate taxes for future economic development projects.</p>	<p>KASB supports the 20-mill levy reauthorization. We support additional revenue to fund increased aid to public education, but have not endorsed specific types of revenue beyond “a balanced and equitable mix,” that is broadly-based.</p> <p>KASB has long-standing positions of concern over local tax abatements, but we have not considered this issue in depth in many years. We are neutral on this specific concept, and would support further study depending on the final outcome in the bill.</p>
--	--	--	--



**KASB Issue Paper:  
Mandating Applied Behavior Analysis Services in Kansas School Districts**

May 17, 2017

By Leah Fliter, Advocacy and Communications Specialist

[Sub for House Bill 2410](#), which has been advanced to the full House of Representatives by the House K-12 Education Budget Committee, was amended to include a provision requiring that Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA) therapy be provided to public school students in some circumstances. The amended bill states that the therapy is not required if the school district does not have qualified providers or the requirement conflicts with state or federal special education law. The amendment also establishes a \$2 million fund to reimburse districts for the cost of providing the therapy; it is unclear if the fund will be sufficient to cover school district costs. Furthermore, the effective date of the ABA amendment is July 1, 2018, to give the Legislature a year to study the topic further.

**What is ABA?**

ABA stands for [Applied Behavior Analysis](#), an intensive methodology that involves 1:1 work with a student to increase or decrease targeted behaviors. Many parents believe this to be the “gold standard” for treatment of autism, while others prefer different treatment (see below).

ABA therapy is designed to be performed by a Board-Certified Behavior Analyst (BCBA) or someone who has been trained by one and is under their supervision. The BCBA is a graduate-level program which first requires a master’s or doctoral degree in behavior analysis, education, or psychology. There are very few of these practitioners working in the field of education in the state of Kansas; as a result, special education teachers and autism specialists deliver the therapy in some public school settings.

**How many Kansas students are currently identified as having an autism spectrum disorder?**

The Kansas State Department of Education estimates that 4,800 students are identified as having a primary or secondary disability with autism. Autism is one of 13 categories of disability recognized under the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and would be listed as an exceptionality on the students’ Individual Education Plan (IEP). National estimates indicate [one in 45 children](#) are on the autism spectrum, raising the possibility that additional Kansas students could be identified as eligible for services.

**How many students are currently receiving ABA therapy?**

Privacy laws make accurate numbers difficult to ascertain. As an example, however, Olathe USD 233 serves roughly 300 students with an autism diagnosis; 70 of those students, or 23 percent, receive ABA therapy in a school setting.

**How is it determined if such students receive ABA?**

ABA therapy is considered a medical benefit. School districts typically do not provide medical benefits unless it is educationally necessary. Under the IDEA, the school district determines the methodology to be used. Case law, at least thus far, has been very clear that methodology issues are determined at the sole discretion of the district.

**What is the best research on the importance/value of ABA?**

Proponents of ABA say research shows it is the best treatment for autism. Proponents of other treatment methods, such as [TEACCH](#) (Treatment and Education of Autistic and Communication related handicapped Children), contend those methods are also effective.

**Do we have any estimate as to how many parents want ABA therapy and it is not approved?**

No, although school district Special Ed Directors may be able to provide anecdotal evidence.

**What is the estimated cost of ABA? Does it vary?**

ABA practitioners state that students should receive at least 25-30 hours of intensive, 1:1 work for the therapy to be effective. ABA therapy delivered by a private therapist can cost \$75,000-\$100,000 per year per student. If all of the estimated 4,800 special education students on the autism spectrum in Kansas requested ABA therapy under the provisions of [Sub HB 2410](#), the cost would run in the hundreds of millions of dollars.

More conservatively, the Olathe school district estimates an annual cost of \$695,000, after federal reimbursement under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), to provide ABA therapy for 70 students through its special education program, where the therapy is administered by autism specialists and/or special education teachers. Using this figure of roughly \$10,000 per student and applying it to 23 percent (as in the Olathe example of 23 percent of autism students who receive ABA therapy) of the 4,800 Kansas students currently identified as on the autism spectrum equals roughly \$11 million in additional costs to school districts to provide the therapy:

$4,800 \times .23 = 1,120$ $1,120 \times \$10,000 = \$11.2 \text{ million}$
---

[Sub HB 2410](#) contains \$2 million for districts to access to help fund the therapy. This appears to be far short of the *potential* cost of the proposed new mandate. However, it is extremely difficult to estimate the actual costs, because most school districts likely to do not have qualified providers residing in the districts. On the other hand, families might move to districts where such services *are* available.

**Are there enough people qualified to provide ABA to meet this requirement?**

No, there are a very limited number of those therapists in Kansas.

**What is the role of private insurance in ABA?**

ABA therapy is funded primarily through private insurance; however, private insurance will not pay for services delivered in the public schools. If schools become eligible for Medicaid reimbursement for the therapy, there will likely be significant up-front cost for additional staff. There are concerns the reimbursement will not be sufficient to cover those costs.

**How would funding flow to districts under state SPED aid? Remember, [Sub HB 2410](#) adds \$12 million per year to special ed over the next five years.**

The districts would seek reimbursement for these additional positions just as they currently do.

**How does this fit with federal law?**

Requiring ABA therapy for special education students under state law would be contrary to federal law, which, as discussed above, leaves the determination of appropriate methodology to the school districts' sole discretion. Educators say the appropriate methodology to use will vary from student to student and IEP teams frequently draw upon a variety of methodologies in working with special education students. Likewise, IEP teams cannot by law be held to one specific methodology. Special education teachers contend that if a method is not working with a student, they must be able to try something else.

### **Addendum: Cost of Constitutionally Suitable Education**

The Kansas Supreme Court did not order a specific total amount of funding; however, there are a number of indicators to suggest a range of funding levels required to provide “suitable” finance for educational improvement and student success.

*Inflation since the funding was found constitutional under the Montoy decision and Legislative remedy.*

The Kansas Supreme Court approved a three-year plan to provide suitable funding by 2009. Total school district funding in 2016 was about \$525 million below 2009 levels when adjusted for inflation, and general operating funds (general fund, local option budget and special education aid) are over \$600 million below. The original House Committee plan provides a total of over \$750 million, but would not be fully implemented for five years.

Previous rates of Kansas funding associated with educational improvement.

**Commented [TC1]:** You know this statement can't be substantiated by the data...

**Rate of growth.** Since 1990, school funding increased an average of approximately two percent more than inflation, over which time Kansas educational outcomes improved significantly. It would require an additional \$162 million in general fund, LOB and special education to provide this rate of increase over the next two years. The original House Committee plan would provide annual increases of approximately \$150 million in general funding and special education aid per year for five years, plus additional authority for the local option budget as the foundation level increases.

**Percentage of personal income.** From 1975 to 2010, total school district funding in Kansas averaged 4.54 percent of state personal income. Based on the Kansas Consensus Revenue Estimate of state income growth, Kansas personal income will be \$146.6 billion in 2017 and \$152.3 billion in 2018. Providing total K-12 funding of 4.45 percent would equal \$6.61 billion for 2017 and \$6.914 for 2018, compared to \$6.021 in 2016; or an increase of \$590 million for 2017 and a further \$300 million for 2018 – a two-year total of about \$900 million. The original House Committee plan would provide \$750 million over five years.

*States that have higher levels of overall student success.*

After adjusting for regional cost differences, states that perform better than Kansas on 15 educational measures spent \$2,855 more per pupil than Kansas in 2014, equal to over \$1.3 billion more. The Midwestern states that outrank Kansas spend \$1,407 more per pupil than Kansas, equal to \$650.9 million more than Kansas. If Kansas funding had increased at the same rate as higher achieving states since 2008, total funding would be \$1,385, or \$640.7 million, higher.

*Recommendations of the State Board of Education.*

The State Board of Education, which seeks to implement the Kansans Can vision of preparing each student for success consistent with the Rose Capacities, has proposed a total increase of \$893.5 million. Most of this money would increase the previous base state aid per pupil. It would also fund special education aid at the statutory level, and fund teacher mentoring and professional development.

**Specific strategies districts can implement with additional resources to improve student success:**

Although each district's needs and circumstances will be different, the general uses of new funding is clear, based on conversations KASB held with school leaders this year and how districts used additional resources after *Montoy* decision. Targets for new funding would likely include:

Commented [LF2]: I think there's a word missing.

**Add/restore positions to keep low class size and improve services**

Restore certified (mostly teacher) positions reduced since 2009;  
1,000 times average teacher salary of \$55,454 \$55.6 million

Restore non-certified positions (aide, para, etc.) reduced since 2009;  
1,000 FTE positions times estimated salary of \$35,000 \$35.0 million

**Expand preschool to meet State Board goal of kindergarten readiness**

Double pre-K teachers to double preschool enrollment;  
580 positions times average teacher salary of \$55,454 \$32.2 million

**Increase services to meet career planning and social/emotional needs**

Increase school counselor and social worker positions (currently approximately 1,500)  
by 50 percent; 750 positions times average teacher salary of \$55,454 \$41.6 million

**Add services for students not meeting standards**

Provide intensive services to students below grade level in reading or math  
(such as Reading Roadmap) at average cost of \$1,000 per student  
to all students below grade level (25% x 462,595 = 115,649) \$115.7 million

Commented [LF3]: Did we decide we didn't want to specifically praise RR?

Provide intensive services to students below college ready at average cost  
of \$1,000 per student (38% x 462,595 = \$175.8) \$175.8 million

Commented [MT4R3]: I don't recall NOT mentioning it.

Commented [MT5R3]:

Provide Jobs for America's Graduates services (or similar) at average cost of \$1,230  
for 40 percent of students grades 9-12 based on risk factors (56,000) \$68.8 million

**Restore salary levels to keep Kansas school positions competitive**

Inflationary adjustment for teacher salaries 2009 to 2016  
Average teacher salary in 2009: \$52,712 times inflation increase of 11.9%  
Equals \$58,985 minus 2016 actual of \$55,454 (\$3,531) x 35,882 teachers \$127 million

Comparable increase for all other district staff members \$127 million

**Total funding increase: \$778.7 million**

Other benefits of increased funding:

With higher salaries, increase school year for students, which has been reduced by approximately one week as districts negotiated fewer days under limited salary increases.

Reduce student fees, which have increased significantly in some districts for activities, early childhood and transportation.

Reduce property tax reliance, which has increased as districts used more local option budget funding with frozen base state aid.