

Here's why K-12 funding needs requested increase

The Kansas State Board of Education is requesting an increase of \$282 million for K-12 education for the 2010-11 school year. That is the amount necessary to fund the school finance laws already passed by the Kansas Legislature. But as the state continues to struggle with the effects of the national recession and faces deep budget cuts, criticism of that request has begun.



The Flint Hills Center for Public Policy has noted public school enrollment is almost unchanged between 1997-98 and 2009-10, yet total expenditures from all sources — federal, state and local — have risen by 83.6 percent, or \$2.5 billion. This means total spending per pupil has increased over 83 percent, or about 7.0 percent per year.

Was that increase excessive? Total personal income in Kansas rose from \$63.4 billion in 1997 to \$106.4 billion in 2008. (Figures for 2009 and 2010 are not available.) That is 68 percent or 6.8 percent per year — just slightly less than education funding increased.

How was the money used? Spending per pupil doesn't explain that a large share of the new money didn't go to regular classroom education but for targeted programs. Nearly \$600 million more in state funding went to special education and to help students at-risk of failing, and to vocational classes and transportation costs. Another \$200 million was federal funding for special education, aid for disadvantaged students, instructional and technology aid, and school lunches. These targeted purposes amounted to one-third of the total increase since 1998.

Without those dollars, per student spending increased about

4.2 percent per year. The biggest expense for most districts is employee costs. From 1997-98 to 2008-09, average teacher salaries, including benefits, increased from \$36,505 to \$52,869: 45 percent or 4.1 percent per year.

Why did education funding increase? Although the number of students hasn't changed, needs and expectations have increased dramatically. The Kansas Supreme Court's ruling the state was not providing suitable funding was based on the state's own requirements for student outcomes and the results of state assessments. Federal funding increased after the federal No Child Left Behind Act. Local districts increased funding for all-day kindergarten, safety and transportation, new technology and new buildings.

What has happened to student achievement? On every measure, Kansas students have improved; where there was targeted additional funding, the improvement was even greater, and on every national comparative measure, Kansas improved faster than the national average.

Between 2000 and 2008, the percentage of students scoring proficient on state assessments increased 42.1 percent in reading; 61.0 percent in math; 53.4 percent in science and 42.6 percent in history/government.

These increases equaled or exceeded the percentage increase in

both school district budgets and state aid.

For every student group that received targeted funding increases (students with disabilities, bilingual, and free lunch), the achievement gap on state assessments narrowed substantially. This also raised the achievement of minority groups, in many cases doubling or tripling their proficiency rates. But scores of "majority" students also went up.

ACT scores for graduating seniors increased every year from 2003 to 2008, exceeding the average and rate of increase for both the nation and states with universities in the "Big 12." Kansas also has one of the highest rates of high school graduates taking the ACT.

On the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP), Kansas combined fourth and eighth grade reading and math scores increased from 12th in the nation in 2003 to 11th in 2005 and seventh in 2007. Kansas now has the highest combined score among "Big 12" states.

Between 1996 and 2006, Kansas increased its ranking for graduation rates using the cumulative promotion index — the percentage of students graduating in four years — from 21st to 16th in the nation.

The Legislature's own Post Audit division found a "nearly one-to-one relationship between increased spending and student achievement" among Kansas school districts.

Why does this matter? Education attainment is the most important factor in economic success. Between 1973 and 2007, inflation-adjusted income for high school drop-outs declined 15.7 percent; for high school gradu-

ates with no additional training income increased just 3.3 percent; those with some postsecondary education increased 15.8 percent and college graduates increased 36.3 percent. Low-skill jobs that can support a family have disappeared. A high wage economy demands a highly skilled workforce, which Kansas is positioned to deliver — for now.

Does Kansas spend too much on education? States with high educational attainment tend to have higher per capita and family income, and less poverty. Kansas ranks among the top states in the region in education spending, educational attainment and income.

States with lower student achievement have lower incomes and more poverty. A recent study found states reap a benefit of \$209,000 for every high school graduate — nearly double the current 12-year cost of a high school education. Improving education reduces welfare costs. Studies show that improving graduation rates reduces crime.

Individuals with more education tend to have better health outcomes. Every additional student better prepared to graduate and succeed in postsecondary training or college over the past decade was a successful investment, not an excessive cost.

If Kansas is going to continue to improve its educational outcomes, the investment in education must also continue. That is what the

State Board is asking for. It also means being honest about the cost and setting priorities. The state budget has been hit hard by the current recession.

But the state has also granted millions of dollars of tax breaks and exemptions that reduce revenue and shift the responsibility for supporting education and other public services.

Our education system will determine whether the next genera-

tion can make the American dream a reality. Previous generations believed in sacrifice for the future. What choice will this generation make?

Mark Tallman
Kansas Association of School Boards
Assistant Executive Director/
Advocacy
800.432.2471
Cell: 785.608.4508
mtallman@kasb.org

•PUBLIC NOTICE• IN THE MATTER OF THE ESTATE OF MILDRED LUCILLE MILLER, also known as MILDRED L. MILLER, Deceased

Published in The Norton Telegram on Friday, July 24, 31, August 7, 2009. (3T)

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF NORTON COUNTY, KANSAS
In the Matter of the Estate of MILDRED LUCILLE MILLER, also known as MILDRED L. MILLER, Deceased
Case No. 2008-PR-55
NOTICE OF HEARING ON PETITION FOR FINAL SETTLEMENT

THE STATE OF KANSAS TO ALL PERSONS CONCERNED:

YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED that a Petition has been filed in this Court by Jerry A. Miller, duly appointed, qualified and acting Executor of the Estate of Mildred Lucille Miller, also known as Mildred L. Miller, Deceased, praying that his acts be approved; that his account be settled and allowed, that the will be construed and the estate be assigned to the persons entitled thereto; that

fees and expenses be allowed; that the costs be determined and ordered paid; that the administration of the estate be closed; that the Executor be discharged and that he be released from further liability.

YOU ARE REQUIRED TO FILE your written defenses thereto on or before the 19th day of August, 2009, at 1:30 o'clock p.m. of said day, in said Court, in the City of Norton, Norton County, Kansas at which time and place said cause will be heard. Should you fail therein, judgment and decree will be entered in due course upon the petition.

Jerry A. Miller, Executor

R. Douglas Sebelius #09157
SEBELIUS & GRIFFITHS, LLP
105 South Norton Street
P. O. Box 10
Norton, Kansas 67654-0010
(785) 877-5143
Attorneys for Petitioner

•PUBLIC NOTICE• NOTICE OF BUDGET HEARING TWIN CREEKS EXTENSION DISTRICT #9 DECATUR COUNTY

Published in The Norton Telegram on Friday, July 31 and August 7, 2009 (2T)

NOTICE OF BUDGET HEARING
The governing body of Twin Creeks Extension District #9 Decatur County

will meet on the day of August 14, 2009, at 10 a.m. at the Decatur County Courthouse, Jury Room for the purpose of hearing and answering objections of taxpayers relating to the proposed use of all funds and the amount of tax to be levied. Detailed budget information is available at and will be available at this hearing.

BUDGET SUMMARY

Proposed Budget 2010 Expenditures and Amount of 2009 Ad Valorem Tax established the maximum limits of the 2009 budget. Estimated Tax Rate is subject to change depending on the final assessed valuation.

FUND	Prior Year Actual 2008		Current Year Estimate for 2009		Proposed Budget Year for 2010		
	Actual Expenditures	Actual Tax Rate*	Actual Expenditures	Actual Tax Rate*	Expenditures	Ad Valorem Tax	Tax Rate*
General	192,622	NEW	267,100	NEW DIST	267,100	137,994	1.976
Debt Service							
Totals	192,622	0.000	227,000	0.000	267,100	137,994	1.976
Less Transfers	0		0		0		
Net Expenditures	192,622		227,000		267,100		
Total Tax Levied	NEW		227,000				
Assessed Valuation	0		0		69,840,322		
Outstanding Indebtedness							

*Tax rates are expressed in mills

NOTICE OF HEARING 2009-2010 BUDGET FOR USD 213

First published in The Norton Telegram on Friday, July 31, 2009 (1T)

NOTICE OF HEARING 2009-2010 BUDGET

The governing body of Unified School District 213 will meet on the 17 day of August, 2009 at 7:00 PM, at Lenora Grade School for the purpose of hearing and answering objections of taxpayers relating to the proposed use of all funds and the amount of tax to be levied. Detailed budget information (including budget profile) is available at USD 213 Board Office and will be available at this hearing.

The Amount of 2009 Tax to be Levied and Expenditures (published below) establish the maximum limits of the 2009-2010 Budget. The "Est. Tax Rate" in the far right column, shown for comparative purposes, is subject to slight change depending on final assessed valuation.

Code 99 Line	2007-2008 Actual		2008-2009 Actual		PROPOSED BUDGET 2009-2010			
	Actual Expenditures (1)	Actual Tax Rate* (2)	Actual Expenditures (3)	Actual Tax Rate* (4)	Expenditures (5)	Amount of 2009 Tax to be Levied (6)	Est. Tax Rate* (7)	
OPERATING								
General	06	596,034	20,000	548,389	20,000	485,070	185,231	20.000
Supplemental General (LOB)	08	175,704	13,050	165,308	16,210	153,784	127,574	12.987
SPECIAL REVENUE								
Adult Education	10	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0	0.000
Adult Supplemental Education	12	0		0		0		
Bilingual Education	14	0		0		0		
Virtual Education	15	0		0		0		
Capital Outlay	16	16,455	0.000	16,021	0.000	165,377	0	0.000
Driver Training	18	0		0		0		
Extraordinary School Program	22	0		0		0		
Food Service	24	48,785		48,291		51,765		
Professional Development	26	1,696				3,575		
Parent Education Program	28	0		0		0		
Summer School	29	0		0		0		
Special Education	30	103,640		102,301		100,800		
Vocational Education	34	0		0		0		
Area Vocational School	36	0		0		0		
Special Liability Expense Fund	42	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0	0.000
School Retirement	44	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0	0.000
Extraordinary Growth Facilities	45	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0	0.000
Special Reserve Fund	47	0		0		0		
Federal Funds	07	1,300		15,044		6,151		
Gifts and Grants	35	0		0		0		
At Risk (4Yr Old)	11	0		0		0		
Cost of Living	33	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0	0.000
At Risk (K-12)	13	26,462		23,095		27,556		
Declining Enrollment	19	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0	0.000

Code 99 Line	2007-2008 Actual		2008-2009 Actual		PROPOSED BUDGET 2009-2010			
	Actual Expenditures (1)	Actual Tax Rate* (2)	Actual Expenditures (3)	Actual Tax Rate* (4)	Expenditures (5)	Amount of 2009 Tax to be Levied (6)	Est. Tax Rate* (7)	
KPERS Special Retirement Contribution	51	19,130		20,449		24,400		
Contingency Reserve	53	0		0		0		
Textbook & Student Material Revolving	55	0		0		0		
Tuition Reimbursement Fund	57	0		0		0		
DEBT SERVICE								
Bond and Interest #1	62	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	
Bond and Interest #2	63	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	
No-Fund Warrant	66	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	
Special Assessment	67	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	
Temporary Note	68	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	
COOPERATIVES**								
Special Education	78	0		0		0		
TOTAL USD EXPENDITURES	100	989,206	33,050	938,898	36,210	1,018,458	312,805	32.987
Less: Transfers	105	157,103	xxxxxx	111,254	xxxxxx	103,778	xxxxxx	xxxxxx
NET USD EXPENDITURES	110	832,103	xxxxxx	827,644	xxxxxx	914,680	xxxxxx	xxxxxx
TOTAL USD TAXES LEVIED	115	350,801	xxxxxx	387,945	xxxxxx	312,805	xxxxxx	xxxxxx
OTHER								
Historical Museum	80	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	
Public Library Board	82	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	
Public Library Board Employee Benefits	83	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	
Recreation Commission	84	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	
Rec Comm Emp Benefits & Spec Liab	86	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	
TOTAL OTHER	120	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	
TOTAL TAXES LEVIED	125	350,801		387,945		312,805		
Assessed Valuation - General Fund	128	\$10,403,293		\$10,374,824		\$9,261,538		
Assessed Valuation - All Other Funds	130	\$10,931,027		\$10,917,279		\$9,823,031		
Outstanding Indebtedness, July 1		2007		2008		2009		
General Obligation Bonds	135	0		0		0		
Capital Outlay Bonds	140	0		0		0		
Temporary Note	145	0		0		0		
No-Fund Warrant	150	0		0		0		
Lease Purchase Principal	153	0		0		0		
TOTAL USD DEBT	155	0		0		0		

* Tax Rates are expressed in Mills
** Sponsoring District Only

Dana Wahl
President

Karla Adams
Clerk of the Board

Fair

(Continued from Page 1)

person won the red ribbon.

Michael Callaway and his cat Butter won the senior cat division.

Molly Maddy won the purple ribbon in the hand pets and Jarrett Wente won the blue ribbon. Mr. VanSkike, county extension agent, said it started as a friendly activity for the home's residents.

The event used to be part of the fair, but Mr. VanSkike said it was moved to pre-fair because of scheduling conflicts.

Events during fair week included the horse show, public fashion show, poultry, rabbits, hogs, beef, goats and lambs judging, quilts judging, the Fonda Telthorst concert, the 4-H Porkburger Special, market animal sale, Norton Idol,

the home-owned carnival and the car races at the Elmoood Park Speedway.

Mrs. Telthorst's concert was sponsored by the Norton County Ministerial Alliance. She is a Norton native and currently lives in Kansas City, Kan.

Events for local 4-Hers included everything from photographs, art exhibits, legos, culinary, horticulture exhibits, entomology and crops and others.

Mr. VanSkike said photography entries were up.

He also said beef entries were up a little, but poultry was down

this year.

Mr. VanSkike said the weather was more moderate this year, even though there were a few hot afternoons. He said the cooler weather was good for the animals as well as fair-goers.

"We had good volunteer help and community support," he said.

"Interest was high. It was another great fair," Mr. VanSkike said.

The Telegram will publish the complete list of fair winners in the special post-fair section in August.

•PUBLIC NOTICE• CHARTER ORDINANCE NO. 3

A CHARTER ORDINANCE EXEMPTING THE CITY OF NORCATUR, KANSAS FROM KSA 15-201 AND PROVIDING SUBSTITUTE AND ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS ON THE SAME SUBJECT RELATING TO THE ELECTION OF MAYOR AND COUNCIL MEMBERS, THE VOTE, TERMS OF OFFICE, QUALIFYING, FAILURE TO QUALIFY OR ACCEPT OFFICE, FILLING VACANCIES AND CERTIFICATES OF ELECTION

Published in The Norton Telegram on Friday, July 24, and July 31, 2009. (2T)

CHARTER ORDINANCE NO. 3
A CHARTER ORDINANCE EXEMPTING THE CITY OF NORCATUR, KANSAS FROM KSA 15-201 AND PROVIDING SUBSTITUTE AND ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS ON THE SAME SUBJECT RELATING TO THE ELECTION OF MAYOR AND COUNCIL MEMBERS, THE VOTE, TERMS OF OFFICE, QUALIFYING, FAILURE TO QUALIFY OR ACCEPT OFFICE, FILLING VACANCIES AND CERTIFICATES OF ELECTION

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE CITY OF NORCATUR:

Section 1. The City of Norcat, Kansas, by the power invested in it by Article 12, Section 5, of the Constitution of the State of Kansas, hereby elects to make inapplicable to it and exempts itself from K.S.A. 15-201, which applies to said city but not uniformly to all cities, and provides substitute and additional provisions on the same subject as hereinafter provided.

Section 2. A regular city election shall be held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in April of each odd-numbered year. At the regular city election in 2009, there was elected a mayor and two (2) council members. Based upon a previous charter ordinance, at the regular city election in 2011 three (3) council members will be elected. All shall serve a term of four (4) years. The terms of the officers shall begin at the first regular meeting of the council in May following their election in April and they shall qualify the taking the oath of office and otherwise, if there be other qualifications prescribed, at any time after receiving notice of election and before or at the beginning of said meeting. If any person elected to the office of council members does not qualify within the required time, they shall be deemed to have refused to accept the office and a vacancy shall exist and the mayor shall appoint, with

the consent of the remaining council members, in the case of a council member, a suitable elector of the city to fill the vacancy for the term to which the refusing person was elected. In case of a vacancy in the office of council member occurring by reason of resignation, death, removal from the city, removal from office, or becoming mayor by reason of being president of the council when a vacancy occurs in the office of mayor, the mayor shall appoint, with the consent of a majority of the remaining council members, some suitable elector of the city to fill the vacancy until the expiration of the term of such office. In case of a vacancy in the office of mayor occurring by reason of resignation, death, removal from office, removal from the city or refusal or failure to qualify, the president of the council, or in the case of the mayor-elect's refusal or failure to qualify, the new president of the council, shall become mayor until the expiration of the term, and a vacancy shall occur in the office of the council member becoming mayor.

Section 3. This ordinance shall be published once each week for two consecutive weeks in the official city newspaper.

Section 4. This is a charter ordinance and shall take effect sixty-one (61) days after final publication unless a sufficient petition for a referendum is filed and a referendum held on the ordinance as provided in Article 12, Section 5, Subdivision (c) (3) of the Constitution of Kansas, in which case the ordinance shall become effective if approved by a majority of the electors voting thereon.