

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

(from the report by Augenblick and Myers, Inc. May 2002,
"Calculation of the Cost of a suitable education in Kansas in 2000-2001
using two different analytic approaches",
excerpts from pages VII – 16, 17.)

Vocational Education

Currently, the state provides support for vocational education by using a pupil weight of .50 and multiplying it by the number of full-time-equivalent (FTE) students participating in vocational programs. Using this approach, the state reimbursed districts for about a third of the actual expenditures incurred by both individual school districts and area vocational schools in providing such services (about \$88 million in 2000-01).

Vocational education has long been an accepted part of a comprehensive high school program. Much of the cost of the program is attributable to the capital investment necessary to assure that students are exposed to the latest technology in business, agriculture, construction, transportation, and other areas. Operating costs are not very different from other curricular areas, such as science or language, where class sizes are small or non-capital equipment needs are higher than average. In fact, the per FTE student operating costs of vocational education are about 12 percent higher than those of all programs, on average (about \$6,500 vs. \$5,800 in 2000-01).

VII - 16

Given that the costs of vocational education are similar to those of other programs that are embedded in the general curriculum, and given that the proportion of students taking vocational classes are not expected to vary dramatically from place to place, we do not believe it is necessary to use a separate weight for vocational education. We would make the same argument about foreign language, or science, or any other subject area that is an essential part of the general curriculum. Our sense is that vocational education costs should be included in the calculation of the base cost figure and not distinguished from other components of the basic program. The fact is that participants in the professional judgment panels included vocational education in their thinking (since it was part of the definition of a suitable education) and we included vocational education expenditures in our calculation of basic expenditures for the successful school district analysis. Our conclusion is that there is no need to weight vocational education but rather, to include vocational education costs in the foundation level.

VII - 17

Per Pupil Funding for CTE

(sorted by amount per pupil)

USD #	District Name	County	CTE Weighting	Headcount (9-12th)	Per-pupil (9-12th)
D0410	Durham-Hillsboro-Lehigh	Marion	129,812.4	165	787
D0283	Elk Valley	Elk	25,423.2	46	553
D0482	Dighton	Lane	36,979.2	67	552
D0103	Cheylin	Cheyenne	26,964.0	51	529
D0349	Stafford	Stafford	34,282.8	65	527
D0440	Halstead	Harvey	135,590.4	260	522
D0310	Fairfield	Reno	41,216.4	80	515
D0506	Labette County	Labette	263,476.8	518	509
D0311	Pretty Prairie	Reno	41,601.6	82	507
D0330	Mission Valley	Wabaunsee	70,491.6	147	480
D0481	Rural Vista	Dickinson	35,438.4	75	473
D0288	Central Heights	Franklin	94,759.2	202	469
D0398	Peabody-Burns	Marion	45,453.6	98	464
D0411	Goessel	Marion	37,364.4	82	456
D0329	Mill Creek Valley	Wabaunsee	67,795.2	149	455
D0287	West Franklin	Franklin	87,055.2	192	453
D0270	Plainville	Rooks	60,476.4	134	451
D0401	Chase-Raymond	Rice	25,423.2	57	446
D0224	Clifton-Clyde	Washington	37,364.4	84	445
D0326	Logan	Phillips	23,497.2	54	435
D0360	Caldwell	Sumner	27,349.2	63	434
D0492	Flinthills	Butler	40,060.8	94	426
D0487	Herington	Dickinson	47,379.6	112	423
D0312	Haven Public Schools	Reno	126,730.8	302	420
D0491	Eudora	Douglas	196,066.8	468	419
D0388	Ellis	Ellis	58,550.4	140	418
D0256	Marmaton Valley	Allen	36,208.8	87	416
D0350	St John-Hudson	Stafford	48,535.2	117	415
D0435	Abilene	Dickinson	216,097.2	521	415
D0395	LaCrosse	Rush	38,134.8	92	415
D0364	Marysville	Marshall	101,692.8	246	413
D0507	Satanta	Haskell	34,668.0	84	413
D0346	Jayhawk	Linn	62,017.2	154	403
D0479	Crest	Anderson	26,964.0	67	402
D0432	Victoria	Ellis	28,890.0	72	401
D0408	Marion-Florence	Marion	63,558.0	162	392
D0439	Sedgwick Public Schools	Harvey	64,713.6	165	392
D0258	Humboldt	Allen	87,440.4	224	390
D0431	Hoisington	Barton	80,506.8	207	389
D0331	Kingman - Norwich	Kingman	124,034.4	320	388
D0460	Hesston	Harvey	97,455.6	255	382
D0115	Nemaha Central	Nemaha	96,685.2	253	382
D0237	Smith Center	Smith	45,838.8	120	382

Per Pupil Funding for CTE					
(sorted by amount per pupil)					
USD #	District Name	County	CTE Weighting	Headcount (9-12th)	Per pupil (9-12th)
D0421	Lyndon	Osage	9,630.0	126	76
D0385	Andover	Butler	162,169.2	2,162	75
D0483	Kismet-Plains	Seward	14,252.4	200	71
D0403	Otis-Bison	Rush	7,318.8	118	62
D0387	Altoona-Midway	Wilson	1,540.8	51	30
D0264	Clearwater	Sedgwick	9,244.8	354	26
D0386	Madison-Virgil	Greenwood	1,540.8	84	18
D0502	Lewis	Edwards	385.2	21	18
D0351	Macksville	Stafford	770.4	72	11
D0207	Ft Leavenworth	Leavenworth	0.0	65	0
D0209	Moscow Public Schools	Stevens	0.0	63	0
D0219	Minneola	Clark	0.0	79	0
D0225	Fowler	Meade	0.0	42	0
D0241	Wallace County Schools	Wallace	0.0	57	0
D0242	Weskan	Wallace	0.0	37	0
D0246	Northeast	Crawford	0.0	162	0
D0275	Triplains	Logan	0.0	27	0
D0285	Cedar Vale	Chautauqua	0.0	45	0
D0314	Brewster	Thomas	0.0	46	0
D0332	Cunningham	Kingman	0.0	41	0
D0374	Sublette	Haskell	0.0	157	0
D0390	Hamilton	Greenwood	0.0	29	0
D0434	Santa Fe Trail	Osage	0.0	326	0
D0468	Healy Public Schools	Lane	0.0	27	0
D0471	Dexter	Cowley	0.0	37	0
D0477	Ingalls	Gray	0.0	67	0
D0496	Pawnee Heights	Pawnee	0.0	33	0
D0511	Attica	Harper	0.0	42	0