



Mark Tallman

Kansas Association of School  
Boards  
Committee on School District  
Efficiency  
Report to the  
Governor's Task Force  
on School Efficiency

November 5, 2012

Legislative Educational Planning Committee  
November 13, 2012  
Attachment 11

# KASB Committee on School District Efficiency:

**Pam Robinson**, Board of Education  
Blue Valley USD 229

**Glennys Doane**, Board of Education  
Waconda USD 272

**Margaret Nightengale**, Board of Education  
Ulysses USD 214

**Patrick Woods**, Board of Education  
Topeka Public Schools USD 501

**Joe Skye**, Board of Education  
Baxter Springs USD 508

**Randy Watson**, Superintendent  
McPherson USD 418

**Jim Freeman**, School Board Treasurer  
Andover USD 385

**Lisa Peters**, School Board Treasurer  
Salina USD 305

**Diane Gjerstad**, Governmental Relations  
Wichita USD 259

**Dave Heinemann**, Public Relations  
Schools for Quality Education

## KASB Staff:

Mark Tallman, Associate Executive Director/Advocacy

Tom Krebs, Governmental Relations Specialist

Jim Hays, Research Specialist

Debbie Dyche, Advocacy/Research Secretary

# Table of Contents

School District Efficiency Committee Report ..... 5

Comments from KASB Survey ..... 13

KASBO Survey Summary ..... 19

KASBO Survey Comments on School Efficiencies ..... 21

KASBO Survey Comments on Impediments to  
School Efficiency ..... 27

USD listing of cooperatives, service centers, interlocals,  
distance learning networks ..... 31

School District Employees 2002-2012 ..... 39

FTE Certified and Non-certified Staff 2002-2012 ..... 43

In August, 2012, the Kansas Association of School Boards Legislative Committee proposed a plan to make Kansas the top-performing state in the nation in educational achievement, focusing on three core principles: raising standards, suitable funding and local leadership. One key issue under local leadership was efficiency. Following the appointment by Governor Brownback of a task force on school efficiency, KASB made the decision to appoint its own Committee on School District Efficiency in to order to study the issue more closely, develop recommendations for the Governor's Task Force and other policy-makers, and help KASB and its members respond to any proposals from the Governor's Task Force.

Following meetings on October 19 and November 2, the KASB Committee has prepared the following report to present to the Governor's Task Force. The committee is prepared to provide additional information or responses in the future. This report includes both findings and recommendations.

### **Part 1 – Committee Findings**

#### *Kansas Constitution and Goals of School District Efficiency*

The Kansas Constitution charges the Legislature with establishing a system of public education to promote "intellectual, educational, vocational and scientific improvement." The constitution further directs the Legislature to "make suitable provision for finance" of the educational interests of the state. "Suitable" implies that funding for public education should be both adequate for improving educational results and provided and used in a way that delivers the maximum improvement in educational outcomes for those funds. ***Efficiency should be defined as getting better results for each dollar spent, not simply reducing or reallocating school spending.***

The constitution also provides that public schools are under the "general supervision" of the State Board of Education, and are to be "maintained, developed and operated by local elected boards." This indicates a strong public preference for a high degree of local control in determining how education funds should be spent, provided local boards are meeting state standards for "improvement" and other requirements of the State Board.

#### *Efficiency measured by Funding and Outcomes of the Kansas Education System*

In evaluating how Kansas has met its constitutional standard of educational improvement, virtually every objective measure shows Kansas education outcomes have been improving. This includes state and national test scores of basic skills, graduation rates and college readiness indicators. Long-term measures of adult educational attainment at all levels (high school, college and advanced degrees) have been improving for decades to all-time highs. These improvements have occurred as the Kansas student population has become more diverse, serving significantly more students with more academic challenges.

On 11 measures of educational outcomes, Kansas has a combined ranking of 6<sup>th</sup> in the nation. Kansas has the third highest level of educational attainment among its neighboring and Plains States, despite serving more minority and low income students than most of these peers.

Compared to its high achievement, Kansas ranks near the average nationally for spending per pupil and for education spending compared to personal income. ***No state with higher educational outcomes spends less per pupil, and Kansas performs better than most states that spend more per pupil.***

Although total spending on public education and spending per pupil have increased significantly, the percent of total Kansas personal income spent on K-12 education is largely unchanged over the past four decades. Kansans today are spending about the same share of income on K-12 education as their parents and grandparents, but getting much higher levels of educational achievement. Higher educational outcomes result in higher incomes, which in turn can finance improvements in the system at the same ratio of spending to income.

#### *Current Efforts to Maximize Effective Use of Resources*

The committee collected information from research reports, surveys and interviews.

**Interlocal Agreements.** School districts make extensive use of constitutional and statutory authority for cooperative, interlocal agreements. Virtually every school district is a member, participates in or received services from service centers, special education cooperatives, distance learning networks.

Unlike some states, Kansas has taken an extremely entrepreneurial approach to these entities. Instead of assigning districts on a regional or other basis, these organizations compete with each other and with providers to give districts options to choose the best services and products.

**Energy.** Many districts participate in natural gas purchasing pools (including KASB's KJUMP program and Greenbush), and many have undergone energy efficiency studies and entered into agreements with various providers for long-term savings.

**Insurance.** KASB and service centers offer insurance pools and programs in areas including health and workers compensation, and districts also bid for these services from private sector providers. Districts are also eligible to choose the state health insurance plan, but most find this a more expensive option.

**Professional services.** Districts receive legal, business, architectural and construction services from private providers. Professional associations, such as KASB, also offer legal, research, board and staff development in a cooperative fashion to reduce district costs. Districts also receive training by membership organizations such as KASB, the United School Administrators, and the Kansas Association of School Business Officials.

**Shared Accounting Software.** Most school districts in the state have adopted one of two major vendors of accounting, payroll and business services software, which has effectively captured economic savings in this area. Districts still require personnel to input data, even if these functions are "consolidated."

**Investments in capital costs.** Kansas school districts significantly increased their capital investments over the past decade. New buildings and equipment are not counted as "instructional" expenditures, but provide more efficient operations in the future through energy savings and consolidation of services.

**Reduced administration and shared staff.** Districts have increasingly turned to sharing staff and reducing administrative and operating staff. Here are the highlights:

- While total full-time equivalent enrollment has increased by 4,567 students since 2002, the number of school districts has decreased from 304 to 286, and the number of school buildings decreased from 1,414 to 1,345.
- The FTE of superintendents decreased from 274.3 to 253.2, and the number of principals decreased from 1,254.9 to 1,184.8, as more districts share superintendents, more principals serve multiple buildings, or superintendents also serve as principals.
- Over the past decade, school districts have added nearly 1,000 teachers; 2,500 other instructional positions to assist teachers and students; nearly 300 licensed student support staff (counselors, nurses, etc.) and over 500 jobs in instructional support, most for technology.
- To help fund these positions, districts cut 138 non-licensed student support positions; 228 central office jobs, 152 school office positions, 250 other administrative or unclassified positions; 465 maintenance and operations jobs and 274 food service jobs.
- The percent of operating funds going to instruction in Kansas increased from 56.1% in 2001 to 61.9% in 2010, while the percent nationally dropped from 61.3% to 61.0%.

#### *Barriers to Cost Saving or Redirection of Resources*

The committee reviewed results of two surveys that include open-ended responses on barriers.

**State and federal mandates.** For school districts, just as in the private sector, mandates imposed from higher levels of government limit management choices and require resources to be spent for specific purposes notwithstanding other priorities. However, each of these mandates has a compelling reason and strong constituency behind it. Some of the major mandates on school districts include:

- State use law – requires district to purchase goods from industries employing the disabled, regardless of cost.
- Special Education – Kansas imposes a number of requirements that go beyond federal law, including services to gifted students, additional parental notice and consent requirements, and services to students in private schools. School are required to provide extensive “related services” to students with disabilities, up to and including one-to-one assistance, medical care and placement in private institutions.
- Professional Negotiations – state law requires districts to collectively bargain with teachers over salaries and other issues, including evaluations and reduction-in-force practices. School boards

can ultimately issue “unilateral contracts” to essentially void contract provisions, but these are often extremely divisive to communities.

- **Teacher Due Process** – requires districts to provide “tenured” teachers with an independent hearing process before termination; increases costs for paying salaries until the issue is resolved, attorney and hearing office fees, or negotiated settlements for resignation.
- **Reporting and Auditing Requirements** –school districts are already subject to extensive auditing by state and federal agencies, and must provide an ever-growing number of reports. Many of these, of course, are required to promote accountability and efficiency.
- **New requirements** such as bullying prevention, regulations on seclusion and restraint, and nutritional guidelines that address legitimate social concerns but add non-instructional costs without additional funding.

**Administrative Capacity.** Despite concerns about excessive administration, most Kansas school districts have a very small central office staff, with a superintendent required to provide educational leadership, community engagement and the district’s business functions with little support. Combined with regular turnover in these positions, such districts may not have experience in finding budget savings or the time to explore and develop bids and proposals.

**Rural isolation.** Many districts report that vendors or biddings for services are simply not available in many areas of Kansas, because it is not profitable for the private sector to serve these areas. Private providers offer competitive bids where it is profitable to do so. In many districts, it is not.

**Community Interests.** Many communities express a preference to use local providers for goods and services even if somewhat less expensive alternatives exist. They want to keep education dollars in the community. School leaders also report the use of local providers not only strengthens the community but also provides more immediate response or maintains a wider range of services.

**More Efficient for Whom?** Consolidating district programs can have different impacts on different districts. For example, a single state health insurance program could help certain districts with high costs due to their small size and experience with a less expensive plan, but could either raise rates or reduce the quality of coverage in other districts. Likewise, larger districts in cooperative programs like special education might be able to operate less expensively on their own, but doing so could raise costs for the remaining districts.

**Cost of Capital Improvements.** Some school leaders say they are unable to replace older, less efficient buildings or implement more efficient energy systems because they lack capital outlay funding or are unable to pass a bond issue. While certain districts have passed large bond issues or benefit from relatively high valuations that generate healthy capital outlay revenues, other districts are effectively restricted by low valuation or high overall property tax rates in the area.

## Part 2 – Recommendations (November 2, 2012)

### The state should:

1. *Maintain the state's traditional – and constitutional – commitment to local control of education.*

The same citizens who elect the Governor, Legislature and State Board of Education elect local school board members, who are constitutionally given the responsibility to “maintain, develop and operate” public schools. This should include the ability to make final decisions on the allocation of resources, such as the use of local vendors or setting priorities among various budget functions. These decisions are choices among competing values. What may be considered inefficient at one level may reflect the priorities of a community that knows its own educational needs best.

The state itself requires districts to act in ways that are not the “most efficient” from a strictly cost viewpoint. A prime example is the state use law requiring the purchase of products from industries employing the disabled. This often increases district costs, but addresses another important social need. School districts should be allowed to make similar choices among competing values.

2. *Reduce the impact of mandates, restrictions and paperwork.*

We believe most Kansans agree that increasing regulation, restrictions and paperwork results in *less* efficiency, not more. Most Kansans also have greater trust in local institutions. However, the state and federal governmental have been increasing regulation, mandates and reporting for decades. While many of these requirements have reasonable justification and/or powerful constituencies behind them, they have an impact on the “efficiency” of school operations. The state should:

- A. Develop a better process of evaluating the impact of state education requirements on local district costs. The state should not impose new mandates without clear evidence that the educational and public policy benefits outweigh the cost. This could be accomplished by a stronger requirement for a cost/benefit analysis before passing new laws or regulations.
- B. Explore ways to reduce paperwork requirements by reducing or consolidating report requirements and audits. This could be accomplished by a Legislative Post Audit study.
- C. Pass a joint resolution urging the state Congressional delegation and federal officials to seek reductions in federal requirements on local school districts.

3. *Help school districts adopt new, innovative practices in delivering educational services.*

School leaders are eager to experiment with more effective ways to help students succeed and learn in high school with the skills they need for college and careers. To help, the state should:

- A. Establish a state grant program to provide “start up” funding for new initiatives. In a period of constrained operating budgets, this would provide an incentive to experiment with new methods without diverting funds from existing commitments.



- B. Encourage the State Department of Education to be more flexible in the implementation of such programs, such as authority to waive restrictions on the use of specific funds.

4. *Maintain current incentives for voluntary school consolidation, and considering strengthening these incentives.*

Current incentives which allow districts to maintain their combined budgets for a period of time has been an effective incentive for district consolidation. These incentives could be strengthened by providing a longer phase-out of additional budget authority that is reduced over time rather than ending all at once, and by providing a higher percentage of state assistance in capital costs for districts that voluntarily consolidate.

5. *Maintain funding for voluntary school efficiency audits, such as provided by Legislative Post Audit.*

Efficiency audits, whether conducted by LPA or other organizations, can provide valuable suggestions for improving district operations. However, it should be specified that the final decision on implementation of those recommendations rests with the local school board, and districts should not be required to participate if they are currently or have recently participated in other efficiency audits.

6. *Consider changes in the school district budget reporting format to increase public understanding.*

The Governor or State Board of Education should convene a task force of school leaders and business officials to develop recommendations for improving the clarity of school budget documents.

7. *Develop a system of multi-year funding commitments or targets to allow districts improved planning.*

Many school leaders believe one of the most important steps the state could take is providing more stability in the school funding process, because long-term planning would allow more efficient use of resources.

8. *Repeal the "public policy goal" of spending 65% of funding on "instruction."*

Instruction is simply a spending category narrowly defined by the federal government. The 65% goal ignores important differences in district characteristics and costs, and does not focus on effective use of all resources for improving educational outcomes. We found absolutely no evidence this goal improves educational outcomes or reduces costs. If the policy is retained, it should be amended to include all district personnel and expenditures that have an impact on student success.

**School districts should:**

1. *Adopt local board policies providing for a system of regular evaluation of efficiencies in school district operations.*

As with any organization, implementing a regular process for management decisions can improve efficiency. This proposal would encourage districts to adopt a system that meets local needs.

2. *Ensure that school district personnel have appropriate training in budgeting and financial management, including coding expenditures.*

Kansas school districts are regularly audited and examples of fraud and abuse are extremely rare. However, districts should take steps to make sure office employees have the training to follow state budget and accounting guidelines.

3. *Adopt local board of education development programs that include a focus on appropriate resource allocation.*

School board members are accountable to local voters. To effectively fulfill their responsibilities, board members should receive information and training on best practices for financial management.

**KASB, professional organizations and interlocal agencies should:**

1. *Increase educational programing on "best practices" for efficient and effective use of resources for school boards and other school leaders.*

Organizations representing and providing services to local school districts should strengthen their own programs for effective management of fiscal resources through training, meetings and conventions, publications and on-line services.

2. *Increase awareness and marketing of programs to assist districts in cost-savings and reallocation.*

These organizations provide extensive services in such areas as group purchasing, natural gas pools and energy savings, insurance, financial management and joint programs for students, teachers and families.

3. *Initiate a comprehensive study of barriers and opportunities in the promotion of school district cooperation and sharing of academic programs, student services, personnel and operations.*

The committee believes the issue of cooperative programs deserves additional, in-depth study.

**Final Comments**

The KASB Committee on School District Efficiency is committed to continuing collaboration with the Governor's Task Force. We are prepared to provide additional information or develop more specific proposals for these recommendations at the request of the Task Force.

Attached to this report are some of the materials the committee gathered, including surveys we conducted of superintendents and school business officials, in looking at the question of school efficiency. We hope you find this material useful, and will be happy to discuss it with you.

Are there any specific changes in state law or policy you believe would allow or encourage districts to operate in a more efficient manner?

**Comments from Superintendents completing this section of the survey**

Allowing even more flexibility with our capital outlay account would help. It wouldn't help everybody, but it would us because of district wealth.

As a district we have gone through consolidation; which is one of the toughest ways to become more efficient. Looking at Consolidation Laws and giving more incentive for patrons/districts to make this choice more attractive and increase efficiency would help.

While this doesn't pertain to the question, I believe the survey missed several important areas that were cut. We went to a 4 day week. This cut our transportation and food service costs by 20% at direct savings of over \$62,000. We cut an administrator saving over \$70,000. We cut two part-time custodians saving over \$40,000 (our teachers clean their own rooms now). We spared the classrooms and students. From the student perspective, there haven't been cuts.

- Surveys for legislators that are very time consuming
- Overlapping State and Federal reports
- Unfunded mandates
- Bidding requirements especially when only one vendor can provide specified product
- Time and personnel restrains of of KSDE due to budget reductions
- Tenure

We have adopted all that make financial and service sense. You can't be efficient if you don't have enough money to meet student's needs and quality educational processes.

Changes to professional negotiations act allowing for differentiated pay based on teacher supply and teacher quality.

Elimination of statutory requirements for the spending of district resources. Local Boards and administrators should be given back flexibility to make these decisions.

Many beneficial changes would become possible if KSDE regulation (bureaucratic controls) were eased to allow for more experimentation with new teaching and learning models.

Having a multi-year finance plan that will allow districts to plan and hire staff without fear of having to cut them or programs in the following year.

rescind the 2.5 mile rule. We have a small community in our district in which three districts send buses.

I feel it would help tremendously if we could pay for custodial and maintenance salaries out of Capital Outlay Fund. I feel this would help give longer life to our buildings and equipment and would allow more money from the General Fund to be used for instruction.

Unfunded mandates always cause us problems because we are a small district.

- Eliminate MOE (federal)
- Loosen vocational course requirements for funding (CAPSTONE)
- Eliminate recordkeeping requirements for Medicaid
- Reduce accreditation requirements for districts meeting high standard

Teacher licensure laws have become more stringent and require more time for teachers to be highly qualified. There are programs that are not funded in my district 4 year old At Risk I am on a waiting list. Parents As Teachers. We are required to have staff development with no funding. We are also required to have a mentor program without funding. We will be asked to implement the Common Core Standards and a new evaluation system without resources to help with the process.

Are there any specific changes in state law or policy you believe would allow or encourage districts to operate in a more efficient manner?

Comments from Superintendents completing this section of the survey
Do away with an unfunded mandates.
A multitude of "unfunded" mandates coupled with requirements restricting expenditures in various funds and budget lines. I would support the elimination of grant programs such that those dollars were funneled into ADDITIONAL revenue for school budgets.
State use law.
Least restrictive environment (part of special education state accountability)
1. Lower the participation percentage and contribution amount for the State Health pool.
1. Change transportation laws back to the original version of the "10 mile rule". 2. Being able to use the "textbook fund" for I pads, etc... which are taking the place of hard copy text books. In addition, allowing the purchase of the hardware needed for this process change. 3. Statewide energy rate contracts for schools. 4. State operated health insurance pool for schools. 5. Two year USD budgets. 6. On time state aid payments 7
The law that makes you give back state aid because you receive federal impact aid.
The unfunded mandates are big time dollar killers in districts.
You didn't ask about the number of administrative positions we have reduced. We have reduced the Food Service Director's position, eliminated one full time administrator so that our district is now administered by a Supt./Director of Sp. Ed./Food Service Director, a full time K-12 principal, and 2 Administrative Assistants who are also full time teachers.
Yes. I would like to see the laws loosen on at-risk and Title money to use as needed.
Utility Regulations would could allow for lower utility costs to rural schools.
The district purchased the bus fleet from the previous contractor in order to save several thousands of dollars.
Food service regulations.
Relax licensure regulations so teachers can teach a class or two outside of their content area. This would facilitate reduction in force techniques. Administrators and Boards are not going to put people in teaching positions where they feel they are not qualified.
Do away with tenure laws.
Food service regulations and training is becoming very expensive.
Unfunded mandates,. The state reporting requirements have grown to the point that it requires much more time on the part of staff to complete or requires the hiring of additional staff. For example, the certified personnel report requires much more information and is much more time consuming to complete than in the past.
Also, removing the state bid law could free school districts to negotiate more equitable pricing with vendors.

11-12

Are there any specific changes in state law or policy you believe would allow or encourage districts to operate in a more efficient manner?

**Comments from Superintendents completing this section of the survey**

Our district has closed two of three attendance centers in the last four years and we now have all students at one campus. We conducted an energy study and have invested over 1.5 million dollars in building upgrades to increase energy efficiency. Our energy usage has declined significantly but our utility bills continue to increase due to rate increases.

Financially it is difficult to find the money to fund technology, new text books, teacher training, and salary increases across the board when we are forced to use declining revenues to pay for increased costs in the areas of food service, utilities, and transportation costs.

For USD 315, changes in state law or policy would not allow our district to operate in a more efficient manner. We have cut everything possible in our district the past four years while trying to keep academics a priority. We have conducted two efficiency audits to find additional ways to cut expenses. The only area left is to cut additional teaching staff, which will put educational goals at risk and hurt students.

USD 315 has always focused on what is best for students. We oppose any new state or federal mandates that would take the focus away from student academic success and college/career readiness.

I want to stress that we are a small district and have only 1 teacher per grade level. There is no way we could eliminate an elementary staff position. All certified, classified, and support staff do multiple jobs and have multiple duties. There is only one administrator in the whole diistrict. It is difficult to cut position when there are no positions to cut. I know this was not the area to explain this, but I thought it was important to explain why there were no cuts. We spend money on students and resources.

Rural school have less options for contracted services thus those services would be more expensive.

Lowering the out of district transportation pick up from 10 miles to 2.5 miles while optional is a huge step back in efficiency.

Increased assessments bring more technology purchases, thus a greater need for support. More programs online lead to increased bandwidth issues.

Many recent laws are postive, but they take a large amount of time such as all the different issues that arise with bullying, mandated reporting is necessary, but it takes a lot of time. Counseling needs are becoming greater due to family situations take a lot of time. SRS is often overwhelmed and slow to respond, so it takes us more time. All good things, but very inefficient toward our task of education.

Less time completing surveys would allow me to use my time more efficeintly toward my students.

It is difficult to provide similar opportunities for our students as larger districts have already, but it is even more difficult while sustaining budget cuts. The rural nature of our district already prevents us from some efficiencies since the efficiencies would be detrimental for our students.

Teacher contract law on evaluations.

Tenure

Reduce reports/surveys

Reduce paperwork

Reduce audits

11-13

Are there any specific changes in state law or policy you believe would allow or encourage districts to operate in a more efficient manner?

**Comments from Superintendents completing this section of the survey**

The current consolidation statute which locks in funding for several years does not always facilitate closing or combining of buildings. In practice you can see where that funding actually allows districts to keep sites open. I think the law is counterproductive at times,

With the increase reporting responsibilities that have been added and added by the state and federal government, we have actually had to increase another secretary in the high school. The district office has operated with a clerk, only. The job is becoming too large for one person. Some of our programs survive on grants, but it is difficult to fulfill the reporting requirements.

Specifically, the legislature should not ask for studies they do not intend to use.

The legislature should not pass laws with increased reporting responsibilities, unless they actually know it is necessary and beneficial.

The legislature should not mandate unfunded programs - or fund them.

Just a note from and above question. Most of our staff reduction was done through retirements and not replacing and done at the secondary level. It made us change our schedule and we did lose about one class in several subject areas especially electives. We tried to have a superintendent serve as secondary principal but that took away staff and student leadership in the building. We cut back some after school programs in the elementary and have shared library services with a neighboring district. Our Title service were reduced as that person helped out with MS English classes. I believe we are committing over 65% of our funding to instruction so I am not sure how the governor's formula works. Any way there is not a problem with the school funding formula or the way we do things. We are hired to be the CEO's of our district and are expected to know how things work to share with the BOE and the patrons of our district. Some flexibility with money for transfers maybe would help us get items purchased for students at the end of the year or beginning of the year is about all I can think of right now.

As a growing district we have not been able to add the number of new positions we feel would be most beneficial to our educational programs.

The last number of years we have annually reviewed all areas to maintain the most efficient educational program as possible.

I believe the vast majority of school districts have followed this philosophy and are functioning efficiently.

Our district has voluntarily gone through three types of efficiency audits.....energy-which we used local HVAC contractors to implement-now moving on with lighting, legislative post audit-where we've implemented some of their suggestions and the center for innovative school leadership-ESU audit-again implementing or solidifying what we were doing or made changes to become more efficient. I think districts that voluntarily participate in these efficiency audits and implement some or all of their suggestions should receive more state funding....that would encourage more efficiency.

Not aware of any at this time!

Fund schools at the appropriate level as the previous law suit ruling required.

I can not come up with anything that I feel would provide more efficient operations without creating opportunities for abuse that would eventually hurt us more than the efficiencies gained.

The idea of having a multi-year finance plan so that districts could prepare for what next year may look like would be the biggest advantage to maintaining efficiency. The current year-to-year plan creates too much reactive planning instead of proactive planning.

11-14

here any specific changes in state law or policy you believe would allow or encourage districts to operate in a more efficient manner?

**Comments from Superintendents completing this section of the survey**

As a small declining enrollment district so the cuts in state funding the past several years have made it extra difficult. We have been reducing staff in all areas for several years now to make our system work. We did not replace the librarian last year, so that we could provide pay raises for the staff - they had not had raises in several years. I think we are very efficient now and am not sure where we go from here other than to continue to reduce staff and limit pay. Ironically our assessment scores are superb. My concern is that we are not getting enough of our best young people into the teaching profession because of the lack of state support for public education. Long term our best talent may leave the state. This may already be occurring.

Two elementary positions lost were certified reading specialists not classroom teachers. The cuts did not result in larger classroom enrollments as these were pull-out teachers for remediation.

Due to the paperwork mandates that have been pushed upon schools over the past few years. We are reducing staff due to declining enrollment and declining budgets, yet we are considering hiring a person just to handle all the mandated reporting.

We have researched contracting in more areas, but every time we have discovered that we are doing it more efficiently ourselves than contracting with others.

To try and bid everything that we can to get the best price, we have cut days of school to give raises, we have eliminated programs to cut costs as well as renovating our heating and air system to save money over the long haul.

I am not sure how much more efficient you would like us to operate. We have reduced about as much as we can without affecting the education of students. Any staff cuts will double the size of our current class rosters in the elementary and middle school and will take out programs in the high school.

We have an awful lot of paperwork to do to try and prove we are efficient and that has caused us to hire personnel to take care of coordinating and submitting everything. There has to be a way to be more efficient on this.

Our district is one of the few GROWING districts in the state. We have not eliminated teaching positions due to budget reductions, but we haven't added positions to keep up with our growth. As a result, our class sizes are getting too large, especially in a school district that is 55% ELL, 80% Free Lunch, and 80% Minority. Primary grade class sizes are approaching 26-28, with many high school classes in excess of 30.

We ended a contract to bus students to school and instead started our own bus service. Even with having to lease purchase buses we are saving \$250,000 per year operating our own bus service. We have one technology employee when we could have one to two additional staff members because of the work load on the one. However, we cannot afford to hire additional staff. In the meantime, our one technology employee is constantly criticized for not reacting quickly enough to problems with computers, equipment, software issues in the district where we have nearly 700 computers and very robust network and software environment.

We are under staffed in custodial and maintenance departments and are desperately trying to keep up with repairs to schools, HVAC issues, plumbing, and electrical problems.

Eliminate the Kansas Use Law. We get better goods from cheaper vendors.

Subsidize or provide a state contract for purchase of bandwidth. AT&T has a virtual monopoly on this and their customer service is terrible.

Facilitate and fund open source development of electronic textbooks and resources. Textbook companies charge ridiculous prices and our teachers statewide could be assembled and paid to develop resources and write textbooks that align to our common core standards better than the text companies.

Are there any specific changes in state law or policy you believe would allow or encourage districts to operate in a more efficient manner?

**Comments from Superintendents completing this section of the survey**

We have eliminated some student support services at the MS level because of budget constraints. We have combined 2 MS teaching positions as well, thus eliminating another position. We have cut about 5% of the teaching positions in the past three years even though we are experiencing an increased enrollment. We have also cut some services that we previously provided for our students (after practice bus service, for instance). We have also cut some supplemental positions (assistant coaching positions, drama, forensics, etc.) in order to save money.

I know many districts cut the number of days of school and/or lengthened the school day. In Hesston we have not done that for it is our belief that those two things take away from student learning. One thing I feel could be encouraged more is sharing of staff between districts. At my previous district it was worked out that a woods teacher was shared with another district. It worked very well.

Cut the audits by 2/3 and give the money to public education. The local patrons will make sure there is no waste it's their money. The legislature should be audited at the level schools are.

Local control of budget and no reductions of state education budget with a guarantee of increases similar to the states cost of living increase.

Eliminated a bus route and driver, one cafeteria personnel, custodian, only principal, 1/2 time librarian, 1/2 time music, and 1/2 time counselor. Already share a Superintendent with USD #371 and he is now the principal at USD #476

Multiple year funding from state would allow us to plan more efficiently. The unknown causes many districts to be overly cautious in spending because of the fear of mid-year cuts, the impact of declining enrollment without assured BBPP, or statewide cuts in BBPP.

Free up how districts can spend operating funds.

USD 505 does not employ directors of special services such as transportation, food service, etc. as our administrative staff serve multiple roles for the district. As a conservative effort, USD 505 is not contracting for additional management roles, i.e. e-rate application, budget preparation, LCP program director, etc. in order to reduce overhead and allowing monies to target student instruction.

11-16



## Summary of the KASBO School Efficiency Survey

This is not a summary of an in depth analysis of the Kansas Association of School Business Officials Efficiency Survey results. Time simply would not allow. Instead, it is an attempt to capture the general nature of the data and comments submitted by 72 school districts. The 72 schools districts represent approximately half of the districts with members in KASBO and approximately 25% of the total districts in the state. The data and comments are categorized into two areas; efficiencies currently implemented and impediments to further efficiencies. It is to be noted that many of the comments regarding the efficiencies implemented indicate they are not in the best interest of our educational goals.

### Efficiency

The survey listed twelve efficiencies currently implemented in some districts and asked the respondents to check the ones that their school district has implemented. The table following shows the number of districts that are using the listed efficiency

Number of Districts out of 72 that responded	Efficiency Listed
66	Utilize the services of a Special Education Coop.
62	Utilize the services of an Interlocal Service Center to provide educational and professional development services.
57	Use purchasing cooperatives
59	Use the state bid list
58	Have an energy program in place to reduce utility costs through automated thermostat controls.
25	Have used a performance contract where energy savings from facility upgrades pays for the project.
54	Utilize volume purchasing of custodial supplies to reduce costs.
46	Transportation fuel is bid or prices locked for periods of time.
55	Purchase natural gas through a consortium to reduce cost.
32	Competitively bid trash and/or pest control services.
42	Conduct paperless Board meetings to save labor and operating costs.
51	Competitively bid, through an RFP process, services such as auditing, banking, property insurance, and/or health insurance.

It should be noted that many districts commented that they could not implement some of these practices due to the community they reside in, and/or a decision by the Board of Education.

As I worked through the additional efficiencies that were listed (Exhibit A), I tried to categorize them into four groups; instructional, facility, operational and financial.

The instructional items are ones that impact the delivery of instruction in the classroom.

The facility items deal directly with the structures and infrastructure of the district.

The operational items include changes to the way the district does business, including such things as how they conduct meetings, handle supplies, enroll students, evaluate employees, maintain the buildings, etc.

While all of the things list have financial impact, the financial group includes such things as refinancing bonds, E-rate filings, self funding insurance, etc.

It should be noted that many of the items listed by districts appear several times, being listed by multiple districts. I counted 91 different items that districts listed. Of those 91, there were 19 instructional, 16 facility, 40 operational, and 16 financial. Another person making the same tally would no doubt come up with different numbers, but to me the vast majority of changes implemented for efficiency were done as far away from the classroom as possible. Exhibit A is the complete, unedited, listing submitted by school districts on the survey.

### Impediments to Efficiency

When you read through the comments submitted under the question "What is stopping you from being more efficient?" you find a couple of reoccurring themes. The most numerous comments speak to unfunded mandates, multiple and complex federal and state reporting, and numerous audits, both state and federal. Another theme you see is that rural Kansas, small school districts, do not have the manpower or ability to take advantage of efficiencies gained by larger districts and communities. Many of the unfunded mandates and audits cannot be avoided since they are federal or state law, and the thought that I came away with is that there are very few impediments that could be eliminated.

I must quote the submission from North Ottawa County USD 239: "At what point does "efficiency" conflict with meeting the needs of the children????? There is a point that "efficiency" efforts reach the law of diminishing returns as far as offering quality programming for the students" I could not have said it better.

Respectfully submitted:  
Jim Freeman  
KASBO President

11-18

Exhibit A

**Other Efficiencies not on the list.**

All employees are on direct deposit - our local bank offers a free checking account if they don't have one.

We had the state and Emporia State University both do efficiency audits of our district. We implemented a number of their recommendations, thought not all of them.

While our district has eight main school buildings and an alternative school, only three of our buildings have kitchens. These three kitchens serve all of the schools. This means that the food served in some of our buildings has to be transported and reheated, but it has led to considerable savings.

In 2008, we followed through with a major district reorganization that led us to close three elementary schools, open one new one, and consolidate our two Jr. Highs into one Middle School. This has led to savings of approximately \$700,000 annually. We made this decision not because of declining enrollment (our enrollment is growing), but because it was the right move educationally and financially.

When a teacher is absent, we try to cover "in house" rather than hire a substitute teacher. We are trying to keep O/T for classified staff to a minimum. Class field trips at the elementary level have been combined - for example Prek and Kdgt go together. 1st and 2nd go together, etc.

We purchase many items from School Specialty. Even though we're not purchasing directly from a cooperative, they give us the price that has been negotiated through the Greenbush purchasing cooperative for anything we purchase from them.

We are currently in the process of changing our gas service to KJUMP.

Required direct deposit/paycard for payroll and software allowing a secured site for all employees saves on check/payment advise printing there by saving labor and operating costs.

1) Online fee payment option with RevTrak. We have been with RevTrak for just over 3 years and have collected more than a million dollars in online fees that are posted directly into our student database. We have saved our building secretaries and food service staff countless hours that would have been spent gathering, posting, and reconciling these transactions manually.

2) The recent drop in interest rates have allowed our district to refinance debt and save hundreds of thousands in future interest payments. We are getting ready to refinance more debt at the start of 2013 which could save an additional \$750,000 if rates stay down.

3) Online open enrollment for students. We have save a lot of paper, postage, and secretarial hours by going to an online open enrollment and our parents seem to enjoy the feature.

**Food Bid**

We lease the property where the football field is located and share expenses with the city to maintain the property.

Resources are shared with other districts and the superintendent conducts a careful review of all expenditures.

USD #3332 contracts with USD #382 to provide part-time administrative leadership.

The USD #3332 junior high football team is cooperating with Fairfield to combine programs.

Duties have been combined for licensed personnel so that educational programs are not adversely affected by the shrinking budget. Several classified employees have dual responsibilities in unrelated job categories so that the safety and comfort of students is not affected.

**Other Efficiencies not on the list.**

We have hired two head custodians that are also licensed professionals - one an electrician and one in HVAC that do that work for the district so we do not have to call anyone to do those services. They get off work in the early afternoon and are free to do outside work in their field - works great for them and has saved us money.

We are a 4-day week school...feel this has cut a small amount from utility usage; and large amount of savings in fuel for transportation.

Building upgrades and maintenance (windows and mini/split AC/heater units) to reduce heating/cooling costs.

We routinely combine transportation with neighboring districts for special ed services, travel to various meetings, share some classroom instruction. We have started emailing our direct deposit slips rather than using paper, envelopes and labor to stuff them to distribute to employees. We have passed a bond issue to build additions to our schools so that we can stop using a building that was built in 1918 which will save us money on energy, transportation, travel paid to teachers who traveled between buildings. We try to participate in as many meetings as possible by means of IDL or video sharing means where we do not have to travel as much.

Our board just approved the purchase of Board Docs, so we will soon convert to a paperless board meeting.

Central office attempts to limit printing in anyway possible; examples are printing fewer purchase orders and delivering them electronically where possible, no longer print pay stubs (delivered electronically), transmit building budgets electronically, etc.

All staff (including substitute teachers) are paid via direct deposit or pay card.

We lock down the buildings in the summer, turning off all lights and AC.

We recently built a LEED Platinum facility that has reduced energy usage over 35%. Purchased our own 50kW wind turbine to produce approximately 10% of electric supply. Retain all of our rain water and use it to irrigate the landscape.

Save as much electronically as possible to reduce space, paper and printing.

1. We use the same company for our student, finance and human resources software. This eliminates a lot of duplication in the various departments.
  2. We have a fairly strict policy for employee travel out of the district. Limited resources are available and we try to bring training to the district or have employees trained in order to have a bigger impact on a larger number of employees.
- Food Service Program is self sufficient except for the occasional purchase of equipment out of Capital Outlay. In fact, the program pays about \$80,000 of indirect costs to the general fund every year.  
Federal E-Rate reimbursement is applied for and received annually.  
All employee positions are evaluated annually in the spring (based on projected enrollment) to determine the following year's staffing needs - positions not needed are eliminated.

Centralized copy center to cut down on copier lease cost.

Volume purchase of copy paper through RFP to lower paper cost.

We are going to paperless Board meetings in the very near future.

Over the past several years we have implemented several changes that save us money, but have not necessarily been best for students. We no longer have certified librarians (we used classified library aids). Textbooks are not up to date. We could certainly use more support staff for student learning, but instead hire few additional people. Class sizes are large, when additional class sections are needed (which would help with putting more money into the classroom).

Because of the lack of resources we are looking at cutting additional sections in the elementary - which would again move us further from the 65% recommendation.

**Other Efficiencies not on the list.**

We use the Hutchinson Correctional Facility for all of our printing. We have reduced printing costs over half.

All the payroll is done electronically through time clocks, direct deposit, bank cards and electronic pay stubs. Reports are all stored electronically and not printed. W-2's are electronic for those that have signed up for it.

Currently in the process of implementing Vendor ACH.

Use business procurement cards.

Two years ago re-set the attendance areas in order to get a better distribution of students to staff.

Have a Facility Use Fee Schedule in order to recapture dollars from outside groups using District facilities.

Purchasing approval process is all electronic.

Receiving at the warehouse is all electronic.

In the last 10 years since I've come to Hutchinson the District has closed two of it's smaller Elementary schools.

95% of all vehicle maintenance is done in-house. 45 buses, 15 cars/Vans  
Run our own kitchens, cook most all food served in-house. Our efficiency allows our unencumbered balance to grow continually.

23

We have cut staff, starting with Administration, though efficiency is only in dollars.

Many software programs

Consortiums and purchasing cooperatives

Purchased 2 hybrid cars to send groups from 1-5 to the destinations efficiently.

Cooperating with groups/administration to lower the cost of transportation as a whole.

Central copy center

Approval of all technology items through the tech department to check for competitive pricing.

Have closed an outlying school, consolidated staff.

ACH-Direct deposit of payroll

Credit/Debit card payment for enrollment fees

District owned buses vs. contracted bus service was cost effective for our district

Currently USD 428 has a Self-Funded Insurance Plan

USD 428 pays mileage to students who live 2.5 miles away from their school and outside the city limits instead of busing.

USD 428 cooks out of a Central Kitchen instead of cooking at all/some school sites.

**Other Efficiencies not on the list.**

Consolidation of operations into one building. Previously the maintenance team, copy center, instructional media center, warehouse and interoffice mail system were all in various locations. We are streamlining that into one large operations center to gain efficiencies.

Sub caller system

Hutchinson has all assets over \$500 tagged and a physical inventory is done every year. We depreciate all assets over \$5,000 and software over \$100,000 on the financials. Not only do we have efficiency because it's all electronic we have accountability of assets.

Hutchinson is in the process of refinancing outstanding bonds to achieve lower interest rates. So far to date we've save taxpayers \$795,000. With the current refinance that will be completed after the first of the year we're looking to achieve another \$429,000 for a total of \$1,224,000 in savings.

Share Parents as Teachers with USD 350

Share Head Start with USD 350

Share H.S. Spanish Teacher with USD 350

Share Elementary Counselor with USD 350

Buses parked at a local business lot - do not own or rent land for secure bus parking

Added an energy efficient personnel that resulted in savings in utilities and making schools more greener.

Reduce custodial staff and only cleaning classrooms 3 times a week.

Close schools with low enrollment. This enables us to utilize space more efficiently. Also the higher enrollment allows the district to staff more efficiently.

Reduce certified and classified staff.

Although the district doesn't use purchasing cooperatives, the district utilizes the purchasing power of existing government contracts, such as US Communities and National Joint Powers Alliance.

Purchase can goods through the food service in bulk. This is definitely a savings.

District Centralized Copy Center and delivery system.

Pay mileage to patrons instead of bus routes

Efforts to automate processes such as enrollment and fee payments.

- Online registration/food service payment system
- Automated pay to employees - payroll & employee reimbursements
- Self funded healthcare & workers compensation plans
- Outcomes based wellness plan to help control healthcare costs
- Use of "Digital Bridge" for sharing small enrollment classes between buildings.
- Use of podcasts & webcasts for professional development
- Streamlined recruitment process
- Staggered work schedules (Grounds, Custodial, Printing)
- Use of equipment and software in our copier & printing service programs to reduce overall cost

**Other Efficiencies not on the list.**

District Central Copy Center and Delivery System

Online Enrollment Process for returning students.

Online Credit Card Payments for Food Service & Fees.

- Participate in KCPL's M-Power energy curtailment program (receive \$43,560 per year in fixed payments plus variable event payments).
- Developed & implemented electronic paystubs to reduce staff time and supplies needed to send out over 600 check stubs each month.
- Collaborated with city government to utilize grant program to fund School Resource Office program, saving salary cost of officer.
- Outsourced driver's education program to reduce program expenses.

Due to budget cuts, actions have been taking that may save time and/or money (efficient), but are not effective for meeting our mission of ensuring success for all students. These items include:

- Elimination of bussing under 2.5 miles
- Closing a small elementary school
- Reducing administrative and other positions which increased workloads and demands on the remaining, already stretched staff

Use purchasing cards (UMB VISA) to minimize smaller dollar purchases.

Maximized contracted regular bus routes to within 90% of state reimbursement amount.

Paperless pay stubs for employees (accessible from internet site).

## Exhibit B

**What is stopping you from being more efficient?**

Nothing. We are always looking for ways to get better.

Rural area...lack of available vendors for some needs.

Time and energy...with only a Supt. and one office person...I have a hard time doing extra things!!

We currently do not conduct paperless board meetings. Our board members would rather have the paper documents in front of them instead of a laptop ;) (not sure why) I do feel there are alot of required reports and surveys to fill out at the state and federal level, that to me, takes alot of time and some of those...not sure what they do with the information or if it's really necessary. ....waste of time!!

It takes time to develop RFP's and bid specifications. We have cut our administrative staff to the point that there is not enough time to accomplish all these efficient tasks. We have approx. 3500 students, 550 permanent staff. Our superintendent handles the HR functions for the licensed staff and I handle the HR functions for the non-licensed personnel, in addition to all of the business functions. The number of federal and state survey's or requests for information continues to grow and someone has to complete these things.

Board objects to paperless board meetings.

Time, people, and money. All 3 of the items I have listed in the other efficiencies list required a lot of time, people, and money to implement. In the long-term, we will make all of it back and then some, but in the short-term it requires people and budget dollars to be stretched to make a reality. Because of recent budget cuts, people only have time to do the essential tasks and have little time to brainstorm and collaborate on new projects which could lead to more efficiency.

Older buildings and heating equipment have prohibited us from utilizing natural gas bidding process.

Small community where there are few service providers to provide services and as a practice the district tries to support local tax paying businesses first.

Although is has gotten a little better - the KIDS program has helped - we report the same information to different agencies several times a year. Our rural location also hinders efficiency sometimes when bidding or obtaining services. Some phone and internet companies just don't offer services here. Same with trash, fuel, and even some food suppliers - they just don't want to come here.

\$\$\$ - we need to consider upgrading our heat/air system in one of our buildings and lack of funds is the biggest reason!

Not all services are available in rural areas that are available in metropolitan areas so I think that impedes efficiency in some areas. Smaller school districts have a harder time implementing some of these efficiency methods because they are cost prohibitive to initiate and or lack of manpower to do so.

The state's decision to cut equalization aid funding to capital outlay limits our ability to pursue projects that could be paid for with capital outlay funds to save operating dollars. The cut forces our district to delay such projects, or finance them through a lease or performance contract which adds cost thereby lengthening the payback on the project.

The state's inability to decide funding for schools until late in the legislative session harms our ability to budget effectively. This not only deals with the upcoming fiscal year; we weren't certain whether the BSAPP in the current fiscal year would be funded fully until early May either. Forces districts to hold cash/budget authority in case of a late cut, not purchase classrooms supplies as needed but wait until funding is known, etc.

We have spent and will spend more time on health insurance coverage for our employees (searching for most affordable coverage, insuring compliance with Affordable Care Act. Much efficiency could be gained if there were a state-wide program districts could affordably join.



State should assist schools to purchase alternative fuel powered buses. Tax credits don't help schools - need to partner with schools through grants to both offset the incremental cost of the bus (versus diesel) and assist the build-out of infrastructure which would encourage further adoption state-wide in both public and private sectors.

Living in central Kansas limits availability to bid for such things as utilities and fuel. Utility usage, supplies and etc. are of course kept to a minimum to help with cost. Most Western Kansas schools are small and many times are left out of the equation when it comes to what it takes to keep a smaller school running.

State Law requiring us to accept the LOW bidder is not always efficient.

Many time the LOW bidder ends up costing us more money down the road for various reasons.

We are a small district and most of these services are not available in our area.

We don't use a consortium for natural gas as the cost of upgrade the meters would be prohibitive. We also have very old buildings.

Other issues are regulations that are inconsistent like Fire Marshall Inspections that change from year to year with whoever the Fire Marshall is that year.

Unfunded mandates are an issue also.

When using public funds for construction, all facilities should be required to meet identified efficiency requirements. Life cycle costs related to not only the construction of the building but operation and maintenance should be considered. Energy is so expensive, new regulations should be put into place which require public facilities to be more energy efficient.

The cost for a small district to use some of the resources isn't feasible.

1. Transportation fuel - we do get a discounted price, but only have one vendor who can provide fuel services for all our busses 24/7.

2. We would be able to use federal and state grant dollars more efficiently if we had more flexibility in the use of the funds. We often find that the restrictions on how the funds can be used is a hindrance to how we can use the funds to provide services that have the most impact on our students. The myriad of unnecessary state, federal, and auditing reporting requirements force us to waste valuable time and resources completing the reports. Transparency and accountability are one thing, time-consuming reports that no one sees are a great waste of time.

Special education regulations that require very expensive FAPE accommodations for severely challenged students who belong in specialized settings also take away instructional money. The pendulum has swung way too far - especially with the state and federal government NOT providing adequate compensation for the programs required by ALL special education students. This is actually one of the greatest drains on our instructional budgets. Another drain on our instructional budget is the amount of money we pay for busing all students in the district. Our state reimbursement covers 65% of that cost, with the remaining 35% coming out of instructional budgets.

Cannot repair machinery with idle money setting in the capital outlay fund. This takes money out of the classroom and allows capital \$\$ to accumulate. Parts or repair services would be great out of this fund. Do not believe that salaries of any kind should be allowed.

Reports for the State: The amount of paperwork, documentation, data, time of multiple staff people, etc. that is required for all of the different reports requested from the legislators have created a whole set of inefficiencies. They are requesting more and more information all the time, however it's very frustrating when, due to all of the budget cuts we have received, we are already short-staffed and can not afford to hire more help.

There are a tremendous number of mandates (not all bad) that we MUST follow. These requirements consume many of our limited resources, and are therefore not available to utilize for direct student achievement. Examples include food service health nutrition mandates, special services, healthy requirements, libraries, technology, safe busing, and a pile of KIDS, assessment and state data requirements.

We bid out all major projects/purchases for the most efficient use of money. However, we are also mindful that our small town local businesses donate to our school system by buying ads, donating to the after-prom, elementary carnival, and supporting the Booster Clubs, and paying taxes. We want to use every opportunity to support their businesses by purchasing items from them. In a small town, the school district and small businesses rely on each other.

Utilities and trash service are city-owned; we only have one option.

Legislative Post Audit in their efficiency studies wanted Districts to move back to traditional scheduling instead of using block scheduling. Hutchinson uses block scheduling. There could be debate about if this is best for students.

Coming up with time for professional learning time tends to be an issue during negotiations. What is the most efficient way to do this that works for parents, staff and the District so we're not paying out additional funds to do this.

Banking/Investment regulations.

New USDA Nutrition regulations.

Tenure

Unfunded Special Ed mandates.

Community Expectations: offerings, activities, athletics, etc.

State Expectations: numerous reports, and expectations.

Community/Safety Expectation: Transporting students below the 2.5 mile rule at own cost

Efficiency is not everything, when it comes to the Food Service program, speaking as a parent and an on looker within another department of the district, I think some regulations upon the food/nutrition required has made it hard to provide a good lunch at a reasonable price without waste! So the school is working harder to be efficient, on top of meeting regulations and the kids aren't truly benefiting from either. If the food is going in the garbage, your efficiency is going with it. I understand that we are fighting obesity younger and younger, but I don't believe that school lunch was ever the problem, some of these kids, this is the only meal they get so it needs to be something they will eat! There has to be a happy medium between "junk" that is bad for them and "junk" that is good for them!

At what point does "efficiency" conflict with meeting the needs of the children????? There is a point that "efficiency" efforts reach the law of diminishing returns as far as offering quality programming for the students.

Accepting the lowest bid, in some instances accepting the lowest bid does not always provide the best product or service to the district and can result in exclusion of local contractors and support to the Kansas economy.

Tenure. Tenure has its purpose, and the district supports tenure. However, situations arise where teachers need to be released and it is a difficult, time consuming and sometimes costly process.

Unfunded mandates. Examples: anti-bullying, some special education requirements, record keeping and reporting for state requirements. All have a need and purpose. All require manpower, technology, and special services which are not all identified as part of classroom instruction.

We are constantly being audited which takes significant administrative time to produce reports and respond to questions of the auditors. Currently we are being audited by the Office of the Inspector General (OIG), Office of Civil Rights (OCR), Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE), CPA's both on the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report as well as the Schedule of Federal Financial Assistance (A-133), Medicare, and the Kansas Department of Health and Environment (KDHE.)

Energy program - automated thermostat controls in 2 of 4 buildings only.

Performance contract - went through study - cost of implementing program is too expensive for our budget.

Trash services cannot be bid due to municipal utility/services restrictions.

Municipal utilities do not allow us flexibility on our rates.

USD 428 has been able to either maintain or reduce most fixed costs (insurance, utilities, supplies, paper, etc.) at the same level for the last eight years.

Bid law limits the ability to negotiate prices for projects.

Our rural location

Increased State and Federal reporting requests

Duplication in reporting  
Unfunded mandates

Increasing state and federal reporting. These reports use valuable human resources to complete. Good example is the CRDC.

Older facilities with older HVAC and heating cost is substantial to replace.

Require to buy from vendors provided by the Kansas use law. The vendor pricing is not always the lowest.

The new food service guidelines appear to be more expensive but I will know more by the end of the year. Obviously any program that is mandated by the state or federal government with no funds attached or not totally funded is not very efficient.

Older facilities

Any unfunded mandate - evaluations, KIDS

Regents required curriculum

The growing list of local, state and federal reporting and compliance measures related to virtually everything we do. In a time where districts are being forced to reduce staffing (especially in their central offices) the expectations continue to grow and increase year after year.

-Unfunded mandates from state & federal

-Special Education regulations

-Complex federal recordkeeping, reporting and ongoing changes to reporting requirements

SDAC Medicaid & Cost Reporting Requirements & Process

• Unfunded mandates

• Continued increase in requirements/regulations which result in increased costs due to personnel or resources needed to comply, but no additional funding is provided to offset the increased expense.

• Staff resources and time to research, study, and implement programs/ideas to gain efficiency in operations due to current state of limited personnel and limited funds.

External pressure from special interest groups to spend down cash reserves.

USD	USDName	2011-12 FTE Enr	Interlocal Member	Service Center Member	Received Services from service centers	Member Special Education Co-operative	Member Interactive Distance Learning Network
101	Erie-Galesburg	499.5	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
102	Cimarron-Ensign	664.4	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
103	Cheylin	138.5		Yes	Yes		
105	Rawlins County	309.0		Yes	Yes		
106	Western Plains	146.5	Yes	Yes	Yes		
107	Rock Hills	286.0		Yes	Yes	Yes	
108	Washington County	393.0		Yes	Yes	Yes	
109	Republic County	464.5		Yes	Yes	Yes	
110	Thunder Ridge	237.0	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
111	Doniphan West	340.0			Yes		Yes
112	Central Plains	479.0		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
113	Prairie Hills	1,178.9			Yes	Yes	Yes
114	Riverside	647.5	Yes		Yes		Yes
115	Nemaha Central	564.8			Yes	Yes	Yes
200	Greeley County	195.0	Yes	Yes	Yes		
202	Turner-Kansas City	3,754.9			Yes		
203	Piper-Kansas City	1,718.0			Yes	Yes	Yes
204	Bonner Springs	2,404.0			Yes	Yes	
205	Bluestem	495.7		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
206	Remington-Whitewater	487.0		Yes	Yes	Yes	
207	Ft. Leavenworth	1,802.0			Yes	Yes	
208	WaKeeney	365.3		Yes	Yes		
209	Moscow	176.6	Yes	Yes	Yes		
210	Hugoton	1,013.2	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
211	Norton Community	713.6	Yes		Yes		
212	Northern Valley	186.0	Yes	Yes	Yes		
214	Ulysses	1,559.8	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
215	Lakin	617.5	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
216	Deerfield	243.0	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
217	Rolla	171.5	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
218	Elkhart	497.1	Yes	Yes	Yes		
219	Minneola	263.0	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
220	Ashland	206.4	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
223	Barnes	357.3		Yes	Yes	Yes	
224	Clifton-Clyde	288.5		Yes	Yes	Yes	
225	Fowler	153.5	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
226	Meade	440.8	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
227	Hodgeman County	302.0	Yes	Yes	Yes		
229	Blue Valley	20,897.7			Yes		
230	Spring Hill	2,115.7			Yes		
231	Gardner-Edgerton	4,940.2			Yes		
232	De Soto	6,526.4			Yes		
233	Olathe	26,342.8			Yes		
234	Fort Scott	1,812.1			Yes		
235	Uniontown	442.5			Yes		
237	Smith Center	402.5	Yes	Yes	Yes		
239	North Ottawa County	590.9		Yes	Yes	Yes	

11-28

USD	USDName	2011-12 FTE Enr	Interlocal Member	Service Center Member	Received Services from service centers	Member Special Education Co-operative	Member Interactive Distance Learning Network
240	Twin Valley	576.0		Yes	Yes	Yes	
241	Wallace County	206.0		Yes	Yes		
242	Weskan	99.5		Yes	Yes		
243	Lebo-Waverly	495.7			Yes	Yes	
244	Burlington	819.7			Yes	Yes	Yes
245	LeRoy-Gridley	208.0			Yes	Yes	
246	Northeast	487.8			Yes		
247	Cherokee	655.0			Yes		Yes
248	Girard	1,011.5		Yes	Yes		Yes
249	Frontenac	867.0			Yes		
250	Pittsburg	2,686.4	Yes		Yes		Yes
251	North Lyon County	418.0			Yes	Yes	Yes
252	Southern Lyon County	499.5			Yes	Yes	
253	Emporia	4,191.1		Yes	Yes	Yes	
254	Barber County North	424.5	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
255	South Barber	215.0	Yes	Yes	Yes		
256	Marmaton Valley	308.0	Yes		Yes		Yes
257	Iola	1,288.5	Yes		Yes		
258	Humboldt	536.0	Yes		Yes		
259	Wichita	44,797.8		Yes	Yes		
260	Derby	6,212.6			Yes		
261	Haysville	4,886.6			Yes		
262	Valley Center	2,496.3	Yes	Yes	Yes		
263	Mulvane	1,759.0		Yes	Yes		
264	Clearwater	1,186.1	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
265	Goddard	5,015.2	Yes		Yes		Yes
266	Maize	6,447.4	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
267	Renwick	1,869.8	Yes	Yes	Yes		
268	Cheney	743.0	Yes	Yes	Yes		
269	Palco	125.0	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
270	Plainville	372.4	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
271	Stockton	273.1	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
272	Waconda	319.7		Yes	Yes	Yes	
273	Beloit	728.8		Yes	Yes	Yes	
274	Oakley	398.6		Yes	Yes		Yes
275	Triplains	80.0		Yes	Yes		Yes
281	Graham County	387.6		Yes	Yes		Yes
282	West Elk	301.0			Yes	Yes	
283	Elk Valley	162.6			Yes	Yes	
284	Chase County	364.0			Yes	Yes	
285	Cedar Vale	149.4			Yes	Yes	Yes
286	Chautauqua County	350.5			Yes	Yes	
287	West Franklin	624.5	Yes		Yes		
288	Central Heights	562.1			Yes	Yes	Yes
289	Wellsville	789.0	Yes		Yes		
290	Ottawa	2,366.9			Yes		
291	Grinnell	83.0		Yes	Yes		

11-29

USD	USDName	2011-12 FTE Enr	Interlocal Member	Service Center Member	Received Services from service centers	Member Special Education Co-operative	Member Interactive Distance Learning Network
292	Wheatland	103.5		Yes	Yes		Yes
293	Quinter	279.5		Yes	Yes		Yes
294	Oberlin	335.1		Yes	Yes		
297	St. Francis	286.0		Yes	Yes		Yes
298	Lincoln	339.0		Yes	Yes	Yes	
299	Sylvan Grove	220.0		Yes	Yes		Yes
300	Comanche County	332.0	Yes	Yes	Yes		
303	Ness City	304.1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
305	Salina	6,867.8		Yes	Yes	Yes	
306	Southeast Of Saline	714.5		Yes	Yes	Yes	
307	Ell-Saline	469.0		Yes	Yes	Yes	
308	Hutchinson	4,781.0		Yes	Yes		
309	Nickerson	1,086.1	Yes		Yes		
310	Fairfield	271.5	Yes	Yes	Yes		
311	Pretty Prairie	265.5	Yes	Yes	Yes		
312	Haven	879.9	Yes	Yes	Yes		
313	Buhler	2,117.1	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
314	Brewster	68.5		Yes	Yes		
315	Colby	886.9		Yes	Yes		Yes
316	Golden Plains	190.5		Yes	Yes		
320	Wamego	1,358.4			Yes	Yes	
321	Kaw Valley	1,099.0			Yes	Yes	
322	Onaga-Havensville-Wheaton	316.5			Yes	Yes	
323	Rock Creek	850.2			Yes	Yes	
325	Phillipsburg	597.0	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
326	Logan	180.0	Yes	Yes	Yes		
327	Ellsworth	575.6		Yes	Yes	Yes	
329	Mill Creek Valley	451.6			Yes	Yes	
330	Mission Valley	475.1			Yes		
331	Kingman - Norwich	962.2	Yes	Yes	Yes		
332	Cunningham	166.5	Yes	Yes	Yes		
333	Concordia	1,040.6		Yes	Yes	Yes	
334	Southern Cloud	246.5		Yes	Yes	Yes	
335	North Jackson	375.5			Yes	Yes	
336	Holton	1,112.6			Yes	Yes	Yes
337	Royal Valley	904.5			Yes	Yes	
338	Valley Falls	393.5		Yes	Yes		Yes
339	Jefferson County North	459.0		Yes	Yes		
340	Jefferson West	850.1		Yes	Yes		
341	Oskaloosa	493.5		Yes	Yes		
342	McLouth	488.7		Yes	Yes		
343	Perry	855.6		Yes	Yes		
344	Pleasanton	318.0			Yes	Yes	Yes
345	Seaman	3,675.2			Yes		
346	Jayhawk	488.0			Yes	Yes	
347	Kinsley-Offerle	354.5		Yes	Yes	Yes	
348	Baldwin City	1,321.2	Yes		Yes		

11-30

USD	USDName	2011-12 FTE Enr	Interlocal Member	Service Center Member	Received Services from service centers	Member Special Education Co-operative	Member Interactive Distance Learning Network
349	Stafford	267.1	Yes	Yes	Yes		
350	St. John-Hudson	301.5	Yes	Yes	Yes		
351	Macksville	272.6	Yes	Yes	Yes		
352	Goodland	981.7		Yes	Yes		
353	Wellington	1,607.6		Yes	Yes		
355	Ellinwood	379.5		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
356	Conway Springs	513.7	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
357	Belle Plaine	591.5	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
358	Oxford	313.3	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
359	Argonia	168.0	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
360	Caldwell	229.5	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
361	Anthony-Harper	804.5	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
362	Prairie View	927.0			Yes	Yes	Yes
363	Holcomb	939.0	Yes	Yes	Yes		
364	Marysville	680.3			Yes	Yes	
365	Garnett	1,046.8			Yes	Yes	
366	Woodson	431.5	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
367	Osawatomie	1,089.2			Yes	Yes	
368	Paola	1,986.6			Yes	Yes	
369	Burrton	246.5	Yes	Yes	Yes		
371	Montezuma	220.0	Yes	Yes	Yes		
372	Silver Lake	695.4			Yes		
373	Newton	3,389.7		Yes	Yes	Yes	
374	Sublette	466.7	Yes	Yes	Yes		
375	Circle	1,789.8		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
376	Sterling	500.8		Yes	Yes	Yes	
377	Atchison County	613.1		Yes	Yes		
378	Riley County	680.5			Yes	Yes	
379	Clay Center	1,311.6		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
380	Vermillion	486.1			Yes	Yes	Yes
381	Spearville	347.0	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
382	Pratt	1,080.0	Yes	Yes	Yes		
383	Manhattan-Ogden	5,639.2			Yes		
384	Blue Valley-Randolph	201.0			Yes	Yes	
385	Andover	4,782.1		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
386	Madison-Virgil	246.0			Yes	Yes	Yes
387	Altoona-Midway	157.0	Yes		Yes		
388	Ellis	373.6		Yes	Yes	Yes	
389	Eureka	607.7			Yes		
390	Hamilton	84.0			Yes	Yes	Yes
392	Osborne County	298.3	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
393	Solomon	341.0		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
394	Rose Hill	1,666.7		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
395	LaCrosse	288.5		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
396	Douglass	698.0		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
397	Centre	246.0	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
398	Peabody-Burns	291.3	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes

USD	USDName	2011-12 FTE Enr	Interlocal Member	Service Center Member	Received Services from service centers	Member Special Education Co-operative	Member Interactive Distance Learning Network
399	Paradise	126.0	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
400	Smoky Valley	922.7		Yes	Yes	Yes	
401	Chase-Raymond	145.0		Yes	Yes	Yes	
402	Augusta	2,118.6		Yes	Yes	Yes	
403	Otis-Bison	177.5		Yes	Yes	Yes	
404	Riverton	770.5	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
405	Lyons	754.2		Yes	Yes	Yes	
407	Russell County	773.5		Yes	Yes		
408	Marion-Florence	531.1	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
409	Atchison	1,600.8			Yes		
410	Durham-Hillsboro-Lehigh	556.9	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
411	Goessel	257.0	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
412	Hoxie Community	320.0		Yes	Yes		
413	Chanute	1,768.5	Yes		Yes		Yes
415	Hiawatha	844.7	Yes		Yes		Yes
416	Louisburg	1,673.4			Yes	Yes	
417	Morris County	745.2			Yes	Yes	
418	McPherson	2,264.9		Yes	Yes	Yes	
419	Canton-Galva	372.5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
420	Osage City	647.6	Yes		Yes		
421	Lyndon	427.5	Yes		Yes		Yes
422	Kiowa County	242.5	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
423	Moundridge	413.5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
426	Pike Valley	235.0		Yes	Yes	Yes	
428	Great Bend	3,000.9			Yes	Yes	
429	Troy	350.0	Yes		Yes		Yes
430	South Brown County	566.5	Yes		Yes		Yes
431	Hoisington	636.3		Yes	Yes	Yes	
432	Victoria	249.5		Yes	Yes	Yes	
434	Santa Fe Trail	1,044.0	Yes		Yes		
435	Abilene	1,490.9		Yes	Yes	Yes	
436	Caney Valley	798.0	Yes		Yes		
437	Auburn Washburn	5,594.5			Yes		Yes
438	Skyline	367.5	Yes	Yes	Yes		
439	Sedgwick	524.1	Yes	Yes	Yes		
440	Halstead	747.0		Yes	Yes	Yes	
443	Dodge City	5,994.0	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
444	Little River	334.2		Yes	Yes	Yes	
445	Coffeyville	1,753.2	Yes		Yes		
446	Independence	1,886.4	Yes		Yes		Yes
447	Cherryvale-Thayer	786.1	Yes		Yes		
448	Inman	420.3		Yes	Yes	Yes	
449	Easton	669.8			Yes	Yes	
450	Shawnee Heights	3,457.5			Yes		
452	Stanton County	449.7	Yes	Yes	Yes		
453	Leavenworth	3,336.2			Yes	Yes	
454	Burlingame	311.2	Yes		Yes		



USD	USDName	2011-12 FTE Enr	Interlocal Member	Service Center Member	Received Services from service centers	Member Special Education Co-operative	Member Interactive Distance Learning Network
456	Marais des Cygnes Valley	280.5	Yes		Yes		
457	Garden City	6,969.8		Yes	Yes		
458	Basehor-Linwood	1,924.0			Yes	Yes	
459	Bucklin	243.3	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
460	Hesston	810.3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
461	Neodesha	709.5	Yes		Yes		
462	Central	331.9			Yes	Yes	Yes
463	Udall	365.5		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
464	Tonganoxie	1,803.3			Yes	Yes	
465	Winfield	2,290.0		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
466	Scott County	825.6	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
467	Leoti	399.1	Yes	Yes	Yes		
468	Healy	68.0		Yes	Yes		Yes
469	Lansing	2,534.8			Yes	Yes	
470	Arkansas City	2,601.8			Yes	Yes	
471	Dexter	153.0		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
473	Chapman	1,032.7		Yes	Yes	Yes	
474	Haviland	116.5	Yes	Yes	Yes		
475	Geary County Schools	7,599.5			Yes		
476	Copeland	116.4	Yes	Yes	Yes		
477	Ingalls	226.0	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
479	Crest	194.5	Yes		Yes		Yes
480	Liberal	4,431.0		Yes	Yes		
481	Rural Vista	357.0		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
482	Dighton	226.0	Yes	Yes	Yes		
483	Kismet-Plains	663.0	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
484	Fredonia	649.1	Yes		Yes		Yes
487	Herington	457.7	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
489	Hays	2,868.2			Yes	Yes	
490	El Dorado	1,873.0		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
491	Eudora	1,485.5	Yes		Yes		
492	Flinthills	256.8		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
493	Columbus	997.5	Yes		Yes		Yes
494	Syracuse	442.5	Yes	Yes	Yes		
495	Ft. Larned	902.0		Yes	Yes	Yes	
496	Pawnee Heights	108.5		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
497	Lawrence	9,715.0			Yes		Yes
498	Valley Heights	341.0			Yes	Yes	
499	Galena	780.2	Yes		Yes		Yes
500	Kansas City	18,589.4			Yes	Yes	
501	Topeka	12,994.1			Yes		
502	Lewis	99.0		Yes	Yes		
503	Parsons	1,186.7			Yes		
504	Oswego	465.5	Yes		Yes		
505	Chetopa-St. Paul	442.0	Yes		Yes		
506	Labette County	1,599.0	Yes		Yes		
507	Satanta	288.5	Yes	Yes	Yes		

USD	USDName	2011-12 FTE Enr	Interlocal Member	Service Center Member	Received Services from service centers	Member Special Education Co-operative	Member Interactive Distance Learning Network
508	Baxter Springs	955.5	Yes		Yes		
509	South Haven	200.5	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
511	Attica	149.0	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
512	Shawnee Mission	26,485.7			Yes		

<b>State Count Totals</b>	<b>286</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>286</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>109</b>
		<b>42.3%</b>	<b>66.4%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>37.8%</b>	<b>38.1%</b>

**School District Employees, 2002-2012**

Position	2001-2002	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2002-12	Percent	2009-12	Percent	2011-12	Percent
						Incl/Dec	Incl/Dec	Incl/Dec	Incl/Dec	Incl/Dec	Incl/Dec
<b>Instruction</b>											
<i>Certified:</i>											
Practical Arts/ Vocational Education Teachers	1,093.2	1,282.1	1,266.8	1,271.3	1,320.3	227.1	20.8%	38.2	3.0%	49.0	3.9%
Special Education Teachers	3,518.8	3,958.2	3,910.3	3,841.4	3,955.1	436.3	12.4%	-3.1	-0.1%	113.7	3.0%
Pre-Kindergarten Teachers	326.3	461.8	490.0	514.8	516.9	190.6	58.4%	55.1	11.9%	2.1	0.4%
Kindergarten Teachers	1,199.4	1,776.2	1,765.3	1,769.2	1,762.9	563.5	47.0%	-13.3	-0.7%	-6.3	-0.4%
Reading Specialists/Teachers	565.5	829.3	862.8	860.0	839.4	273.9	48.4%	10.1	1.2%	-20.6	-2.4%
Other Teachers	26,380.8	27,130.4	26,689.9	26,074.8	25,680.2	-700.6	-2.7%	-1,450.2	-5.3%	-394.6	-1.5%
TOTAL Instructional certified	33,084.0	35,438.0	34,985.1	34,331.5	34,074.8	990.8	3.0%	-1,363.2	-3.8%	-256.7	-0.7%
<i>Non-Certified:</i>											
Regular Education Teacher Aides	2,353.0	2,944.0	3,073.6	2,913.2	2,839.1	486.1	20.7%	-104.9	-3.6%	-74.1	-2.5%
Coaching Assistant	315.2	455.7	448.8	433.9	428.0	112.8	35.8%	-27.7	-6.1%	-5.9	-1.4%
Special Education Paraprofessionals	4,799.5	6,266.8	6,383.9	6,249.3	6,488.2	1,688.7	35.2%	221.4	3.5%	238.9	3.8%
Parents as Teachers	0.0	219.5	215.6	201.6	203.5	203.5		-16.0	-7.3%	1.9	0.9%
Total Instructional non-certified	7,467.7	9,886.0	10,121.9	9,798.0	9,958.8	2,491.1	33.4%	72.8	0.7%	160.8	1.6%
<b>TOTAL Instruction:</b>	40,551.7	45,324.0	45,107.0	44,129.5	44,033.6	3,481.9	8.6%	-1,290.4	-2.8%	-95.9	-0.2%
<b>Student Support</b>											
<i>Certified:</i>											
Directors/Supervisors of Health	14.3	11.6	8.1	8.0	8.5	-5.8	-40.6%	-3.1	-26.7%	0.5	6.3%
School Counselors	1,172.7	1,169.9	1,136.2	1,085.1	1,070.5	-102.2	-8.7%	-99.4	-8.5%	-14.6	-1.3%
Clinical/School Psychologists	369.3	387.0	395.3	386.7	398.8	29.5	8.0%	11.8	3.0%	12.1	3.1%
Nurses	446.0	530.9	556.8	576.6	593.1	147.1	33.0%	62.2	11.7%	16.5	2.9%
Speech Pathologists	518.3	559.7	590.0	601.1	621.5	103.2	19.9%	61.8	11.0%	20.4	3.4%
Audiologists	9.4	12.7	13.5	12.6	15.5	6.1	64.9%	2.8	22.0%	2.9	23.0%
Social Work Services	276.2	341.1	382.5	353.1	367.6	91.4	33.1%	26.5	7.8%	14.5	4.1%
Total Student Support certified	2,806.2	3,012.9	3,082.4	3,023.2	3,075.5	269.3	9.6%	62.6	2.1%	52.3	1.7%
<i>Non-Certified:</i>											
Attendance Services Staff	74.1	76.1	110.6	104.1	101.9	27.8	37.5%	25.8	33.9%	-2.2	-2.1%
LPN Nurses	170.6	170.4	123.5	116.8	84.9	-85.7	-50.2%	-85.5	-50.2%	-31.9	-27.3%
Social Services Staff	88.8	79.2	64.7	57.0	49.6	-39.2	-44.1%	-29.6	-37.4%	-7.4	-13.0%
Student Services Clerical Staff	544.1	521.2	517.6	511.3	469.8	-74.3	-13.7%	-51.4	-9.9%	-41.5	-8.1%
School Resource Officer	0.0	42.0	34.8	31.4	32.5	32.5		-9.5	-22.6%	1.1	3.5%
Total Student Support non-certified	877.6	888.9	851.2	820.6	738.7	-138.9	-15.8%	-150.2	-16.9%	-81.9	-10.0%
<b>TOTAL Student Support:</b>	3,683.8	3,901.8	3,933.6	3,843.8	3,814.2	130.4	3.5%	-87.6	-2.2%	-29.6	-0.8%
<b>Instructional Support</b>											
<i>Certified:</i>											
Directors/Supervisors of Special Education	113.5	120.8	121.3	105.8	113.8	0.3	0.3%	-7.0	-5.8%	8.0	7.6%
Directors/Supervisors of Vocational Education	23.3	13.9	13.0	11.4	12.3	-11.0	-47.2%	-1.6	-11.5%	0.9	7.9%
Instructional Coordinators/Supervisors	136.4	178.4	175.4	137.1	138.3	1.9	1.4%	-40.1	-22.5%	1.2	0.9%
Other Directors/Supervisors	192.4	202.1	202.3	185.7	170.0	-22.4	-11.6%	-32.1	-15.9%	-15.7	-8.5%
Other Curriculum Specialist	121.0	164.8	149.3	171.8	165.0	44.0	36.4%	0.2	0.1%	-6.8	-4.0%
Library Media Specialist	974.9	903.1	859.9	809.0	767.2	-207.7	-21.3%	-135.9	-15.0%	-41.8	-5.2%
Total Instructional Support certified:	1,561.5	1,583.1	1,521.2	1,420.8	1,366.6	-194.9	-12.5%	-216.5	-13.7%	-54.2	-3.8%
<i>Non-Certified:</i>											
Other Directors/Coordinators/Supervisors	246.4	184.6	161.6	165.4	160.6	-85.8	-34.8%	-24.0	-13.0%	-4.8	-2.9%
Library Media Aides	589.4	615.4	538.5	521.6	501.2	-88.2	-15.0%	-114.2	-18.6%	-20.4	-3.9%
Technology Director	0.0	203.0	188.0	189.5	192.8	192.8		-10.2	-5.0%	3.3	1.7%
Other Technology Personnel	0.0	719.9	723.6	696.3	687.9	687.9		-32.0	-4.4%	-8.4	-1.2%
Total Instructional Support non-certified:	835.8	1,722.9	1,611.7	1,572.8	1,542.5	706.7	84.6%	-180.4	-10.5%	-30.3	-1.9%
<b>TOTAL Instructional Support:</b>	2,397.3	3,306.0	3,132.9	2,993.6	2,909.1	511.8	21.3%	-396.9	-12.0%	-84.5	-2.8%

Position	2001-2002	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2002-12 Inc/Dec	Percent Change	2009-12 Inc/Dec	Percent Change	2011-12 Inc/Dec	Percent Change
<b>General Administration</b>											
<i>Certified:</i>											
Superintendents	278.0	264.9	263.5	255.6	253.2	-24.8	-8.9%	-11.7	-4.4%	-2.4	-0.9%
Associate/Assistant Superintendents	101.0	91.0	89.7	91.3	90.0	-20.8%	-20.8%	-11.0	-12.1%	-11.3	-12.4%
Administrative Assistants	40.0	62.5	58.4	52.3	62.6	22.6	56.5%	0.1	0.2%	10.3	19.7%
Total General Administration certified:	419.0	418.4	411.6	399.2	395.8	-23.2	-5.5%	-22.6	-5.4%	-3.4	-0.9%
<i>Non-certified:</i>											
Assistant Superintendents	7.0	4.4	5.4	5.4	7.4	0.4	5.7%	3.0	68.2%	2.0	37.0%
Central Administration Clerical Staff	905.2	826.8	795.1	754.1	700.1	-205.1	-22.7%	-126.7	-15.3%	-54.0	-7.2%
Total Non-Certified General Administration:	912.2	831.2	800.5	759.5	707.5	-204.7	-22.4%	-123.7	-14.9%	-52.0	-6.8%
<b>TOTAL General Administration:</b>	<b>1,331.2</b>	<b>1,249.6</b>	<b>1,212.1</b>	<b>1,158.7</b>	<b>1,103.3</b>	<b>-227.9</b>	<b>-17.1%</b>	<b>-146.3</b>	<b>-11.7%</b>	<b>-55.4</b>	<b>-4.8%</b>
<b>School Administration</b>											
<i>Certified:</i>											
Principals	1,273.9	1,248.7	1,242.3	1,212.9	1,184.8	-89.0	-7.0%	-63.9	-5.1%	-28.1	-2.9%
Assistant Principals	480.5	543.7	529.5	534.0	518.5	38.0	7.9%	-25.2	-4.6%	-15.5	-2.9%
Total School Administration certified	1,754.3	1,792.4	1,771.8	1,746.9	1,703.3	-51.0	-2.9%	-89.1	-5.0%	-43.6	-2.5%
<i>Non-Certified:</i>											
School Administration Clerical Staff	2,201.9	2,194.3	2,162.3	2,052.4	2,101.0	-100.9	-4.6%	-93.3	-4.3%	48.6	2.4%
<b>TOTAL School Administration:</b>	<b>3,956.2</b>	<b>3,986.7</b>	<b>3,934.1</b>	<b>3,799.3</b>	<b>3,804.3</b>	<b>-151.9</b>	<b>-3.8%</b>	<b>-182.4</b>	<b>-4.6%</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>0.1%</b>
<b>Other Support Services</b>											
<i>Non-certified:</i>											
Business Managers	71.7	94.2	95.6	99.4	105.2	33.5	46.7%	11.0	11.7%	5.8	5.8%
Business Directors/Coordinators/ Supervisors	96.2	104.5	100.6	93.4	100.8	4.6	4.8%	-3.7	-3.5%	7.4	7.9%
Other Business Personnel	555.9	464.8	443.0	459.8	442.9	-113.0	-20.3%	-21.9	-4.7%	-16.9	-3.7%
<b>Total Other Support Services:</b>	<b>723.8</b>	<b>663.5</b>	<b>639.2</b>	<b>652.6</b>	<b>648.9</b>	<b>-74.9</b>	<b>-10.3%</b>	<b>-14.6</b>	<b>-2.2%</b>	<b>-3.7</b>	<b>-0.6%</b>
<b>Operations and Maintenance</b>											
<i>Non-certified:</i>											
Maintenance and Operation Directors/Coordinators/Supervisors	335.2	394.2	397.9	377.1	399.4	4.2	1.3%	-54.8	-13.9%	-37.7	-10.0%
Other Maintenance and Operation Personnel	5,275.9	5,148.6	5,044.7	4,910.1	4,874.9	-401.0	-7.6%	-273.7	-5.3%	-35.2	-0.7%
Security Officers	224.8	157.0	158.5	153.7	156.5	-68.3	-30.4%	-0.5	-0.3%	2.8	1.8%
<b>Total Operations and Maintenance:</b>	<b>5,835.9</b>	<b>5,699.8</b>	<b>5,601.1</b>	<b>5,440.9</b>	<b>5,370.8</b>	<b>-465.1</b>	<b>-8.0%</b>	<b>-329.0</b>	<b>-5.8%</b>	<b>-70.1</b>	<b>-1.3%</b>
<b>Transportation</b>											
<i>Non-certified:</i>											
Transportation Directors/Coordinators/Supervisors	156.5	166.6	172.0	159.9	156.0	-0.5	-0.3%	-10.6	-6.4%	-3.9	-2.4%
Other Transportation Personnel	1,688.4	1,717.6	1,741.1	1,712.6	1,742.9	54.5	3.2%	25.3	1.5%	30.3	1.8%
<b>Total Transportation:</b>	<b>1,844.9</b>	<b>1,884.2</b>	<b>1,913.1</b>	<b>1,872.5</b>	<b>1,898.9</b>	<b>54.0</b>	<b>2.9%</b>	<b>14.7</b>	<b>0.8%</b>	<b>26.4</b>	<b>1.4%</b>
<b>Food Service</b>											
<i>Non-certified:</i>											
Food Service Directors/Coordinators/Supervisors	292.5	311.4	314.1	273.5	257.2	-35.3	-12.1%	-54.2	-17.4%	-16.3	-6.0%
Other Food Service Personnel	3,218.3	3,139.1	3,020.7	2,984.1	2,978.8	-239.5	-7.4%	-160.3	-5.1%	-5.3	-0.2%
<b>Total Food Service:</b>	<b>3,510.8</b>	<b>3,450.5</b>	<b>3,334.8</b>	<b>3,257.6</b>	<b>3,236.0</b>	<b>-274.8</b>	<b>-7.8%</b>	<b>-214.5</b>	<b>-6.2%</b>	<b>-21.6</b>	<b>-0.7%</b>
<b>Others (Uncategorized)</b>											
<i>Certified:</i>											
Others	340.1	292.7	293.6	327.8	354.5	14.4	4.2%	61.8	21.1%	26.7	8.1%
<i>Non-certified:</i>											
Others	979.7	650.6	745.6	710.5	686.4	-293.3	-29.9%	35.8	5.5%	-24.1	-3.4%
<b>TOTAL Others:</b>	<b>1,319.8</b>	<b>943.3</b>	<b>1,039.2</b>	<b>1,038.3</b>	<b>1,040.9</b>	<b>-278.9</b>	<b>-21.1%</b>	<b>97.6</b>	<b>10.3%</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>0.3%</b>
<b>TOTAL Teachers:</b>	<b>33,084.0</b>	<b>35,438.0</b>	<b>34,985.1</b>	<b>34,331.5</b>	<b>34,074.8</b>	<b>990.8</b>	<b>3.0%</b>	<b>-1,363.2</b>	<b>-3.8%</b>	<b>-256.7</b>	<b>-0.7%</b>

11-36

