### Administration

#### **Consequences of Not Funding this Program**

The ability of KSDE to do the following would either be diminished or eliminated: process/audit state and federal aid payments to school districts; license teachers; accredit school districts; accredit teacher preparation programs; collect data from school districts; respond to requests for information from the Legislature and Governor; follow federal and state regulations for procurement; recruit and hire staff; comply with federal and state employment laws; and communicate to all public and nonpublic schools in Kansas.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific –KSA 72-5170 (school district accreditation) –KSA 72-1250–2167 (teacher	Mandatory	No	8
Specific –KSA 72-5131–5176 (audit state aid payments)	Mandatory	No	8
Specific –KSA 72-1167 (USD budgets) –KSA 72-5131–5176 (process state	Mandatory	No	8
General –Uniform Grant Guidance –State purchasing regulations	Discretionary	No	8
General –KSA 72-1167 (post USD budgets) –KSA 72-2171 (USD accountability	Discretionary	No	8
Specific –National and Community Service Act of 1990	Discretionary	Yes	8

#### **Program Goals**

A. Access and distribute state and federal revenues to local education agencies and other qualifying organizations.

B. To verify the fiscal accountability of all USDs, special education interlocals, cooperatives, service centers, child care centers, and non-C. Ensure Kansas educators are qualified and prepared to improve the learning of Kansas students.

D. To ensure that all educational systems in Kansas achieve Kansas Education Systems Accreditation (FY 2018 was the first year of E. Continue the development and ehancement of web-based applications for seamless communication and exchange of information

with customers and funding agencies.

Federal Funds

Kansas State Department of Education

-Serve America Act of 2002

F. Utilize federal SLDS grant to maximize standardization of data, increase interoperability of systems and modernize overall P20W

Program History

This program provides legal, human resource, communication, school finance, accounting, budgeting, purchasing, auditing, information technology, research, and legislative services to the entire agency. Additionally, it oversees the licensing of educators and accreditation of education systems in Kansas. These services have long existed in the Kansas State Department of Education and its predecessor agencies. However, certain services have become more important over time. In particular, information technology services have increased in importance as KSDE collects more data and operates more web-based applications.

Performance Measures											
Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	3- yr. Avg.	FY 2022	FY 2023				
1. Deployment of a statewide student information system or comparable platform	F	N/A	2%	5%	3.5%	25%	75%				
2. Percent of assignments filled by fully licensed educators	С	90.0%	95.0%	95.0%	93.3%	95.0%	95.0%				
3. Total amount of state aid savings generated by KSDE fiscal auditing	В	\$ 17,760,541	\$ 18,645,980	\$ 22,562,435	\$ 19,656,319	\$ 17,000,000	\$ 17,000,000				
Output Measures											
4. Number of state and federal aid payments distributed	A	507	432	450	463	440	440				
5. Total number of licenses issued per year	С	20,323	20,570	24,551	21,815	22,000	22,000				
Additional Measures as Necessary											
6. Number of accredited systems in Kansas under KESA (cumulative)	D	28	51	79	53	173	360				
<ol> <li>Percent of educator program standards that have completed the comprehensive revision process and have been approved by KSBE</li> </ol>	С	76.0%	75.0%	77.5%	76.2%	80.0%	90.0%				
8. Number of new teachers being supported by multi-year approved mentoring support	С	4,841	4,513	4,829	4,728	4,500	4,500				
9. Number of web-enabled applications maintained by KSDE	E	90	93	95	93	97	99				
	•	Fu	Inding								
Funding Source		FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023				
State General Fund		\$ 8,674,274	\$ 9,334,290	\$ 9,553,581	\$ 9,601,123	\$ 9,305,274	\$ 9,312,303				
Non-SGF State Funds		3,203,965	3,541,452	3,099,344	2,819,299	4,239,135	6,818,449				

3,043,286

3,502,336

3,205,477

\$ 14,921,525 \$ 16,378,078 \$ 15,858,402 \$ 16,182,935 \$ 19,380,204

3,762,513

5,835,795

Total

5,455,146

\$ 21 585 898

# Governance of Education

		Consequence	s of Not Fundir	ng this Program	n							
The constitutionally proscribed State State's K-12 educational interests.	Board	of Education wo	ould not be able t	o carry out its d	uties to provide	general supervis	sion of the					
Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary		MOE / Match Rqt.		Priority Level						
Specific KSA 72-243-72-263	- ī	Mandatory	N	lo	-	7						
			Program Goals	5								
A. Kansas leads the world in the suc B. Provide an effective educator in e C. Develop active communication an	very cl	assroom.	ilies, communitie	es, business sta	ikeholders, cons	stituents, and pol	icy partners.					
			Program Histor	у								
each representing a district comprise schedule. Every other year, the State Commissioner of Education who ser position of the Kansas State Superin	e Board ves as	d reorganizes to its executive dire at of Public Instru	elect a chairman ector. The Kansa iction effective Ja	and vice-chain as State Board o anuary 14, 1969	man. The State of Education wa	Board appoints a	a					
Performance Measures												
Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	3- yr. Avg.	FY 2022	FY 2023					
1. Five-year postsecondary effectiveness rate	A	48	48.3	48.3	48.2	50	52					
2. Percent of assignments filled by fully licensed educators	В	90.0%	95.0%	95.0%	93.3%	95.0%	95.0%					
Output Measures           4. Total number of licenses issued per year	в	20,323	20,570	24,551	21,815	22,000	22,000					
5. Statewide dropout rate Additional Measures as Necessary	А	1.4	1.3	N/A	1.35	1.4	1.0					
6. Percent of educator program standards that have completed the comprehensive revision process and have been approved by KSBE	В	76.0%	75.0%	77.5%	76.2%	80.0%	90.0%					
7. Number of educator vacancies reported by USDs	В	540	648	839	675.7	700	700					
8. HS graduation rate	А	87.5	88.3	88.1	88.0	90	91					
<ul><li>9. Percent of students scoring in levels</li><li>3 &amp; 4 on the ELA assessment</li></ul>	A	36.6	N/A	35.2	35.9	37	38.5					
<ol> <li>Percent of students scoring in levels</li> <li>&amp; 4 on the math assessment</li> </ol>	A	32.6	N/A	27.9	30.3	33	34.5					
11. Percent of students scoring in levels 3 & 4 on the science assessment	A	35.6	N/A	34.5	35.03	36	37.5					

Funding									
Funding Source			FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	
State General Fund		\$	360,691 \$	373,290 \$	333,852 \$	351,585 \$	405,838 \$	426,749	
	Total	\$	360,691 \$	373,290 \$	333,852 \$	351,585 \$	405,838 \$	426,749	

Failure to fund the Child Nutrition and Wellness program would be the loss of approximately \$200 million in annual federal funding for school nutrition programs. As a result, children who depend on school nutrition programs for meals would no longer have access to free or reduced price meals.

Statutory Basis	Discretionary								Priority Level			
Specific -42 USC 1751-1761,         Mandatory         Yes         5           1762a, 1765, 1766, 1772,         1773, 1776, 1779         -KSA 72-17,132 –         17,148         5												
				Program	Go	oals						
<ul> <li>A. Sponsors provide participant</li> <li>B. Sponsors comply with federa and snacks served.</li> </ul>				-	ien	t and effective	pr	ograms; and r	ece	eive reimburse	eme	ent for meals
C. Sponsors increase participar	nts' av	wareness of the l	ben	efits of choos	ing	nutritious foo	ds.					
				Program I								
The Child Nutrition and Wellness health food to children including and several others. The Nationa permanent in 1975, with other p	the l al Sch	National School	Lun am	ch Program, S was authorize	Sch ed	nool Breakfast in 1946 and th	Pr ie S	ogram, Child a School Breakfa	and ast	l Adult Care F Program was	ooc ma	l Program, ide
federal law.												
Performance Measures												
Outcome Measures 1. Percent of programs that follow	Goal	<u>FY 2019</u> 99.8%	1	FY 2020 99.6%	FY 2021			<u>3- yr. Avg.</u> 99.6%		FY 2022 99.0%		FY 2023 99.0%
federal regulations and guidance	Б	99.0%		99.0%		99.3%		99.0%		99.0%		99.0%
2. Number of meals/snacks served to participants in Child Nutrition Programs	A	102,065,303		87,060,622		83,177,067		90,767,664		103,184,608		104,216,456
3. Average reimbursement for each meal/snack served	В	\$ 1.87	\$	2.16	\$	3.11	\$	2.38	\$	2.62	\$	1.87
Output Measures 4. Percent of sponsors that had an administrative review and procurement review conducted by KSDE	В	50.3%		38.0%		31.3%		39.9%		30.0%		30.0%
5. Amount of reimbursement processed through KSDE's KN- CLAIM application	A	\$ 190,936,443	\$	188,014,837	\$	258,329,047	\$	212,426,776	\$	270,000,000	\$	194,774,266
Additional Measures as Necessary 6. Percent of KS elementary students who participated in the Body Venture health education exhibit	С	8.5%		6.4%		0.0%		5.0%		10.0%		10.0%
7. Number of Body Venture site visits	с	78		52		-		43.3		100		100
	-		_	Fundi	ng		_		_		_	
Funding Source		FY 2018	ć	FY 2019	<i>.</i>	FY 2020	ć	FY 2021	ć	FY 2022	ć	FY 2023
State General Fund		\$ 320,351	\$	323,526	\$	328,760	\$	333,870	\$	321,218	\$	331,875
Non-SGF State Funds		367,908	ļ	267,479		264,789		27,548		65,750		16,500
Federal Funds Total		3,363,284 \$ 4,051,543	¢	3,129,992 3,720,997		3,170,794 3,764,343		3,005,672 3,367,090	¢	3,247,087 3,634,055		2,774,618 3,122,993

## Standards and Assessments

KSDE could not develop and implen	Consequences of Not Funding this Program											
KSDE could not develop and implement the state assessments and academic standards required by both state and federal law.												
Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs.		MOE/Match			ority					
Specific –Every Student Succeeds Act	-	Discretionary Mandatory	-	Rqt. No			vel 3					
-KSA 72-5170(b) -KSA 72-5170(c		Manualory	'	NO			5					
Program Goals												
A. Provide the resources educators need to ensure that Kansas graduates have the academic and cognitive preparations, technical and employability skills, and civic engagement experiences to be successful in (1) postsecondary education, (2) the attainment of an industry-recognized certification, or (3) the workforce, without the need for remediation.												
			Program Histo	ry								
<ul> <li>State: In the 1980s, a state minimum competency law existed that required all schools in Kansas to participate in a minimum competency testing program in reading and mathematics developed by the University of Kansas. Beginning in 1992, the state law has required the State Board of Education to establish curriculum standards for mathematics, science, ready, writing, and social studies and to develop statewide assessments in those core subjects. State assessments must be administered at three grade levels, as determined by the State Board of Education.</li> <li>Federal: The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) was originally pased as part of President Lyndon Johnson's broader anti-poverty initiative. The Improving America's Schools Act (IASA) attempted to coordinate federal resources and policies with the pre-existing efforts at the state and local levels to improve instructions for all students. This included adding math and reading/language arts standards to be used to assess student progress and provide accountability. In 2002, No Child Left Behind (NCLB) required states to test students in reading and mathematics annually in grades 3-8 and once in grades 10-12. It also required assessments during grades 3-5, 6-9, and 10-12 for science. Individual schools, school districts, and state were required to report overall test results and also scores for specific subgroups (i.e., low-income students, students with disabilities, English-language learners, and major racial and ethnic groups). In 2015, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) retained the testing schedule of NCLB but also required states to establish ambitious long-term goals for measurements of interim progress for all students and subgroups of students on state assessments, graduation rates, and English language proficiency for English-language learners. ESSA also requires comprehensive supports for the lowest performing 5% of Title I schools and targeted support for schools with</li> </ul>												
consistently underperforming subgro	oups.		est performing :	5% of Title I s	chools and tarę	geted support fo	or schools with					
consistently underperforming subgro	oups.				chools and tar	geted support fo	or schools with					
		Pei	formance Mea	sures								
Outcome Measures	Goal	Per FY 2019	formance Mea	sures FY 2021	3- yr. Avg.	FY 2022	FY 2023					
Outcome Measures 1. Five-year postsecondary		Pei	formance Mea	sures								
Outcome Measures	Goal	Per FY 2019	formance Mea	sures FY 2021	3- yr. Avg.	FY 2022	FY 2023					
Outcome Measures 1. Five-year postsecondary effectiveness rate	Goal A	Per FY 2019 48.0%	formance Mea FY 2020 48.3%	<b>sures</b> FY 2021 48.3%	<u>3- yr. Avg.</u> 48.2%	FY 2022 50.0%	FY 2023 52.0%					
Outcome Measures           1. Five-year postsecondary           effectiveness rate           2. Five-year postsecondary success           3. SGF cost per assessment           administered           4. Total cost per assessment           administered	Goal A A	Per FY 2019 48.0% 55.0%	formance Meas FY 2020 48.3% 55.9%	sures FY 2021 48.3% 55.7%	3- yr. Avg. 48.2% 55.5%	FY 2022 50.0% 58.0%	<i>FY 2023</i> 52.0% 60.0%					
Outcome Measures           1. Five-year postsecondary           effectiveness rate           2. Five-year postsecondary success           3. SGF cost per assessment           administered           4. Total cost per assessment	Goal A A A	Per FY 2019 48.0% 55.0% \$ 1.20	formance Meas FY 2020 48.3% 55.9% N/A	SURES FY 2021 48.3% 55.7% \$1.39	3- yr. Avg. 48.2% 55.5% \$ 1.30	FY 2022 50.0% 58.0% \$ 1.17	<i>FY 2023</i> 52.0% 60.0% \$ 1.12					
Outcome Measures           1. Five-year postsecondary           effectiveness rate           2. Five-year postsecondary success           3. SGF cost per assessment           administered           4. Total cost per assessment           administered <b>Output Measures</b> 4. Number of ELA, math, and science	Goal A A A A A	Per FY 2019 48.0% 55.0% \$ 1.20 \$ 5.13	formance Meas FY 2020 48.3% 55.9% N/A N/A	SURES FY 2021 48.3% 55.7% \$1.39 \$5.97	<u>3- yr. Avg.</u> 48.2% 55.5% \$ 1.30 \$ 5.24	FY 2022 50.0% 58.0% \$ 1.17 \$ 5.08	FY 2023 52.0% 60.0% \$ 1.12 \$ 4.78					
Outcome Measures           1. Five-year postsecondary           effectiveness rate           2. Five-year postsecondary success           3. SGF cost per assessment           administered           4. Total cost per assessment           administered           4. Number of ELA, math, and science           assessments administered           5. Total number of state interim           assessments administered (regular and	Goal A A A A A	Per FY 2019 48.0% 55.0% \$ 1.20 \$ 5.13 603,133	formance Meas FY 2020 48.3% 55.9% N/A N/A	SURES FY 2021 48.3% 55.7% \$1.39 \$5.97 487,388	3- yr. Avg. 48.2% 55.5% \$ 1.30 \$ 5.24 545,261 542,692	FY 2022 50.0% 58.0% \$ 1.17 \$ 5.08 605,000	FY 2023 52.0% 60.0% \$ 1.12 \$ 4.78 605,000					
Outcome Measures           1. Five-year postsecondary           effectiveness rate           2. Five-year postsecondary success           3. SGF cost per assessment           administered           4. Total cost per assessment           administered           4. Number of ELA, math, and science           assessments administered           5. Total number of state interim           assessments administered (regular and           predictive)           Additional Measures as Necessary           6. Percent of students scoring in levels           3 & 4 of the ELA assessment	Goal A A A A A	Per FY 2019 48.0% 55.0% \$ 1.20 \$ 5.13 603,133 565,382 36.6%	formance Meas FY 2020 48.3% 55.9% N/A N/A N/A 544,540 N/A	sures FY 2021 48.3% 55.7% \$1.39 \$5.97 487,388 518,155 35.20%	3- yr. Avg. 48.2% 55.5% \$ 1.30 \$ 5.24 545,261 542,692 35.9%	FY 2022 50.0% \$ 58.0% \$ 1.17 \$ 5.08 605,000 575,000 37.0%	FY 2023 52.0% 60.0% \$ 1.12 \$ 4.78 605,000 650,000 650,000					
Outcome Measures           1. Five-year postsecondary           effectiveness rate           2. Five-year postsecondary success           3. SGF cost per assessment           administered           4. Total cost per assessment           administered           4. Total cost per assessment           administered           5. Total number of ELA, math, and science           assessments administered           5. Total number of state interim           assessments administered (regular and           predictive)           Additional Measures as Necessary           6. Percent of students scoring in levels           3 & 4 of the ELA assessment           7. Percent of students scoring in levels           3 & 4 of the math assessment	Goal A A A A A A	Per FY 2019 48.0% 55.0% \$ 1.20 \$ 5.13 603,133 565,382 36.6% 32.6%	formance Meas FY 2020 48.3% 55.9% N/A N/A N/A 544,540 N/A N/A	Sures FY 2021 48.3% 55.7% \$1.39 \$5.97 487,388 518,155 35.20% 27.90%	3- yr. Avg. 48.2% 55.5% \$ 1.30 \$ 5.24 545,261 542,692 35.9% 30.3%	FY 2022 50.0% \$ 1.17 \$ 5.08 605,000 575,000 37.0% 33.0%	FY 2023 52.0% 60.0% \$ 1.12 \$ 4.78 605,000 650,000 650,000 38.5% 34.5%					
Outcome Measures           1. Five-year postsecondary           effectiveness rate           2. Five-year postsecondary success           3. SGF cost per assessment           administered           4. Total cost per assessment           administered           4. Number of ELA, math, and science           assessments administered           5. Total number of state interim           assessments administered (regular and           predictive)           Additional Measures as Necessary           6. Percent of students scoring in levels           3 & 4 of the ELA assessment           7. Percent of students scoring in levels	Goal A A A A A	Per FY 2019 48.0% 55.0% \$ 1.20 \$ 5.13 603,133 565,382 36.6%	formance Meas FY 2020 48.3% 55.9% N/A N/A N/A 544,540 N/A	sures FY 2021 48.3% 55.7% \$1.39 \$5.97 487,388 518,155 35.20%	3- yr. Avg. 48.2% 55.5% \$ 1.30 \$ 5.24 545,261 542,692 35.9%	FY 2022 50.0% \$ 58.0% \$ 1.17 \$ 5.08 605,000 575,000 37.0%	FY 2023 52.0% 60.0% \$ 1.12 \$ 4.78 605,000 650,000 650,000					

	00.07	v
Fun	Iding	

Funding Source		FY 2018	I	FY 2019		FY 2020		FY 2021		FY 2022		FY 2023
State General Fund	\$	2,501,317	\$	2,609,381	\$	2,657,697	\$	2,626,987	\$	2,864,142	\$	2,949,148
Non-SGF State Funds		389,288		388,528		328,647		30,103		287,047		280,112
Federal Funds		7,058,537		7,255,704		6,949,124		6,707,998		6,552,624		6,369,303
Total	\$	9,949,142	\$	10,253,613	\$	9,935,468	\$	9,365,088	\$	9,703,813	\$	9,598,563

### **Special Education Services**

**Consequences of Not Funding this Program** Failure to fund the Special Education Services program will diminish the amount of support and assistance KSDE can provide to students in special education programs throughout Kansas. Additionally, failure by the State to provide necessary services opens up the State to legal consequences, including court orders and the loss of federal funding.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific –Individuals with Disabilities Education Act –KSA 72-3403, et seq.	Mandatory	Yes	2

**Program Goals** 

A. Provide leadership, technical assistance, and financial support to local education agencies to ensure high-quality special education programs and success for all students with disabilities.

B. To support local agencies providing early learning opportunities and to collaboratively strengthen early childhood services in Kansas so that each student enters kindergarten at age five socially, emotionally, and academically prepared for success.

C. Assist local education agencies in employing highly-qualified teachers, administrators, and support staff.

Program History

A special education division was created in the State Department of Public Instruction (the predecessor to KSDE) in 1949. The first appropriations for financing special education classes were made in 1951. In 1975, Congress passed the Education for all Handicapped Children Act (EHA) in order to ensure that all students with disabilities have access to a free and appropriate education. In addition, financial assistance to state was authorized to allow compliance with the new law. Congress has periodically updated and reauthorized the law to improve the structure of supports and accountability. In 1990, the EHA was reauthorized and the title changed to the Individuals with Disabilites Education Act (IDEA). The most recent reauthorization of the IDEA was in 2004. The Kansas Special Education for Exceptional Children Act was passed in 1974. The state law largely mirrors the IDEA, but also includes gifted students and children enrolled in private schools as students eligible to receive a free and appropriate public education.

This program also oversees all early childhood education programs administered by KSDE

	Performance Measures										
Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	3- yr. Avg.	FY 2022	FY 2023				
1. Percent of students with disabilities enrolled in	A	73.0%	75.0%	75.6%	74.5%	73.4%	73.6%				
higher education or some other postsecondary											
education or training program, or employed within											
2. Percent of preschool-aged children aged 3 through	в	89.7%	89.1%	89.7%	89.5%	86.5%	86.5%				
5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved acquisition											
and use of knowledge and skills (including early											
Output Measures											
3. Number of technical assistance and training events	A	439	438	591	489	600	605				
sponsored by TASN to improve student performance											
4. Number of USDs with approved preschool-aged at-	в	215	226	244	228	255	260				
risk programs											
Additional Measures as Necessary											
5. Percent of students with disabilities scoring in	A										
levels 3 & 4 on the reading assessment (by grade)											
4th Grade		20.5%	N/A	22.8%	20.5%	20.5%	22.0%				
8th Grade		7.3%	N/A	7.6%	7.3%	7.5%	9.0%				
High School		7.0%	N/A	6.7%	7.0%	7.0%	8.5%				
0	A										
levels 3 & 4 on the math assessment (by grade)											
4th Grade		14.5%	N/A	13.5%	14.5%	14.5%	16.0%				
8th Grade	_	5.7%	N/A	5.1%	5.7%	6.5%	7.5%				
High School	_	4.5%	N/A	4.0%	4.5%	5.5%	6.0%				
0 0	A	77.5%	78.4%	80.0%	78.6%	80.5%	81.0%				
from high school											
5	С	257	215	144	205	280	300				
Kansas Education Employment Board											
-	В	22,588	23,421	21,544	22,518	22,900	25,100				
public school districts	_										
	A	9,968	7,917	14,429	10,771	15,100	15,200				
performance technical assistance and training events											
sponsored by TASN											
11. Number of agencies participating in students	A	335	317	348	333	355	375				
performance technical assistance and training events											
sponsored by TASN											
		Fund	ling								
Funding Source		FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023				
State General Fund	9	519 198	\$ 508 062	\$ 601 749	\$ 547 422	\$ 577 425	\$ 581 762				

Funding Source	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023
State General Fund	\$ 519,198	\$ 508,062	\$ 601,749	\$ 547,422	\$ 577,425	\$ 581,762
Non-SGF State Funds	56,878	24,337	11,704	4,246	15,547	32,458
Federal Funds	13,540,923	13,872,165	17,155,328	17,509,406	12,056,019	16,736,378
Total	\$14,116,999	\$14,404,564	\$17,768,781	\$18,061,074	\$ 12,648,991	\$17,350,598

### **Title Programs and Services**

**Consequences of Not Funding this Program** 

Reductions or elimination in funding will significantly reduce supplemental supports and assistance to Kansas students, including to subgroups identified as at-risk.						
Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level			
Specific Elementary and Secondary Education Act (20 USC 6301, et seq.)	Mandatory	No	4			

**Program Goals** 

A. Provide leadership, technical assistance, and financial support to local education agencies to ensure the success of all at-risk and special population students.

Program History

Congress passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) in 1965 to provide supplemental assistance to local school districts to support the academic success of low-income children (Title I, Part A). Since enactment, the ESEA has been expanded to include a variety of other at-risk students, including English-language learners (Title III, Part A), students in rural areas (Title IV, Part B), migrant students (Title I, Part C), and neglected and delinquent youth (Title I, Part D). Additionally, ESEA provides funds to train and recruit high-quality teachers (Title II, Part A), funds Student Support and Enrichment Grants (Title IV, Part A), and funds 21st Century Community Learning Grants (Title IV, Part B). All of this federal grant funding is expended through KSDE's Financial Aid program, but the grants are administered by the Title Programs and Services program.

Performance Measures									
Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	3- yr. Avg.	FY 2022	FY 2023		
1. Percent of economically disadvantaged									
students scoring in levels 3 & 4 on state									
assessments:									
English language arts	_	22.9%	N/A	21.1%	22.9%	23.0%	24.5%		
Math	_	19.3%	N/A	14.8%	19.3%	19.5%	21.0%		
2. Percent of English-language learner students									
scoring in levels 3 & 4 on state assessments:									
English language arts	_	7.5%	N/A	6.00%	7.5%	7.50%	9.00%		
Math	_	9.4%	N/A	6.2%	9.4%	9.5%	11.0%		
Output Measures	-	4 000	0.440	0.050	0.400	0,400	0.450		
4. Number of technical assistance resources for teachers made available through TASN		1,829	2,146	2,353	2,109	2,400	2,450		
6	_								
5. Number of contacts made by TASN staff to		1,632	1,570	1,779	1,660	1,800	1,900		
local agencies and school districts with the									
purpose of assisting in improving student academic performance									
•									
Additional Measures as Necessary									
6. Percent of migrant students scoring in levels									
3 & 4 on state assessments:									
English language arts	_	13.2%	N/A	13.6%	13.2%	13.5%	15.0%		
Math	_	11.5%	N/A	9.1%	11.5%	12.0%	13.0%		
7. Percent of homeless students scoring in									
levels 3 & 4 on state assessments:		47.40/	<b>N</b> 1/A	10.40	47 40/	47 50/	10.000		
English language arts Math	-	17.4% 13.8%	N/A N/A	18.4% 11.0%	17.4%	17.5% 14.0%	19.0%		
	-	13.8%	N/A	11.0%	13.8%	14.0%	15.5%		
<ol> <li>Percent of students who graduate from high school:</li> </ol>									
English learners		82.6%	83.7%	82.6%	83.2%	85.5%	86.0%		
Economically disadvantaged	-	80.2%	81.2%	81.0%	80.7%	82.5%	83.0%		
Migrant	-	79.4%	78.3%	81.4%	78.9%	83.5%	84.0%		
Homeless	-	67.1%	68.3%	68.8%	67.7%	71.5%	72.0%		
Tomeless		-	Funding	00.0%	07.7%	71.3%	72.0%		
Euroding Source			FY 2019	FY 2020	EV 2021	EV 2022	EV 2022		
Funding Source State General Fund		FY 2018 \$ 44,867			FY 2021 \$ 43,825	FY 2022 \$ 48,634	FY 2023 \$ 50,019		
Non-SGF State Funds		\$ 44,867 11.785	\$ 45,915 4.301	<del>م 48,769</del> 4.875	<del>م 43,825</del> 850	<u></u>	<u>\$ 50,019</u> 1.442		
Federal Funds				·····			·····		
Total		3,362,404 \$3,419,056	4,050,808 \$ 4,101,024	8,960,749 \$9,014,393	4,154,985 \$ 4,199,660	, ,	9,337,073 \$9,388,534		
Iotai		φ 3,419,000	φ 4,101,024	φ 9,014,393	φ 4,199,000	φ 4,210,795	φ 9,300,334		

### **Career and Technical Education**

Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Not funding the Career and Technical Education program would limit the amount of CTE courses available to students in Kansas middle and high schools, which would make Kansas graduate less prepared to enter a highly technical labor market. Additionally, eliminating or reducing State funding would place federal funding at risk.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific –Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act (20 USC 2301, et seq.) –KSA 72-3810, et seq.	Mandatory	Yes	6

#### **Program Goals**

A. Provide technical assistance and support to local school districts to ensure every middle school and high school student has an Individual Plan of Study in place and is engaged in a quality career pathway leading to success in postsecondary education or in the workforce.

#### **Program History**

In 1917, Congress enacted the Smith-Hughes Act which authorized federal funds for the establishment and support of secondary and postsecondary vacational training in agriculture, home economics, and trade and industry. The 1985 Carl D. Perkins Vocational eDucation Act aimed to expan, improve, modernize, and develop quality vocational education programs to meet the needs of the workforce and promote economic growth, as well as meet the needs of specific populations, including handicapped and disadvantaged individuals. The Perkins Act was reauthorized in 2018 and now allows school districts to use federal funds to provide all students, not just those enrolled in CTE courses, career exploration and development activities. Since July 1, 2004, the Kansas Board of Regents has served as the lead agency for the Perkins Grant. Funding is split eveningly between KBOR and KSDE.

			Performance M	easures			
Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	3- yr. Avg.	FY 2022	FY 2023
1. Number of CTE career clusters/pathway programs meeting standards and implemented at the local level	A	2,988	3,245	3,415	3,216	3,491	3,500
2. Number of high school students enrolled in tuition-free college, career, and technical education courses	A	13,675	13,934	10,000	12,536	14,000	14,000
Output Measures							
4. Number of students participating in CTE organizations	A	23,555	23,441	20,068	22,355	23,000	23,500
5. Number of CTE students who have earned at least two credits in an approved CTE career cluster/pathway course sequence		24,502	29,920	20,000	24,807	25,000	26,000
Additional Measures as Necessary		00.00/	07.000	100.000	07.0%	100.00/	100.00/
6. Percent of middle and high school students that have developed IPS	A	96.8%	97.0%	100.0%	97.9%	100.0%	100.0%
			Funding	]			
Funding Source		FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023
State General Fund		\$ 1,099,952	\$ 1,058,605	\$ 1,122,668	\$ 1,113,986	\$ 718,913	\$ 706,616
Non-SGF State Funds		10,010	13,782	10,183	2,800	11,403	11,624

945,527

2,017,914 \$

629,189

1,762,040 \$

595,627

1.712.413 \$

801,774

\$

1,532,090

803,955

\$

1.913.917

Total

Federal Funds

843,556

1,561,796

School districts would not have th	Consequences of Not Funding this Program School districts would not have the funding to effectively operate and educate Kansas students.					
Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level			
Specific –KSA 72-5131–5176 (KSEEA) –KSA 72-53,126 (Capital Outlay) –KSA 72-5462 (Capital Improvement) –KSA 72-3422, 72-3425, & 72-3440 (SPED) –KSA 72-17,132–17,148 (Food Service) –KSA 72-4161–4166 (Parents as Teachers) –KSA 72-4005–4010 (Driver Education) –KSA 72-1173 (Juvenile Detention Facilities) –Elementary and Secondary Education Act –Individuals with Disabilities Education Act –42 USC 1751-1779	Mandatory	Yes	1			

#### A. To provide financial support that will assist local education agencies in meeting the educational needs of students. Program History

The distribution of state aid has always been the responsibility of the Department of Education or its predecessor agencies. The amount of state aid distributed has been significantly impacted by legislative changes and court challenges. Major school finance formulas have included the State Foundation Aid of 1965; School District Equalization Act of 1972; School District Finance and Quality Performance Act of 1992; Classroom Learning Assuring Student Success Act of 2015; and the Kansas School Equity and Enhancement Act of 2017. Signficant court challenges include Mock v. State of Kansas, USD 229 v. State of Kansas, Montoy v. State of Kansas, and Gannon v. State of Kansas.

Additionally, KSDE has distributed the vast majority of federal aid to school districts since 1947, which is when the Legislature authorized school districts to participate in the National School Lunch Program. Other major federal aid programs include Title I and special education funding.

Performance measures for the Financial Aid program are those identified for KSDE's other programs, excluding those for the Kansas Children's Cabinet. Accurately implementing the Financial Aid program assists these programs in meeting their performance measures.

			_ /					
Performance Measures								
Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	3- yr. Avg.	FY 2022	FY 2023	
1. Outcome Measure #1		Performance meas	sures for the Finar	ncial Aid Program are	e those identified f	or the other seven p	rograms:	
2. Outcome measure #2		Administration, Go	vernance of Educ	ation, Child Nutrition	and Wellness, St	andards and Assess	ment	
3. Outcome measure comparing		Services, Special I	Education Service	s, Title Programs and	d Services, and C	areer and Technical	Education.	
outcomes to dollars							neir	
	performance measures.							
Output Measures								
4. Additional Output Measure								
5. Additional Output Measure								
			Fundi	ng				
Funding Source (in Thousands)		FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	
State General Fund		\$ 3,377,337	\$ 3,480,745	\$ 3,962,795 \$	3,916,185	\$ 4,159,380 \$	4,347,182	
Non-SGF State Funds		1.051.864	1,051,170	1,039,399	1,053,113	1,069,353	1,142,378	

454,502

4,986,416 \$

397,120

5,399,315 \$

449,911

4,879,112 \$

Total

Federal Funds

5.910.477

420,917

5,693,032

464,298

\$

481,399

5,450,697 \$

### Kansas Children's Cabinet

**Consequences of Not Funding this Program** 

Reduction or elimination of services to Kansas families and children in a variety of areas, including child abuse and neglect prevention, early childhood education, mental and heavioral health screening, training for parents and health care providers, and access to healthcare.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match	Priority
	Discretionary	Rqt.	Level
Specific –KSA 38-2103	Mandatory	Yes	

Program Goals

A. The Children's Cabinet will develop and implement a coordinated, comprehensive delivery system to improve the health and wellbeing of families and children in Kansas and evaluate programs funded with Children's Initiatives Funds.

Program History

In 1980, Kansas was the first state to establish a special fund, the Kansas Family and Children Trust Fund, dedicated to the prevention of child abuse and neglect by funding community-based prevention programs. In 1992, the Legislature created the Corporation for Change, which was given the responsibility for administering the Children's Trust Fund. In 1998, the Corporation for Change was replaced by the Governor's Advisory Committee on Children and Families. In 1999, the Governor's Advisory Committee on Children and Families was abolished and the Children's Cabinet was created. The Children's Cabinet was tasked with advising the Governor and Legislature on how best to use the tobacco Master Settlement Agreement moneys credited to the Children's Initiatives Fund and to assist the Governor in developing a coordinated, comprehensive system to serve children and families in Kansas.

From its creation through June 30, 2016, the Department of Social and Rehabilitative Services and the Department for Children and Families served as the fiscal agent for the Children's Cabinet. Since July 1, 2016, the Kansas State Department of Education has served as the Cabinet's fiscal agent.

		F	Performance M	easures				
Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	3- yr. Avg.	FY 2022*	FY 2023*	
1. Percent of classrooms funded by the Early Childhood Block Grant meeting high quality standards for classroom instruction: Toddler classrooms Pre-K classrooms	A.	74% 74%	59% 62%	75% 72%	69.3% 69.3%	The COVID-19 crisis has posed special challenges to programs serving children and families, which have often needed to reallocate resources to meet the changing needs of the families they serve, adopt new health and safety protocols, and maintain adequate staffing in an increasingly tight labor market. These disruptions are likely to continue, and, in the absence of increased funding, will affect the number of children programs can serve, as well as the resources that can be devoted to		
2. Percent of classrooms funded by Communities Aligned in Early Development and Education meeting high quality standards for classroom instruction: Toddler classrooms <u>Pre-K classrooms</u> Output Measures	A.	44% 20%	55% 35%	44% 14%	47.7% 23.0%			
4. Number of children served through ECGB programs	A.	7,457	7,163	6,074	6,898			
5. Number of children served through CAEDE programs	A.	343	653	511	502	professional devel quality improveme		
Additional Measures as Necessary								
6. Percent of providers funded by the Child Care Quality Initiative meeting high-quality standards at initial assessment	A.	N/A	42.0	45.0	43.5			
7. Number of children receiving services through the Child Care Quality Initiative	A.	372	527	484	461			
8. Number of professionals receiving professional development through the Autism Diagnosis Program	A.	153	91	62	102			
		•	Funding	J	•			
Funding Source		FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	
Non-SGF State Funds		17,013,051	20,234,400	20,131,307	20,281,709	21,212,516	22,766,156	
Federal Funds		963,194	822,652	790,697	16,610,314	10,040,463	9,672,052	

\$ 17,976,245 \$ 21,057,052 \$ 20,922,004 \$ 36,892,023 \$ 31,252,979 \$ 32,438,208

Total